APR 8 - 1919

THE PROPERTY OF
THE LAW SOCIETY

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 EDWARD VII., 1907-8

VOL. LXXXII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF NOVEMBER TO THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1907-8

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FOURTH SESSION OF THE TENTH PARLIAMENT.

1907-8.

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

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

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

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

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

ALBERT HORTON ..... Chief Reporter.

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FOURTH SESSION, TENTH PARLIAMENT.

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

BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton, East.
BARR, JOHN—Dufferin.
BEAUPARLANT, AIMÉ M.—St. Hyacinthe.
BÉLAND, HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E.R.
BERGERON, JOSEPH G. H.—Beauharnois.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLACK, JUDSON BURPEE—Hants.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BOLE, DAVID WESLEY—Winnipeg.
BORDEN, HON. SIR FREDERICK W., K.C.M.G.—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, ROBERT LAIRD—Carleton, Ont.
BOURBONNAIS, AUGUSTIN—Soulanges.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BRABAZON, Gerald H.—Pontiac.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BUREAU, HON. JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURROWS, THEODORE ARTHUR—Dauphin.

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

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

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

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

GALLIHER, WILLIAM ALFRED—Kootenay.
GANONG, GILBERT W.—Charlotte.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GEOFFRION, VICTOR—Chambly and Verchères.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLY—Welland.
GERVAIS, HONORÉ—Montreal, St. James.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GLADU, JOSEPH E. O.—Yamaska.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent, E.R.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE PERRY—Brockville.
GRANT, GEORGE D.—Ontario, N.R.
GREENWAY, THOMAS—Lisgar.
GUNN, BENJAMIN B.—Huron, S.R.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S.R.

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

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

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

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

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

NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R

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

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

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

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

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.
TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds.
TELFORD, WILLIAM PATTESON—Grey, N.R.

TEMPLEMAN, HON. WILLIAM—Victoria City, B.C.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
TISDALE, HON. DAVID—Norfolk.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, JOHN—Bruce, N. Riding.
TURCOTTE, G. A.—Nicolet.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN G.—Assiniboia, East.

VERVILLE, A.—Maisonneuve.

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

ZIMMERMAN, ADAM—Hamilton, West.

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 28, 1907.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time to the 28th day of November, 1907, met this day for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

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

OTTAWA, November 26, 1907.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the Fourth Session of the Tenth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada on Thursday the 28th instant at three o'clock p.m.

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

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

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

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

Accordingly the House went to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to 'The Dominion Controverted Elections,' certificates and reports relating to the elections:

For the Electoral District of Winnipeg
For the Electoral District of Brandon.
For the Electoral District of Provencher.
For the Electoral District of Portage la Prairie.
For the Electoral District of Selkirk.
For the Electoral District of Macdonald.
For the Electoral District of Lisgar.
For the Electoral District of Marquette.
For the Electoral District of Souris.

——by which the said election petitions were severally dismissed and the sitting members declared duly elected.

VACANCIES.

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

Of A. A. Stockton, Esq., member for the Electoral District of St. John City and County, by decease.

Of Daniel Derbyshire, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Brockville, by resignation.

Of Thomas Martin, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Wellington, by decease.

Of Edward Cochrane, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, Ontario, by decease.

Of Charles Devlin, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, by resignation.

Of Henri Bourassa, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Labelle, by resignation.

Of Frederick A. Laurence, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Colchester, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit: Judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

Of Honourable Antoine Napoléon Belcourt, member for the Electoral District of Ottawa, by resignation.

Of Archibald Campbell, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the Centre Riding of the County of York, Ontario, by resignation.

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

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of Honourable William Pugsley, for the Electoral District of St. John City and County.

Of Honourable George Perry Graham, for the Electoral District of Brockville.

REVISED EDITION.

Of Thomas Beattie, Esq., for the Electoral District of London.

Of Charles Lewis Owen, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, and

Of Alexander Munro Martin, Esq., for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Wellington.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Honourable William Pugsley, member for the Electoral District of St. John City and County ; introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and Honourable W. S. Fielding.

Honourable George Perry Graham, member for the Electoral District of Brockville ; introduced by Hon. Wm. Paterson and Mr. W. S. Calvert.

Thomas Beattie, Esq., member for the Electoral District of London ; introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. F. D. Monk.

Charles Lewis Owen, Esq., member for the Electoral District of East Northumberland; introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. W. B. Northrup.

Alexander Munro Martin, Esq., member for the Electoral District of North Wellington ; introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Millar.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the administration of oaths of office.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Prime Minister.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In again meeting you at a period of the year most convenient for the despatch of business, it gives me great pleasure to be able to congratulate you on the remarkable expansion of the trade of Canada with other countries, the total trade of the past year far exceeding that of any of its predecessors. A gratifying result of this expansion was that the revenue of the last fiscal period of nine months was more than sufficient to meet expenses on Consolidated Fund, National Transcontinental Railway Capital and Special outlays, all expenses of the Dominion of every kind, and leave a balance of over three million dollars to be applied in reduction of the public debt.

The stream of immigrants coming to Canada continues to increase in volume, the year now drawing to a close showing a larger number than any preceding year, and it is gratifying to observe the many coming from the British Isles.

The Dominion has been blessed by a long series of prosperous years, and, though at the present moment its business is being restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel assured that this unfavourable condition will be temporary and that the illimitable resources of Canada and the world-wide recognition of them give us ample guarantee of continued material progress.

The conference held in London in the months of April and May last between the government of the United Kingdom and the governments of the British Dominions beyond the seas satisfactorily dealt with many subjects in which the empire at large is interested. A copy of the minutes of the proceedings will be laid before you.

Two of my ministers, duly authorized by His Majesty for the purpose, and acting in conjunction with His Majesty's ambassador at Paris, have recently negotiated a convention with the government of the French Republic respecting the commercial relations between France and Canada, subject, however, to the approval of the French Chambers and the Canadian Parliament. A copy of this convention will be submitted to you immediately and you will be asked to give it your sanction.

The government of Newfoundland having become involved in a controversy with the government of the United States as to the true meaning of article 1 of the convention respecting fisheries, concluded in the year 1818 between the United Kingdom and the United States, and Canada being also interested in the question at issue, my government has joined with the government of Newfoundland in an agreement to refer all matters of difference arising under said article 1 to the Hague Tribunal.

The difficulty of obtaining labour and materials at a time of great business activity has somewhat retarded the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway. Nevertheless great progress has been made both on the eastern division and on the prairie section of the western division. A section of the latter of about two hundred and fifty miles has been available for handling the traffic of the present season. Contracts for the portion of the prairie section west of Edmonton are about to be let, and immediate steps will be taken for the commencement of work at both the eastern and western ends of the mountain division. Thus, in a very short time,

the whole work from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be under vigorous construction.

The unexpected influx of immigrants from oriental countries into British Columbia aroused a strong feeling of opposition. A member of my government has been deputed to proceed to Japan to confer with the Japanese government on this subject.

The sudden and unexpected collapse of the great cantilever bridge in course of construction across the St. Lawrence, in the vicinity of Quebec, may be regarded as a national calamity and the event has evoked much sorrow for the lives which were lost on that occasion. A commission has been appointed to inquire into the causes which led to the disaster. When received, the report of the commission will be laid before you. It will be necessary to devise means for the completion of the bridge within a reasonable time.

It is most gratifying to find that, notwithstanding the large reductions of postal rates, which have been made, the revenue of the Post Office Department has continued to increase rapidly. The large receipts of this branch of the government business will enable the department to make still more liberal provision for the extension of postal facilities throughout the Dominion.

The time has arrived when the public interest requires that telegraph and telephone companies holding federal charters should be placed under government control. A Bill will be introduced for that purpose.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The public accounts for the nine months ending March 31 last will be laid before you without delay.

The estimates for the coming fiscal year will be submitted for your approval at an early date.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

Among the measures to be submitted to you is a Bill for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba and of other provinces; also a Bill to provide for the issue of Government Annuities for old age; a Bill respecting Insurance; and Bills to amend the Election Act and the Dominion Lands Act.

I commend to your thoughtful consideration the several subjects to which I have referred and I trust that in your deliberations you may be guided by Divine light.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada be taken into consideration on Monday next.

Mr. L. R. BORDEN. I would ask the Prime Minister: when may we expect that the Treaty with France will be laid upon the table of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-day.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That a special committee of seven members be appointed to prepare a report with all convenient speed, of a list of the members to compose the select standing committees of this House under rule No. 10; said committee to be composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. R. L. Borden, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Fielding, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Haggart and Mr. Taylor.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it be convenient to have that committee called together at a very early day. There is some work which it could undertake immediately, and which if done now might be of advantage in shortening the session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Early next week.

Motion agreed to.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, which was as follows:

GREY:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of a convention respecting the commercial relations between France and Canada, entered into at Paris on the 19th day of September, 1907, between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Government House,
Ottawa, November 28, 1907.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

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

Public accounts of Canada for the fiscal period of nine months ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Fielding.

The Auditor General's Report, vol. iii.—Mr. Fielding. He said: There are two other volumes which I hope to bring down very soon, but as this volume is ready, we presented it at the earliest possible moment.

Annual reports of the Department of Inland Revenue—Excise, Weights and Measures, and Adulteration of Food.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 4 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 29, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Oliver.

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, for the year ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Oliver.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Graham.

Report of the Commission on the Transcontinental Railway for the year ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Graham.

Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.—Mr. Graham.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce (part 1).—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the reports of the Transcontinental Railway Commission and of the Board of Railway Commissioners in printed form?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it intended to print and distribute them?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. They will go to the committee in the regular course and be printed.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 3.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 2, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Auditor General's Report, vol. i, for the nine months ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Fielding.

Trade and Navigation Returns for the fiscal period ended March 31, 1907.—Mr. Paterson.

Report of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal period ended March 31, 1907.—Mr. Pugsley.

Report of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal period ended March 31, 1907.—Mr. Fisher.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

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

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, as follows:

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute of Council appointing the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance; the Honourable Louis Philippe Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the Honourable William Paterson, Minister of Customs, and the Honourable William Pugsley, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 11th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled: 'An Act respecting the House of Commons.'

Government House,
Ottawa, November 28, 1907.

THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the order for the consideration of the motion for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the Speech at the opening of the session be now called, and that the same have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills until disposed of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The questions on the Order Paper could not be very well answered to-day; but I presume that after to-day the debate on the address will be proceeded with immediately after questions. That has been the practice in the past.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No objection.

Motion amended as suggested, agreed to.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

On the order of the day being called:

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, with regard to the French Treaty, to simplify matters, and make it a little easier for the members of the House, and probably people outside of the House, to understand the real bearings of the different schedules, if he could have a statement prepared, showing the different items in the schedules, with the minimum tariff, the intermediate tariff and the preferential tariff set opposite to them; and showing also, with reference to the articles on which we are given favoured terms by France, the gross amount of imports into France during recent years. Otherwise it will be a great deal of trouble for each one to pick out all these matters for himself: indeed, it will be almost impossible.

Mr. FIELDING. The first part of my hon. friend's suggestion I can readily comply with, and perhaps the second part also. Although notice has been given of a motion for to-morrow, it may be considered that that will be dropped, and the motion left till the necessary information can be ob-

tained, which may cause a delay of several days. We will endeavour to get as well as possible the information the hon. gentleman has asked for.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals a matter of very great importance to the members attending the House of Commons, particularly those living east of Toronto on the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is out of order. If this is a matter of urgent public importance——

Mr. TAYLOR. It is.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the hon member will have to proceed under rule 37.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is perhaps a personal matter and a matter of privilege, because I myself——

Mr. SPEAKER. The House has passed the motion for the consideration of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne and that order is now before the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I will bring it up before the orders of the day.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. R. R. HALL (West Peterborough). Mr. Speaker, permit me at the outset to thank the Rt. hon. the Prime Minister in honouring me with the privilege of moving the motion which I am about to make. I take it as a compliment, not so much personal to myself as to the great constituency which I have the honour to represent. There are about twenty cities in Canada having each a larger population than the city of Peterborough, but I suppose the Premier, in coupling my name with this motion, must have had in mind the fact that there are only five cities in the Dominion showing a greater manufacturing output than that of the city of Peterborough. He must also have had in mind the fact that the farmers of the county of Peterborough produce the finest cheese and butter to be found on the British market.

Now, I would like to devote some little time and attention to the question of the development of our trade, especially during recent years. In order that we may take a comprehensive view of the growth and development of Canadian trade during the last few years, it is necessary to keep in view two very important years in the recent history of Canada. I take the year 1878 as being a year of marked importance in the history of Canada. It was then that the late Sir John Macdonald and his party succeeded in gaining the confidence of the country and in being elected to this House by a very large majority. And for upwards of eighteen years they held power continuously. I am quite ready to admit that during these eighteen years much valuable and progressive work was done for Canada, especially the construction of that great transcontinental railway the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not suppose that any one would be disposed to detract from the credit which the government of the late Sir John Macdonald deserved in that connection, although no doubt a great deal of difference of opinion exists regarding the cost to the people of that undertaking, and no doubt there is good ground for the contention that it cost the people enormously more than it should have. The next year that begins a still more important epoch in the history of Canada is the year 1896, when our present First Minister, the Right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and his party were elected to office and given control of the destinies of this country. Let me now compare the progress which Canada made in the eighteen years when the late government was in office with that which this country made since 1896 under Liberal regime. In 1878 the total trade of Canada amounted to $172,405,454. In 1896 it had grown to $239,025,360. Thus during the whole eighteen years of Conservative government the total increase of Canadian trade was $66,619,906. Then taking our trade for the year ending June 30, 1907, I find that it amounted to $617,964,952, or an increase in eleven years of $376,939,592. That is to say, comparing the last eleven years with the previous eighteen years the average increase in Canadian trade has been nine times as great in the latter period what it was in the former. I might add that the trade between Canada and Great Britain has also increased in a most remarkable extent in the last eleven years compared with the previous eighteen years. The increase from 1878 to 1896 amounted to $16,297,311, whereas the increase from 1896 to 1907 has amounted to $117,319,460. Therefore, the increase in the latter period has been eleven times as great as it was during the previous eighteen years. Our trade with the United States has increased twelve times as much during the last eleven years as it did during the previous eighteen years.

I might further point out that the trade of Canada still continues to develop. Take the four months previous to October 31, 1906, and we find that our trade amounted in the aggregate to $215,196,190. Compare that with the four months ending October 31, 1907, and you find that our trade in the latter period amounted to $246,592,497. Thus it is clear that during the four months ending October 31, 1907, compared with the cor-

responding four months of 1906, our trade has increased $31,396,307.

I might further point out that this enormous trade seems to be developing continuously and along every line. It must be very satisfactory to the people of Canada to feel that the impulsive flow of Canadian trade ne'er feels returning ebb, but holds on its course in a swelling tide. One may naturally ask what are the causes of this enormous growth. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons is that we have rich and fertile lands which attract immigration from all parts of the world. The illimitable resources of Canada attract foreign capital from abroad. We have also sound banking institutions and sound financial institutions which still further tend to increase the financial strength and credit of our country. We also enjoy stability in government. But what are some of the other causes of this enormous growth? This growth is certainly due in a very marked degree to the wise and prudent administration of this government. To that administration must be largely attributed the successful development of our resources, the rapid peopling of our Northwest, the increasing of our transportation facilities, the improvements of our canals and harbours, the deepening of our waterways, the improvement of the St. Lawrence ship channel, the improvement in transportation of perishable goods, the improvement of our terminal facilities and our ocean steamship service, the establishment of a trade commissioners' service outside of Canada on a broad business-like basis. These are some of the causes set in motion by this government which have resulted in this great expansion of trade.

It must also be a cause of pride and satisfaction to our people to know that this wonderful advancement in our trade has been brought about without in any way increasing our national debt. In 1896 the national debt of Canada amounted to $258,497,432. Down to March 31, 1907, it amounted to $263,671,859, being an increase of but little over $5,000,000 since 1896. During the previous eighteen years our trade increased only some $66,000,000, but our national debt increased during that period $118,000,000. Just compare the two. During the last eleven years under the present government our increase in trade amounts to $378,000,000 and the increase in our national debt is but $5,000,000. Had the same proportion continued between the increase in trade and the increase in the national debt in the last eleven years as during the previous eighteen years, our national debt would have increased upwards of $600,000,000.

It is another matter of pride and satisfaction to know that our debt per head, which in 1896 was $50.71, is to-day only $40 per head. It is quite true that in the working out of this wonderful expansive policy our annual expenditure has increased, but it is satisfactory to know that our revenue has likewise increased. The money spent during the eighteen years of the late Conservative government produced indifferent results, but the money spent during the last eleven years has produced most excellent returns.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have embarked upon the construction of a national transcontinental railway and have spent large sums during the past nine months on capital account on the improvement of our public works and canals, even to the extent of over $14,000,000, our public accounts show a surplus, notwithstanding all this expenditure on capital account, of $3,300,000 to apply on the national debt. Therefore, so far as the financial position of Canada is concerned, I do not think any one can seriously find any fault with it. I have said that this great growth of Canada's trade has largely been brought about by the judicious expenditure of public money. Let me give an illustration to show how money can be judiciously expended and our annual expenditure increased with the result that Canada will reap considerable profit from the investment.

Take for instance, our trade with Mexico. In 1896 our total trade with Mexico was $37,876; and in 1907 it was $1,137,784. This great increase in our trade with Mexico has been brought about largely by the establishment, on July 21, 1905, of a steamship service on the Atlantic between Canada and Mexico. I notice that on May 1, 1907, a steamship service with Mexico was established on the Pacific also. In 1905, our total trade with Mexico was $174,593, and in 1907, as I have already stated, it was $1,137,784, or over six times as great as it was only two years ago. The establishment of steamship service is but one of many illustrations that might be given of how wise expenditures made by this government contributes toward the growth of Canada.

Another illustration that might be given of the remarkable growth of Canada is seen in the results of the excellent work done by the Department of Agriculture in improving our transportation facilities and in other ways. In 1906, we sent cheese to Great Britain to the amount of $14,000,000 but in 1907 our exports of cheese to Great Britain amounted to $25,000,000, an increase of almost 100 per cent. One fact that shows very clearly the proud position that Canada occupies in the British market is that our export of cheese to that market amounts to nearly three times as much as that of Holland and the United States combined. There is no doubt that the application of the principle of cold storage to our railways, our terminal facilities and our steamship lines has enabled Canada to send to Great Britain immense quantities of butter, fruit, and other kinds of perishable goods. The Department of Agriculture seems to have proceeded in its work upon the confident belief that if we preserve our perishable goods efficiently and transport them cheaply, in-

crease in our trade will follow as naturally as day follows night.

One of the most remarkable features of Canada's advancement is the growth of our immigration. During the eighteen years before this government took office, it was a deplorable thing that so many of our farmer's sons and mechanics left Canada to go to the United States and other fields seeking more profitable employment and more rapid advancement in life than could be found at home. In 1896, the total immigration into Canada was only 21,716. It was a deplorable fact that, down to that time, the majority of people coming from across the Atlantic to Canada passed through Canada to find homes in the United States. In 1907, the total immigration to Canada amounted to upwards of 250,000. From March 31, 1907, until the end of October, a period of seven months, no fewer than 211,859 people have come to Canada, or 50,297 more than during the same period last year. I observe, by the returns, that the majority of these immigrants are from Great Britain and Ireland. We are always glad to see people from Great Britain and Ireland come to make their homes in Canada. We find also that many of these immigrants come from the continent of Europe. I am sure that every Canadian welcomes these immigrants from the continent of Europe, provided they come with sound bodies and sound minds. We heartily welcome any citizens who come from the good old land of France; not as many have come from France within the last few years as I would like to see.

Another feature this government has every reason to be proud of is its management of the Post Office Department. In 1896, there was a deficit of $700,000 in the administration of the Post Office Department. For the present year, there will be a surplus of $1,000,000, and this result has been brought about not by cutting down or starving the service in any way, but through judicious and able management. Since 1896 there have been great reductions in our postal rates, as well as great extensions in our system. The rapid development of the west has made enormous demands upon the government for the increase of new mail services and the establishment of new post offices. An increase of pay to the amount of ten per cent was granted to our postmasters by the former Postmaster General, and still further increases have been granted by the present head of the department. Better postal facilities have been established between Great Britain and Canada. Until a few years ago, the postal rate to Great Britain was 5 cents per ounce; then it was cut down to 2 cents per half-ounce, and now it is 2 cents per ounce. The establishment of mail delivery in our cities of over 10,000 population is also a marked improvement in the administration of our postal service. So that, I think, in looking at the management of the Post Office, we cannot but regard it as having been most efficiently and most economically carried on.

The growth and development of the Canadian transportation system, especially in regard to our railways is also a feature of our national life of which we have every reason to be proud. In 1896, we had 16,270 miles of railways; in 1906, our railway lines increased to 21,353 miles. We find that the freight carried in 1906 showed an increase over that carried in 1896 of no less than 33,000,000 tons, and there were 13,000,000 more passengers carried in 1906 than in 1896.

The freight carried on our canals was three million tons greater in 1906 than it was in 1896.

If there is one thing more than another of which the people of Canada can congratulate themselves it is the fact that the National Transcontinenal Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific are making such remarkable progress towards completion notwithstanding the many difficulties which confront them, both in securing the necessary labour to construct them and in carrying supplies to points on the construction route so remote from those touched by existing railway lines. West of Winnipeg upwards of 300 miles have been graded, and about completed and grain has been carried over a part of this road since October last. About 500 miles more are under contract between Winnipeg and Edmonton and will be completed in due time. On the mountain section, between Edmonton and the Pacific coast, surveys are going on rapidly and tenders will soon be called for. The construction of the National Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Moncton is making good progress; 861 miles are under contract, with 946 miles yet to be let. The progress made upon the construction of the line between Winnipeg and Moncton must necessarily be slow because of the fact that the line is being constructed through a new territory far from the base of supply. It is also satisfactory to know that the line between Winnipeg and Quebec will have a much better roadbed than was at first anticipated. The maximum grade adverse to east-bound traffic is but ·4, and the maximum grade adverse to west-bound traffic is ·6. The government could not have taken any better course in the interest of Canada, notwithstanding all the embarrassments that were thrown in their way, than the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. It has given employment to a large number of the people who are coming into this country as well as to those already in. It is also a fact that the port of New York is very much congested. The handling of traffic at that port, it is agreed upon all hands, is becoming exceedingly expensive. I noticed an interview with Mr. J. J. Hill,

in to-day's Montreal 'Gazette.' The despatch I refer to is as follows :

New York, in the opinion of James J. Hill, head of the Great Northern system of railroads, has reached the climax of her commercial supremacy. In an interview to-day the railroad builder of the Northwest expressed this view, his reason being that this city cannot hope to maintain its commercial control when its chief claim is, as he states it, that it is the dearest place in which to do business. 'The cost of everything relating to trade and commerce,' said Mr. Hill, 'has increased here beyond the point of profit. Traffic will be forced to seek other outlets; business other locations.

'The tax imposed on business in New York is enormous. Your real estate, your dock, your means of communication, are all burdened with heavy charges. The price to live and do business in New York is growing beyond the ability of the people to stand it. They will be forced to go elsewhere, seeking places where the cost is more reasonable.

'Traffic cannot be dammed up. It will seek an outlet somewhere, by going around the edges or making for itself entirely new channels.

'There are two outlets for the west possible of development besides New York and the adjacent ports. One is through Canada, down the St. Lawrence, and the other down the Mississippi to New Orleans.

'The products of the west are bound to reach their markets. Therefore, if they are blocked and overtaxed on their way through New York, they will find new channels for themselves.'

Therefore, so far as Canada is concerned, it was with wisdom and foresight that the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, or the National Transcontinental Railway was undertaken. It will make certain that Canadian trade will be carried through Canadian ports. While Canada's trade has increased as it has done from all these causes, at the same time in comparing her with other great commercial countries of the world, it is important for us to realize where she stands. We find that Great Britain's trade between 1895 and 1896, increased 53 per cent, that of France increased 53½ per cent, that of Germany 87 per cent, that of the United States 100 per cent, and that of Canada 170 per cent. That is a proud and remarkable position for Canada to occupy among the great commercial countries of the world. She stands second place upon the list of all the commercial nations in the growth and expansion of her trade. There is but one other nation that occupies the unique position of having a greater trade expansion than Canada and that is Japan. It is only within recent years that Japan's ports have been thrown open, and that her trade has been afforded an opportunity for development ; therefore it is not at all surprising that, with this complete change of front, the trade of Japan should have increased as rapidly as it has done. It is also a satisfaction to know that although Japan stands at the head of the list in the growth and expansion of its trade, with a population of upwards of forty-four millions, yet Canada with a population of only six millions actually has a greater volume of trade by over fifty-four millions than that of Japan. It must further be remembered that the expansion of the trade of Canada has been wholly in the arts of peace, whereas a large part of Japan's trade has been in munitions of war.

It is also necessary for us to realize the fact that the development of our oriental trade is of great importance to the welfare of Canada. We are in a position to raise a vast amount of produce in the Northwest; the products of our forests and our mines in British Columbia must find a market, and there is no market so convenient for them as that of Japan and other oriental nations. It is for that reason that we can well wish God speed and success to the mission of the hon. the Postmaster General to Japan. It is important for us to cultivate that trade, because in a comparatively few years we will not only have Canadian Pacific steamship lines plying between British Columbia and the orient, but we will also have lines of steamers connecting the orient with the Grand Trunk Pacific as well.

Our trade relations with France have not been as satisfactory as we could have wished, nor our commerce with that country as great as we could have desired, when we consider the enormous trade of that country with the rest of the world. We find that France has a total trade of $2,100,000,000 per annum. Japan stands fourth upon the list of great commercial nations, exceeded only by Great Britain, the United States and Germany. Canada's trade with France was only $11,000,000 last year, whereas Canada's trade with Great Britain and the United States amounted to upwards of $500,000,000. It does seem strange that our trade with France has not increased more rapidly in the past. However, we can readily understand how high tariff impositions to a large extent prevent trade between the two countries which might otherwise take place. I must say that it is to the credit of the hon. the Finance Minister, and also to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the barriers that have so long stood in the way between France and Canada are now to be removed, and that Canada will occupy a more favourable position in the future in her trade relations with France. All the articles which Canada is able to produce, namely, the products of the farm, the forest, the mine and the fisheries, will receive more favourable treatment in France than they have in the past. It is also a satisfaction for us to know that Canada has been honoured by Great Britain in appointing the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as plenipotentiaries to act for her on our behalf in framing this treaty with France, and we

are glad to learn that their efforts have been so successful.

I will not dwell upon the imperial conference that lately took place in London, nor mention any of the great imperial questions that were brought under consideration. I will only say that no living imperial statesman has done more than the right hon. the leader of this House to bind the British possessions in all parts of the globe more closely to those golden islands in the Northern Sea. In conclusion, I desire to extend my hearty congratulations to the right hon. Premier on his just having passed his 66th birthday, in the full vigour of his mental and physical powers : for I know that such congratulations will awaken a sympathetic chord in every heart and hearthstone throughout this broad land. His advancing years but bring to him increasing honours, and more widely extended fame. His greatest service to Canada has been in securing unity and progress at home, and respect abroad. His country's welfare has ever been the guiding star of his every end and aim, and hence to him the road to fame and to honour has not been so difficult to travel. I beg to move, Sir, that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne.

Mr. ADELARD LANCTOT (Richelieu), (Translation). Mr. Speaker, although I felt greatly honoured when requested to second the address in answer to the speech from the Throne, I did not lose sight of the ungratefulness and difficulties of the task. He who deals with a subject of his own choice, who himself settles on a plan for his speech, who draws from his own mind those arguments which are to convince his hearers, is really doing original work wherein his reasoning and imaginative powers have their full sway. But the seconder of an address in answer to the speech from the Throne is restricted to a few formal and precise statements, which he must be very discreet and prudent in commenting upon and concerning which he may at most attempt a few variations as evidence of his skill. It so happens, however, that I am not a skilled orator and that I feel utterly unequal to the task which has been assigned to me. Indeed, were it not customary, under such circumstances, to go over the statements contained in the speech from the Throne, I would, in seconding the motion of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall), be content with proclaiming myself a faithful follower of the party in power; a follower sufficiently well satisfied with the past record of the government to confidently endorse their future conduct.

But, Sir, you expect something more from me. You expect that I shall make some brief comment regarding the various matters which His Excellency has thought fit to bring forward. Some of these relate to measures which the government propose to introduce; others merely recall past deeds which we are requested to approve. Thus the speech from the Throne calls our attention to matters of yesterday as well as to matters of to-morrow.

What is the programme for to-morrow? It will be mainly an Act concerning insurance companies, an Act for extending the powers of the board of Railway Commissioners, an Act regarding parliamentary elections.

The legislation proposed in the speech from the Throne was demanded by public opinion, and the government should be congratulated for having introduced it. It is the part of true statesmanship to legislate in accordance with the just wishes of the people. Only headstrong reformers would think of enforcing on the people laws which do not answer a clearly expressed need. Never has the government been more worthy than it is to-day of being called liberal, the government of the people by the people, since it has undoubtedly voiced the general opinion when inviting us to vote such measures as are to take up our time at the opening of this session.

The Bill concerning insurance companies will have for its object to give policy-holders safeguards greater than those provided by the present Act. If there is one thing more than another which has a bearing on the security and well-being of families, it certainly is the insurance question. Indeed, insurance companies may be termed the provident citizen's permanent savings bank. There it is that the man who looks less to his personal comfort than to the future well-being of his family, deposits the most sacred part of his earnings or revenues. I say the most sacred part, because in most cases, it is the result of sacrifice of personal comfort on the part of the head of the family, for the benefit of others who will enjoy it only after his death.

Is there, Mr. Speaker, anything more worthy of admiration than the feeling which prompts the workingman to lay something aside for the benefit of his family, who will thus continue to enjoy his help, even when he is no longer there to work for them. The workingman, the mechanic, considers himself in duty bound to join some mutual benefit association, and he does so without the slightest suspicion. These associations, most of which originated in the neighbouring republic, have extended their philanthropic work into our country. Not only have these branch associations been tolerated, but they have enjoyed the protection of our laws. The Canadian citizen who trusts the government, trusts as well these institutions which the government protects. That confidence should be maintained and the savings of policy-holders given all necessary safeguards. As a matter of fact, such savings are no longer the property

of the person who has effected them; they belong henceforth to the widow, who has no other means of living, and to the orphans whom death has deprived of their father. Should these savings, instead of reaching their destination, be thrown into speculative ventures, used in stock gambling, or invested in securities of doubtful value, the policy-holder may lose the benefit of his self-denial. So I contend it would be criminal on the part of the government to overlook such a threatening evil, and to neglect amending the present insurance law, defective as it is. Certain facts of a scandalous nature, recently brought to light, especially in the United States, have sufficed to summon action on the government's part; and though not familiar with all the details of the proposed legislation, I am happy to be in a position to state that it will tend to ensure to the policy-holder a greater measure of protection. As regards its scope, it will apply as well to the mutual benefit associations under the control of the Dominion government. Insurance concerns will also be benefited thereby; for what will become of our insurance system if policy-holders suspect that they are not absolutely safeguarded against trickery and machinations on the part of officers of our insurance companies and mutual benefit associations.

I shall now draw attention to the measure for extending the powers of the board of Railway Commissioners over telephone and telegraph lines, which are nowadays considered to be on a par with our modern system of railways. In our time, steam and electricity are utilized in all industries, and as their uses multiply, it is the more necessary that the public should be protected against the exactions of monopolists. Business men have not as a rule the generosity and disinterestedness of that illustrious Frenchman, Pasteur, who gave away his discoveries, the outcome of the labours of a lifetime. Business men have laid hands on all recent discoveries in electrical science. They strive to make money out of the genius of great inventors and market out the result of scientific research. Telephone and telegraph lines are public facilities of such import as to make it desirable to place them under the control of the present Board of Railway Commissioners, in order to end all difficulties between the producer and the consumer. The problem which the government had to solve when the Board of Railway Commissioners was instituted, comes up to-day in connection with the management of telegraph and telephone lines. There has been no serious criticism as regards the establishment of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Nay, it was conceded by all that such establishment was a decided step in advance on the former condition of things. In fact, by referring to the report of that board, dated March 31, 1906, one may ascertain all the good that board has accomplished, all the abuses it has corrected and the lawsuits it has prevented. The government in putting the telephone companies under the control of a board of commissioners, is entitled to equal praise as when they established the Board of Railway Commissioners.

As regards the proposed Act concerning elections, I shall only hope that it will be in all particulars worthy of the Liberal party in this country. It is the same party which, in 1874, with a view to putting a stop to all corrupt practices, instituted the secret ballot. That in itself would be sufficient to entitle Sir Aime Dorion to the gratitude of his fellow-citizens ; for he then secured to them a sure means of freely using the franchise, provided corruption and fraud do not interfere. Since the last session of parliament, the manner in which elections are carried on in this country has been discussed on many hustings. I do not propose recalling in detail the corrupt practices denounced by representative political men belonging to either party. The 'tu quoque' argument has been freely used on both sides. It is the most clear proof that purity in elections has not attained here its highest standard. If the leader of the opposition is in earnest when taunting his opponents on account of alleged electoral corruption, he should join hands with the government in their effort to bring about a better state of things in this respect. And as I am quite satisfied that the charges brought by the Liberals against the opposition are justified, I trust that the reference made in the speech from the Throne to the desirability of having a more perfect electoral law will be unanimously endorsed by this House.

So, much, Mr. Speaker, for that part of the speech from the Throne dealing with proposed legislation. That will be our task to-morrow. As regards that part of the speech from the Throne which refers to yesterday's accomplishments, it is summed up in a reference to the Colonial Conference of 1907, and in another to the treaty between Canada and France.

Governments cannot afford to be inactive between sessions. During recess ministerial responsibility is often put to severe tests. That is precisely what happened after prorogation, when the right hon. leader of the House, accompanied by two of his colleagues, proceeded to London, at the call of the Imperial government, to take part in the Colonial Conference. They were not then in a position to shield their own responsibility behind the authority of parliament, they were left to their own resources, to their own judgment, to their own private wisdom. Nevertheless, we were not apprehensive of any danger. What our Prime Minister had accomplished at previous conferences,

towards the safeguarding of Canadian interests, was sufficient guarantee to us that nothing in the outcome of the conference of 1907 would in the least counteract the aspirations of our people. It will be recorded in history, and to our credit, that the foremost part in the work of that conference was taken by the Prime Minister of Canada.

If we have reason to rejoice in consequence, we should also rejoice because self-government has not thereby in any way been interfered with, and also because our representative at the conference has suggested a plan for the establishment of a line of steamers likely to provide more efficient means of transportation between England, Australia, New Zealand and our own country. Let us hope that this plan will be before long carried out.

Previous to the opening of that conference, people wondered whether England would continue as heretofore to be content with the help voluntarily tendered by her colonies in the wars waged for the defence of the Empire, or whether she would determine in advance and for ever the shares to be contributed by the colonies. Our Prime Minister has given the answer to that question in terms which are considered to-day as expressing the relations which should exist between the Empire and the self-governing states: 'British colonies, he said, enjoy self-government, thanks to England's liberality, and for no consideration whatever should we give up the smallest particle of that self-government.' Hereafter, then, the self-governing states shall remain free to contribute to the defence of the Empire in the measure which they think fit. Nothing has been changed in the state of things which existed before the conference and the danger apprehended by some has been conjured for ever, let us hope, through the farsightedness of the present Prime Minister.

The imperialist press on both sides of the ocean has pronounced the Canadian Prime Minister responsible for the failure of the scheme which they advocated; they have criticised him sharply on that account. It is only fair that the partisans of self-government should loudly proclaim what nobody can deny, that it is solely owing to his unique prestige, to his great experience that the autonomy of our country has been preserved in its entirety.

The government, through two of its most distinguished members, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), has just concluded with France a treaty, concerning which we have great cause to rejoice. We should rejoice, in the first place, because Canada has in the course of these negotiations taken the stand of an almost independent nation, since it has itself freely laid down all its terms and conditions. As for England, her part in the matter has taken the form of gracious acquiescence rather than that of an assertion of her sovereign will. We should also rejoice because that treaty opens up a new market for our trade and our industries. Of course, the task of developing agriculture and laying down rules for the utilization of the natural products of the country rests primarily with the provincial governments. But it is through the exportation of such products to foreign markets, where they bring the highest prices, that wealth will come to our country. Now, it is the duty of the Dominion government to find new channels for our trade; the more numerous these channels, the more will producers be in a position to reap such profits as may reasonably be expected, by selecting the most advantageous among the markets secured to them by the government.

Then again—and this will be my concluding remark—I rejoice over the conclusion of this treaty because it will tend to strengthen the entente cordiale, the friendly relations between the two nations. Since our great Sovereign has proclaimed in no uncertain terms that all nations are sisters and should love each other, it would seem that the bonds uniting the various peoples inhabiting our country have been drawn more closely together.

The royal utterances impressed more strongly on their minds the truth which they already perceived, that called as they are to live side by side in this land of Canada, and to build up by their united efforts one same country whose greatness they wish to ensure, they cannot hope to attain that object, otherwise than by leaving to all races the greatest measure of liberty, and by respecting the rights of each and every one of them. In that way do nationalities truly manifest love for one another. Of all the self-governing states which make up the British Empire, Canada is the only one which can claim as ancestors the two greatest nations in the world; England and France. England's supremacy in industry, commerce and navigation cannot be gainsaid. France's supremacy in literary, artistic and scientific pursuits cannot be denied. Let the attainments which distinguish both nations flourish in Canada, and there will spring up a nation without a superior in the world, since it will present, as it were the synthesis of the characeristics of both France and England.

I am not, as you perceive, in sympathy with those who wish to see, in the course of time, only one nationality survive in Canada, all the various races being blended together into one. Let us rather preserve our distinctive features. It would be unwise to obliterate them. Indeed, humanity has too varied and too complex a task to perform, for one people to accomplish it single-handed. Each race, with its peculiarities and attainments con-

tributes something towards the furtherance of the world's progress. Let us then congratulate ourselves on having the opportunity in this land of Canada of doubling up as it were and contributing to that admirable work the capabilities of our twofold ancestry. Accordingly, I repeat it, I rejoice at the conclusion of the treaty with France, for it will strengthen the entente cordiale.

Let the French literature and French art develop more and more in this Dominion; we who speak the French language will contribute to the greatness of our country, those qualities which have made France great. And in the meantime, let those who speak another language continue to develop that spirit of enterprise, that energy and those talents which have made England powerful.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to second the motion of the hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, I am sure that on this side of the House, we all join in the congratulations which the hon. member who moved this address (Mr. Hall) extended to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon his recent attainment of an additional birthday. I am rapidly arriving at that stage of life when I am not specially fond of these congratulations, especially when they call attention to my advancing years. I do not know how it may be with the Prime Minister in this regard, but, at all events, it is needless to say that we join most sincerely and heartily in the congratulations which have been thus extended by the hon. member who moved this address. Let me also congratulate both the mover and seconder of the address upon the very excellent speeches which they have made—speeches moderate and reasonable in their character for the most part except in so far as they endeavoured to attribute the prosperity of this country in past years to this very benign and benevolent government. I notice that my hon. friend the member for Peterborough boasted very much of the surpluses which have been piled up in recent years. Apparently he did it in ignorance of some bygone expressions of opinion from the Minister of Finance to which I will take an opportunity of drawing attention later on. I was also constrained to observe that in the illustrations of judicious expenditure which were brought to the attention of the House by the honourable mover of this address he did not for a very good reason include the Moncton land deal, the North Atlantic Trading Company, the Arctic expedition, or payments to the Yukon rainmaker. He also spoke of the great work done by the Post Office Department of this country. If he had been traversing this country from east to west as I have been doing some recent weeks, he would have found that there is an almost continual complaint in all parts of the country of the inadequacy of the postal facilities, and attention is called on every hand to the fact that letters which ought to be delivered in one or two days often take a week or ten days before they reach the persons for whom they are designed. Under these circumstances it does not seem to me that there is very great cause of congratulation to the country that the Post Office Department, year after year, is piling up a surplus when the postal service throughout the country, out of the mouths of business men and others, is denounced in terms, which I would hardly care to repeat in this House to-day.

Now, we have not yet had from either the mover or seconder of the address—we could hardly expect it from them—or from the Prime Minister himself, or any member of this government, any explanation of the cabinet changes which have been made since the last session of parliament closed. Attention was called to the fact that Mr. Aylesworth, whose indisposition we all most sincerely regret, was called from outside of the parliamentary ranks of the Liberal party to take the position of Postmaster General of this country, and I think that the Prime Minister himself on that occasion, as well as on other occasions when there had been very great delay in filling vacancies in the government, laid the cause to the excess of good material which is to be found in the ranks of his followers behind him. Let me say that perhaps that excuse has become just a little stale and possibly to-day he may give some better reason for having passed over every one of the gentlemen who sit behind him, for having gone outside of this House and for having selected the two hon. gentlemen whom I see to-day occupying the positions of Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and of Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). Now, I do not know what the explanation of this somewhat extraordinary circumstance is. Was there no one among the one hundred and twenty-five or one hundred and thirty gentlemen who sit on the government benches to-day whom the Prime Minister deemed worthy to sit beside him round the council board of the country? I do not know what the explanation may be. We have given to many hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Prime Minister the deserved credit for possessing a fair amount of capacity and business ability, for having a good reputation not only in this House but throughout the country as well. When we find the Prime Minister passing over all these gentlemen, going outside the House and selecting two gentlemen who, however, eminent they may be, are perhaps after all not so surpassingly superior to some gentlemen who may be found behind the Prime Minister and the cabinet, it is natural that the attention of

the country and of parliament should be called to it and that the Prime Minister to-day should be asked to give some explanation, not so much to ourselves as to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with whom, under the circumstances, we most profoundly and deeply sympathize. I do not suppose that in any country a greater slight or a greater indignity was ever offered to one hundred and thirty men sitting behind a government than that which has been offered by the Prime Minister and his colleagues on three separate occasions to these gentlemen who sit behind him. What is the object of the Prime Minister and the members of his government? Did they go and inspect every one of these gentlemen, did they take the lamp of Diogenes and look over him, look at his record, look at his capacity, give consideration to every quality that he might possess which ought reasonably to enable him to take a seat at the Council Board of this country, and after doing that, did they arrive at the conclusion that there was not one gentleman sitting behind them who measured up to the standard that the Prime Minister required in that regard? I do not know what answer the Prime Minister will make, but in default of any answer up to the present, I might express my own private opinion that the Prime Minister intended to give these gentlemen a lesson in philosophy. An old philosopher many years ago, declared that the beginnings of philosophy are a consciousness of your own weakness and inability in necessary things. It was this that the Prime Minister desired to impress upon the gentlemen sitting behind him, but after all, let them remember that,

> The rank is but the guinea stamp
> A man's a man for a' that.

and that although they have not been held worthy to approach the Council Board of this country they will still enjoy from time to time in the future the inestimable privilege of voting for everything that the government orders whether they like it or not and in that way take the same part in the future as in the past in the public affairs of this country in this House of parliament.

Now, we have heard something of the appointment of secretaries of state. I was almost constrained to fear for my hon. friend the member for Peterborough after listening to the magnificent peroration in which he referred in such glowing terms to the Prime Minister. I do not know whether or not it is the intention of the government, as announced in some of their organs, to appoint secretaries of state; but it should be remembered that in days gone by they thought we had too many ministers of the Crown in this country. Conservative ministers have been criticised in the past in reference to this matter, yet when the Liberals came into power two secretaries of State, the controller of Customs and the controller of Inland Revenue, were raised to the position of ministers so that we have in Canada to-day two more ministers of the Crown than at the time when this government assumed power. Under these circumstances one would suppose if it is the intention of the government to appoint secretaries of state, that some diminution would be made in the number of ministers of the Crown, because, as was pointed out in the good old days of Liberal opposition from 1878 to 1896, if the government of the United States, a nation of 80,000,000 can be carried on with a cabinet of seven members, this country might very well get on with thirteen ministers of the Crown, without the addition of any secretaries of state.

It might also be well for us to inquire from the Prime Minister as to the reasons which have induced him to select the particular gentlemen who have been called upon to take the vacant portfolios. I do not propose at this time to make any criticism on those gentlemen; we intend to give them a fair trial in the departments which have been selected for them by the Prime Minister—that is only fair and reasonable. But it is also, I think, fair and reasonable to inquire as to the special and peculiar qualifications of these gentlemen who have induced the Prime Minister to pass over every member of his party who occupied a seat in this House to select these two gentlemen, neither of whom, at the time of his appointment, had the honour of being a member of this House.

One of these two gentlemen, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has been good enough during the past five or six weeks to make some rather bold and, I think, rather rash statements with regard to campaign funds. I want to tell that hon. gentleman and to tell the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that if any investigation into campaign funds is desired, we are ready for it as soon as they choose to institute it. I shall not take time to-day to repeat the terms of the challenge which I made to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) but inasmuch as some statements have been made outside of this parliament in regard to what is known as the 'La Presse' deal, if that is a matter of any public interest to the people of Canada, we on this side of the House are as ready for an investigation of that deal as for an investigation of campaign funds at any time the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) desire to institute it and we shall endeavour when that investigation comes, if it does come, to find out whether there is any public interest connected with the present ownership and control of 'La Presse' newspaper. We think that perhaps it is as much in the public interest, to say

the least, that the circumstances attending the present holding and control of that paper should be investigated, as that the circumstances to which attention has been called should be investigated, and we venture to think that if any investigation of that kind is desired, it should not stop short of the present deal under which 'La Presse' newspaper is held and controlled by certain political interests in this country, if I am not thoroughly mistaken.

Coming to the appointment of new senators, an interesting theory was propounded in days gone by that no man should be appointed from the ranks of this House to the Senate or to any office of emolument under the Crown, within two years of his ceasing to hold a seat in this House. Since the close of the last session we have had four gentlemen, the hon. member for Colchester, the hon. member for Centre York, the hon. senior member for the city of Ottawa and the hon. member for Brockville appointed to positions; the first named to the judicial bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and the last three to the Senate. I observe that these three gentlemen who have gone to the Senate resigned their seats in this House, and I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the resignation of each of these gentlemen was for the purpose of his appointment to the Senate? Would my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) favour me with a reply to that at this moment?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that these gentlemen have resigned; they were appointed to the Senate without any reference to their resignation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall refresh my recollection. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seems strangely unaware of what goes on in his government. I quote from 'Hansard':

Of Daniel Derbyshire, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Brockville, by resignation.

Of Frederick A. Laurence, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Colchester, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit: Judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

Of Honourable Napoléon Antoine Belcourt, member for the Electoral District of Ottawa, by resignation.

Of Archibald Campbell, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the Centre Riding of the County of York, Ontario, by resignation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that the gentlemen had not resigned. I said that their appointment had been made without any reference at all to their resignation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I think knows as well as every other member of this House that that is not an answer to my question. He must have known perfectly well that these gentleman had resigned in order that they might be appointed to the Senate. Does any one suppose for one moment that the late member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) resigned his seat for Ottawa without thoroughly understanding that he was to be appointed to the Senate? Does any one suppose for one moment that the late hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) resigned his seat in this House without its being thoroughly understood that he was going to the Senate? And last, but not least, does any one suppose that the late hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) resigned his seat without a thorough understanding that he was to go to the Senate? I do not think there will be much doubt on that score—and this is the way in which my hon. friends on the other side of the House are carrying out that promise made, not only on every husting in the country, but laid down as one of the planks of their Ottawa platform, that their first duty after obtaining power would be to carry out that long promised and long delayed reform of the Senate of Canada.

I observe that my hon. friend who seconded the address (Mr. Lanctot) has called attention to a strange omission in the speech from the Throne, in that there is no mention of the celebrated all-red line between Canada and Great Britain and between Canada and Australia, which was heralded with so much acclaim by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on his return from the mother country. There is not one word in the speech from the Throne, so far as I have been able to gather, with regard to that project, and I think it is only due to us that the Prime Minister should inform the House and the country as to the present position of that grand scheme. Why, after having heralded it, as he did, in the city of Quebec, have we not a word in regard to it in the speech from the Throne?

But we have something in the speech from the Throne with regard to the treaty with France, and I join most heartily in what was so eloquently said by the hon. gentleman who seconded the address (Mr. Lanctot) with regard to the good relations between Great Britain and France, and in the hope that these good relations may always continue. I sincerely trust that the operation of this treaty, which at present we cannot very well understand without more investigation, may be such as to increase and develop the commercial relations between France and Canada. But there are one or two items in the proposed remission of duties to France which call for a little attention, and I would like to ask whether these have been inserted at the special instance of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The Liberal party had a prohibition plank in its platform in 1893, which was supposed to have been inserted on behalf of and at the instance of my hon. friend the Min-

ister of Agriculture, who was a great exponent of the principle embodied in that particular plank of the Liberal platform. I observe, in looking over this treaty, that the duties are very considerably reduced on the following articles when imported from France : gin of all kinds ; rum, whisky, and all spirituous or alcholic liquors; absinthe, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy ; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds ; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, shiedam and other schnapps ; tafia, angostura and similar alcholic liquors or beverages ; and wines containing more than forty per cent of proof spirit.

Mr. FIELDING. What is the amount of the reduction ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That we will ascertain from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance later on. I have no doubt that it will be entirely satisfactory, so that the workingman with reduced wages, or possibly out of employment, will be able to lay in his store of champagne or angostura bitters at a very large reduction.

Mr. FIELDING. They will not get a reduction on brandies, spirits and the other articles which my hon. friend mentions, because there are no such reductions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I do not know for what purpose they are referred to in the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman does not know, he should not say.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend knows, perhaps he will say.

Mr. FIELDING. I say that there is no reduction on most of the articles which the hon. gentleman has named.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, why are they inserted in the treaty ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there no reduction on champagne ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. There is a reduction on light wines. There is no reduction on champagnes at all. I think the hon. gentleman had better wait until we have the treaty before us in proper form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the present duty on champagnes ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a specific and an ad valorem duty. Some years ago the specific duty was retained and the ad valorem duty abolished. We retain the same rates of duty, the ad valorem duty being abolished. I forget the precise figures.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you strike off the specific duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. There is no change in the rate on champagne.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I take the hon. gentleman's statement. I observe in schedule C that the French products enjoying the benefit of a special tariff includes 'Champagnes and all other sparkling wines in bottles.'

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend; but, as he has asked the question, I would say that these items are put there simply because they were in the treaty of 1893, and they are carried on in the same condition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say that on none of these articles to which I have alluded is there any reduction ?

Mr. FIELDING. Only on light wines.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the workingman will have to content himself with laying in a supply of light wines instead of angostura bitters and champagne, and I have no doubt that will be a very important plank in the platform of the Minister of Finance, and especially the Minister of Agriculture, when they come to lay the policy of the Liberal party with regard to prohibition before the electors of this country at the next general election.

The speech from the Throne refers to the Quebec bridge. It is undoubtedly a most regrettable incident that the Quebec bridge should have fallen in the midst of its construction, and that so many lives should have been lost. It has always seemed a marvel to the members of parliament and the people of this country that the government of Canada, dealing with that bridge as a great national work, should have seen fit to commit its construction to a company which at the time of the passage of the Act of 1893 had put less than $66,000 of its own money into the enterprise. In 1903 the government of this country practically declared that the Quebec bridge should be a part of the great system of railways known as the National Transcontinental Railway. There was no doubt about it—both political parties were committed to the construction of that bridge ; and yet the government of Canada saw fit to commit its construction to this company, which was interested in it at that time to no greater extent than $66,000, so far as its own money was concerned ; the rest of the money was to come from the province of Quebec and from the city of Quebec, but principally from the Dominion of Canada, which had provided a subsidy of $1,000,000. By the Act of 1903 it was provided that the capital of the company should be brought up to $200,000, and that $184,000 of that sum should be devoted to wiping out the deficit in the sale of the company's bonds. It provided further that a bond issue to the extent of nearly $7,000,000 should be guaranteed by the government of this country; and it was provided especially in that Act, chapter 54 of 1903, that this

work should be carried on subject to government supervision and government conrol. I observe that by that Act and by the agreement entered into between the government and the company, and ratified by that Act, it is provided as follows :

The plans and specifications for all the works of the undertaking shall be submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council before any work is constructed thereunder.

The continuation of the work of constructing the said undertaking shall be proceeded with so soon as the plans thereof are submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council, and the said undertaking shall be completed not later than the 1st day of December, 1906.

So that the responsibility for a thoroughly efficient method of construction was accepted by the government, and I presume that the government must have approved by order in council of the plan and method of construction ; so that the government became responsible not only for the mode of construction, but for something more, because the proceeds of the bonds to which I have alluded were to be paid to the company 'as the construction of the undertaking is proceeded with to the satisfaction of the government, and in such sums as the chief engineer of the government railways or such other officer as the government may appoint may certify are justified.' Under these circumstances it seems very clear that the responsibility for the method of construction and the carrying out of that method in an efficient manner rests on the government of this country, and although an investigation is now going on, I think it is time that we should ask of the government whether or not the plans have been approved by order in council, and whether or not the chief engineer of government railways, or any engineer on behalf of the government, has from time to time supervised the construction of that work, and upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility for this accident, which has resulted not only in the loss of human lives to the number of seventy or seventy-five, but also in the loss of an enormous amount of money from the public treasury of this country. I do not know how that matter stands between the government and the Phœnix Bridge Company and between the government and the Quebec Bridge Company, but we are entitled to have that information and also to be informed how the government proposes to carry out the work. In a recent number of a great American scientific journal, there appears a very strong criticism of the methods which were employed in the building of the bridge. The article is to be found in the Scientific American of November last. I shall not read the whole article, but just two selections. The writer says:

It is evident, however, from the statements of the consulting engineer, that the enterprise laboured under two serious drawbacks, namely, scarcity of funds, and the absence of any chief engineer of the bridge, present on the ground, and possessing the authority to act instantly in those cases of emergency which are certain to arise during the prosecution of a work of this magnitude.

If that be a just criticism, it was the fault of the government that such an engineer was not on the ground, because his presence would undoubtedly have resulted in the saving of the lives that were lost, although it might not have resulted in the saving of the other great loss which has fallen on the public. In concluding, the writer uses this language ?

The consulting engineer's detailed story of the discovery of the eccentricity in the bottom chord; the making light of it by the engineer in charge; and the tardy and roundabout measures taken to stop all further additions to the weight on the bridge, read more like the story of the building of some county bridge than the record of the erection of the greatest work of bridge engineering of the century.

Another subject mentioned in the speech from the Throne is that of Japanese immigration. I would like to point out to the right hon. the First Minister—lest he has forgotten it—and to the House, the position which the government has taken from 1900 to 1907 on this question. So far as Japanese immigration is concerned, I have already said from the public platform that at present I regard it as a purely economic question. It is a question between labouring men in British Columbia, accustomed to a certain condition of living, and immigrants from China and Japan who are accustomed to other conditions of life, and with whom the labouring men of British Columbia and some of the eastern provinces feel they cannot compete on even terms. I am not saying this to the discredit of the Chinese and Japanese. They have many qualities we might very well emulate, and I can quite understand that Japan. being the ally and friend of Great Britian, must be treated with the greatest possible respect. I, therefore, thoroughly support the government in any action they have taken or may take to offer proper reparation to the citizens of Japan peacefully residing in British Columbia under treaty rights and to whom violence has been offered. But we want no race question in this country, and this might develop into a race question in the most western province of Canada. Therefore it behooves us to find out where the government are with regard to this matter and what is the actual mission to-day of the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to the great empire of Japan. In 1900, when a member from the province of British Columbia brought this question to the attention of the House, the right hon. gentleman said :—

I made a great difference between China and Japan in that respect. In so far as Japan is concerned, I have to call the attention of the House, and the members from British Colum-

bia especially, to the fact that Japan and its government have themselves taken the initiative in this respect and actually restricted emigration from Japan to Canada.

The 'Evening Post' of New York contains an article on this subject, which has been reproduced in the weekly edition of that paper the 'New York Nation,' and which I might read to the House as an evidence of what I am now saying.

The article in the 'Post' goes on to speak of the restriction by the Japanese government of immigration to the United States :

That is the actual order issued by the Japanese government restricting the number of emigrants to Canada to ten per month or one hundred and twenty per year. In the face of this condition of things, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) will find that it is not necessary to adopt an amendment which, if adopted, might lead to serious international difficulties, and which, if not adopted, will not affect the case, as the point is covered already by the action taken by the Japanese government.

And my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) spoke in this House on the same subject in 1903, after his return from Japan, where, I understand, he was invested with something akin to the functions of an ambassador. I asked him this question :—

Before the hon. gentleman sits down I would like to ask if he was able to make such observations of the social and economic conditions as would justify him in coming to a conclusion with respect to the effect that extensive emigration from Japan might have upon our conditions in Canada.

The hon. gentleman replied :

I am satisfied, in the first place, that there will be no such emigration from Japan. The Japanese are home-loving people and have abundant opportunity for progress and industry in their own country. The Japanese government itself forbids the emigration of anybody from the country without a permit, and for several years past they have refused to issue a permit to any Japanese to come from Japan to Canada, who is a labourer or of the ordinary labouring class. Permits are issued only to merchants, students and travellers.

Mr. CLANCY. Did that extend to emigration to any other country than Canada?

Mr. FISHER. The system extends to every country. No Japanese can leave his own country without a permit from his government. The government there, in accordance with negotiation with our government, issued orders, I think, about two years ago, that for the future no permit should be given to a Japanese, except the classes I have mentioned, to go to Canada, and that has been strictly maintained to the present time. I had the assurance of the government there, personally and in writing, that that policy would be maintained.

So that there was a definite assurance given to the Canadian ambassador, not only personally but in writing, that that policy of the Japanese government would be pursued in the future as it had been for some time in the past. Then the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) continued :

My hon friend spoke about the possibilities of industrial invasion. I consider that there is no prospect of that. The Japanese are a home-loving people, proud of their nation, proud of their empire, and a most devoted patriotism seems to inspire them, from top to bottom of every class, men, women and children.

Then my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when the Japanese treaty was passed last session, said this :—

At present the Japanese government do not allow emigration from their own provinces, with the exception of a very few from each province. I think not more than four or five from each province. That is all the Japanese permit to leave the Empire of Japan, and therefore practically there has been no emigration to British Columbia from that country.

Under these circumstances, with this information before the House, and in this light, the Japanese treaty was ratified by the parliament of Canada. Either the government was under some misapprehension or deceived parliament. Either the government deceived parliament when it said that such an assurance had been given by the Japanese government in that regard, or the government is in a position to call for the abrogation of that treaty on the ground that the Japanese have not carried out their assurances. Apparently the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has gone to Japan in view of some such situation, and we ought to have from the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a statement of the exact object of his mission and the position this matter occupies.

Now, the speech from the Throne refers us to another subject of considerable importance to the people of this country, and that is the financial stringency which prevails throughout Canada at the present time. I observe one peculiarity in the reference in the speech from the Throne to that stringency. In any reference to the prosperity of the country such as have often appeared in speeches from the Throne in bygone years there has never been much suggestion that that prosperity was world-wide. But I observe the remarkable care with which the world-wide character of this stringency is pointed out :—

The Dominion has been blessed by a long series of prosperous years, and, though at the present moment its business is being restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel assured that this unfavourable condition will be temporary and that the illimitable resources of Canada and the world-wide recognition of them give us ample guarantee of continued material progress.

I am sure that all of us in this House, whether we sit to your right or to your left, Mr. Speaker, join most sincerely in the hope here expressed, and that no man in the Conservative ranks will follow the course which was pursued by many hon. gentlemen on the other side in bygone days when depression to a greater or less extent affected the industries of this Dominion. The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) did not say much with regard to the financial stringency. He painted in glowing colours the virtues of this government. My attention was called, while he was speaking, to a forcible editorial contained in one of the great journals of this country, the Montreal 'Gazette,' a few sentences of which I will read. After dealing with the Quebec bridge, the management of the Intercolonial, the Moncton and Halifax land deals and other details of that character, this editorial proceeds as follows :—

And what is the rule with big things is also the rule with small where the government is concerned. Its buildings fall down. Its dredges sink. Its steamers run aground. Its calculations fail. It is effective only in taxing and spending, and it is breaking all the records in taxing and spending at a time when individuals, seeing the commercial conditions, are practising and enforcing economy as the readiest means of saving the situation.

The matter could not be put in fewer or more trenchant words. Let us look for a moment at some of the conditions which have prevailed in this country during recent years as to which the government seem absolutely oblivious. The Minister of Finance, over and over again, even as far back as 1898 and 1899, gave warning to the people of this country, but he has gone on deaf to his own warnings, and the result in Canada to-day, although the present stringency is world-wide, must be attributed, to some extent at any rate, to the lack of foresight and ordinary business prudence displayed by this government. Take, for instance, the taxation of this country by five year periods :

	Average total taxation.	Average taxation per capita.
For 5 years ending 1896..	$27,750,000	$ 5·66
For 5 years ending 1902..	36,500,000	6·93
For 5 years ending 1907..	57,000,000	9·47
For 9 months ending March 31, 1907, at the rate of.. ..	68,750,000	10·34

During every week of the year, under the taxation imposed by this government, the people of Canada have paid into the treasury of this country $1,322,000 or $800,000 per week more than they paid eleven years ago. Not only is the taxation per capita increased, but the amount actually paid in custom duties on a pound or yard of material coming into this country is increased, by reason of the greater price of these commodities and the ad valorem tariff. The cost of living in this country has increased very largely during the past ten or eleven years, and during recent years we have had a remarkable condition of affairs in connection with the balance of trade against Canada in its trade with the world. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Hall) referred to the great development of Canadian trade. Let me point out to the House and to the country the figures showing the state of our trade :

Adverse balance of trade.

For 5 years ending 1896..	$ 8,250,900
For 5 years ending 1902..	2,529,450
For 5 years ending 1907..	57,432,200

Total adverse balance of trade in the past five years ending June 30, 1907, $287,161,004.

And the adverse balance for the single year ending June 30, 1907, was no less than $120,000,000. I have obtained that figure by taking the completed returns to March 31, 1907, and adding the further returns to be found in publications of the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Customs. These figures I am bound to believe to be authentic and correct. These figures are a strange commentary upon what we have heard from the hon. gentlemen who addressed the House to-day in their praises of the government. Do not these hon. gentlemen think that there is some food for reflection in these figures ? And does not the Minister of Finance, when he boasts of his surpluses, recall his own language of bygone days ? The hon. Minister of Finance boasts of his surpluses of the past eight or ten years, amounting to perhaps $90,000,000—I trust I am not doing injustice to his figures ; the total may be more. What did he say in 1882 or 1883, when he occupied the editorial chair of the Halifax ' Chronicle,' and when the Conservative government of that day announced a surplus ? He said :

If these surpluses were created by the government in some magic way there may be in them a cause for thankfulness to Sir John Macdonald and his followers, but when it is considered that every dollar of the surplus is taken out of the pockets of the people without the shadow of an excuse, money not required even by the reckless expenditure of the government, there is not much cause for rejoicing.

And the ' reckless expenditure ' of the government of that day was a good deal less than half—not much more than one-third—of the far more reckless expenditure in which the present Minister of Finance indulges. In the following year there was another surplus, and the hon. gentleman broke out again, and this is what he said during the following year :

That millions of dollars should be unnecessarily taken yearly from the consuming classes of the country, and this without being absolutely necessary, is a cardinal principle of the Finance Minister, to which even his best

friends do not unreservedly assent. They see that a surplus of millions at the capital is just so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country. How long can the Dominion stand the drain? Certainly not many years longer.

I commend in the heartiest manner the words of Mr. Fielding, the editor of the Halifax 'Chronicle,' to the Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance of Canada. The prophecy of the hon. gentleman has had its fulfilment in that financial stringency which he himself has been compelled to acknowledge in the speech from the Throne. No words more apt to describe the situation could be found than those words which he quoted to himself, and which I have taken the liberty to read to the House this afternoon.

Now just one or two words more. The speech from the Throne refers to telegraph and telephone companies, and declares that these are to be brought under government control. The meaning of that paragraph in the speech was not very clear to some hon. gentlemen in this House. It reads as follows :—

> The time has arrived when the public interest requires that telegraph and telephone companies holding federal charters should be placed under government control. A Bill will be introduced for that purpose.

The hon. member who seconded the address (Mr. Lanctot) referred to that as a proposal to bring under the control of the Railway Commission of Canada telephone and telegraph companies. It may be that the paragraph in the speech has that meaning, but the paragraph does not say so. I will be glad indeed if the Prime Minister, when he comes to speak, will be good enough to inform the House exactly what is intended by that paragraph in the speech of His Excellency.

Then we are told that very great progress has been made upon the National Transcontinental Railway, that 250 miles of the western division are open to traffic. Might I inquire from the government how many miles of the eastern division constructed under the management of this government, are open to traffic if any ? I understand no portion of the eastern division is open for traffic. I would like further to inquire from the Prime Minister when it is expected that any portion of the eastern division will be ready for traffic. I also wish to inquire when any portion of the western division was opened to traffic. I understood when recently in the west that it had not been formally opened for traffic, but that it was a matter of convenience to the people, the Grand Trunk Pacific was carrying grain and other commodities to Winnipeg for the benefit of the people, but that there had not been any formal opening. I would like especially to inquire as to the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, when that portion of it which extends from Winnipeg to the Port Arthur branch will be ready for traffic ; because we have already heard of certain possible claims of the Grand Trunk Pacific interfered with by default of the government in not having its portion of the road ready in time. It is well that we should know what we have to expect in that regard

There are other matters of legislation referred to in the speech from the Throne which, however, I do not propose to refer to at the present moment. These, as well as the French treaty, will come before the House in due course. But I would say that so far as a Bill for the purpose of reforming the electoral laws of this country is concerned, I will be prepared to give it my most hearty support. I brought up this subject in 1906, upon motion for a committee, when the present Chief Justice of Canada was Minister of Justice. I did not introduce it in a partisan way, I informed my hon. friend, Mr. Fitzpatrick, at that time, that I did not propose to make any attack on the government in connection with what I was suggesting, because I desired that both parties should join together to perfect if possible the electoral laws of this country. A committee was formed, which took the matter into consideration, but owing to the elevation of Mr. Fitzpatrick to the bench, no Bill was brought down. Legislation was promised last session but it was not passed, presumably because it was not intended that parliament should be dissolved before holding another session. I am prepared to join most heartily in any action of the government looking to a reform in our electoral laws. I think the government should see that our electoral laws are placed upon at least as high a basis in Canada as that which prevails in the British Islands. Notwithstanding certain illegal acts which from time to time come to light in the British islands, we know that the standard of electoral purity there is very much higher than, unfortunately, it has been in Canada during recent years. I believe that we should follow the example of some of the American states, and either prohibit corporate contributions altogether, or at least make it a penal offence for any corporation or any member of a corporation on its behalf to contribute to any campaign fund, unless it is made public and unless the people thoroughly understand the amount of the contribution and the purpose for which it was devoted. I think that all contributions to campaign funds should be made public. At the present time those of the candidates themselves are made public in this country. In Great Britain a very much stricter rule prevails. There the campaign fund under control of any political club, any political association or organization, must be disclosed under oath, and no contribution can be made without a violation of the law unless it is made public in that way, and

the amount of it is verified upon oath. I think further that we should have an independent investigation provided for, when necessary, into any election where there is good reason to believe that corruption has taken place, either by one party or the other, or by both, and where neither one party or the other sees fit to take action. I think also that provision should be made for the disfranchisement of corrupt constituencies where corruption has widely prevailed, that as in Great Britain, so in Canada a constituency may for a time be disfranchised, and also visited with the costs of any investigation made for the purpose of exposing that corruption. These are only a few of the details in respect of which I think that the electoral law of this country should be amended. I will join most heartily, as I have said, in assisting the government in that regard, and I sincerely hope that when a measure is brought down it will be no half measure. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will join with us, as we are prepared to join with them, in bringing about better conditions in regard to holding elections in this country. We know the methods that were adopted in London in 1905; we know that from 1898 down to the present time not only has bribery been rampant, but there has also been a deliberate attempt to defeat the will of the people by means of the substitution of ballots, or what is commonly called ballot-switching. In London in 1904 and 1905 we know that bribery was practised on a very great scale, we know that has been exposed in the courts of this country, and we know that legal proceedings are now pending, and have had a certain issue in the city of Toronto, with regard to what took place in London in that year. I have every reason to believe that in the recent election in the county of Colchester the Conservative party, at least, ran an absolutely clean election, and that the victory of the Conservative party in that county was won without the aid of a single dollar.

Mr. FIELDING. How can the hon. gentleman know that when he was not there? I suppose he believes it but how can he know it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said in the first place that I believed it, and I went further, and I said I knew it; for this reason, that I know that Mr. Stanfield, in his manifesto to the electors and the Conservative organization in the county of Colchester, eighteen months ago, declared that the by-election, which was then thought to be impending, should be run by the association on absolutely clean lines and without the expenditure of one dollar for illegal purposes. I know Mr. Stanfield as a man against whom I think not one single word of reproach can be uttered. Knowing him as I do, knowing the pledge then made—a pledge which he later made to the electors of the county of Colchester—I am justified in saying that the election in the county of Colchester was carried on by the Conservative party without the expenditure of one dollar for illegal purposes. However, if those gentlemen who are inclined to doubt that——

Mr. TALBOT. What about——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TALBOT. What about his personal money in the way of expenditure?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. TALBOT. What about his personal money in the way of expenditure?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What about it?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, what about it?

Mr. TALBOT. That is what I want to know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman will put his question in intelligible shape, I will endeavour to answer it. I was about to say to some of these hon. gentlemen who are smiling and doubting that if they have any doubt on the subject they had better have an investigation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend will have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman pledges himself to that?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very good. I am glad he has undertaken it. It is very useful to have a gentleman who will undertake matters of this kind. I congratulate him upon his public spirit, but let me inform him that if an investigation does take place I am sure it will be thorough and effectual, and probably will not be confined to one side.

Now, I apologize for having taken up, to such an extent, the time of this House in this connection, and I do sincerely trust, in conclusion, that the measure promised, almost in the concluding words of the speech from the Throne, in regard to our electoral laws, will be brought down, and will be brought down early. As I have said before, we on this side of the House will be prepared to most heartily and sincerely, and in no partisan spirit, to co-operate with the government in making the electoral laws of this country such as they ought to be and such as will minimize the evil which unfortunately has greatly increased in Canada in recent years.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it is more than a usual pleasure to me to be able to offer

also my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address now in your hands for the manner in which they have discharged an always important though rather trying duty. The House will agree with me that the addresses of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot) were of more than usual excellence. The observations of my hon. friend from Peterborough, while they were most acceptable from the first to the last sentence, were, in so far as I am concerned, altogether too kind. He spoke in terms altogether too flattering of the part which it was my privilege to take in the imperial conference which took place in the months of April and May of this year in London. I am bound to say that the sentiments which were expressed were not by any means unanimous, and that in a certain school it was rather a question whether the conference had done any good or whether it had accomplished anything. I have to confess, as a member of this conference, that in so far as its spectacular features were concerned, it did not come up to the expectations of the jingo or superficial observer, but I think I can claim that it has accomplished some lasting work which will mark a new era in the history of the British empire. The conferences which had taken place up to this year were irregular, without any status and without any definite object. These conferences have been arranged to take place under a well understood and well defined plan. Their period of meeting has been fixed, their composition has been determined, their object has been clearly defined and, more important still, it has been accepted, declared and adopted on all sides that there are to be conferences, not of individuals, not of superior and subordinate, but conferences of government and governments, conferences between the United Kingdom and the young daughter nations of the empire. Unless I am greatly mistaken, I think it can be said that this is a most important step in the history of the British Empire, and certainly something which is absolutely unprecedented in the annals of the world. When the conference opened on the 15th April, 1907, the main question before it, was what were to be the relations of the present state and the young daughter nations. The problem was what was the principle which was to regulate these nations. Was it to be a centralization, or was it to be autonomy? There were many who believed that these relations should be based upon the principle that the young daughter communities should be simply satellites revolving around the parent state, but others there were who held—and in my estimation rightly held—that the proper basis of the British Empire was that it was to be composed of a galaxy of nations under the British Crown.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to interrupt my right hon. friend, but is my hon. friend speaking now of the views held by the members of the conference itself?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am speaking of views held inside and outside the conference.

Mr. FOSTER. Then will my right hon. friend please mention the names of those who wished to make the daughter colonies subordinates or satellites?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I shall not gratify the curiosity of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend can.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not want to be personal, but it seems to me that if my hon. friend wants to pursue this inquiry he can find for himself in the pages of the record of the conference that I speak within the mark.

Mr. FOSTER. I have read every page of it, and it cannot be found there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, sir, it is a question of appreciation. I have read every page of it, and moreover, I was there. With all due deference to my hon. friend, and without being hypercritical, I think my judgment is as good as his own. But it matters not whether I am right or whether I am wrong in this matter; this is nothing but a question of appreciation after all. But my hon. friend, I suppose, will not question that the solution which was come to was the right one on the question of the secretariat. As a result of the labours of the conference it is not improbable that when a new conference takes place four years hence it shall have sitting at its board another member representing another dominion, representing the South African confederation, in which the Cape, Natal, Orange, Transvaal and Rhodesia shall be united. The members of this House who sat in the parliament elected in 1896 perhaps have not forgotten some of the debates which took place during the session 1900, when our policy in regard to the sending of the contingents to South Africa came up for review. Some of these debates took place at the most critical and darkest period of the war, and the gloom of this uncertainty was still weighing heavily upon us. Who could have believed or could have supposed that in the space of seven short years only the country which at that time was engaged in mortal combat with the Britain would have become a loyal British colony, and that it would be represented at the Imperial Conference which took place this year by the very man who was the soul of the armed resistance against England, and who, at the conference, modestly, but firmly, declar-

ed that he was ready to fight for England as he had fought against her ?

Who would have supposed that in seven short years those disjointed and warring communities of South Africa would be united by the bond of a common tariff, by the bond of commercial union, and that it is now contemplated to have this bond of commercial union replaced by a political confederation, under which, on the pattern of the Canadian confederation, two races in South Africa, as in Canada, shall be working towards a common destiny ? Sir, I do not say that this consummation has been accomplished, but it is in a fair way of accomplishment, and since it is not improbable to see it realized in a very short time, it has the endorsement of such men as Dr. Jameson and General Botha, of the men of the raid and the men of the war. This consummation, I believe, is probable, but one thing is certain, that such a consummation would be possible nowhere except within the bonds of the British empire, under the ægis of those British institutions, so broad, so free, so just, so fair, and which alone are capable of such majestic development.

My hon. friend from Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot) has spoken eloquently and well of the completion of the treaty with France. This is another opening in the history of Canada. The Liberal party have long claimed for Canada the privilege of negotiating their own treaties and in making that claim we did not intend to reflect in any way upon British diplomacy, because everybody who is familiar with British history knows that the services of British diplomacy have been in their sphere as bright as the services of the army and the navy ; we claim that privilege simply on account of the old homely maxim that one's own business is better done by one's self. We thought that in negotiating any treaty that concerned Canada, Canada could do better for herself than could be done for her by any one else. Now, Sir, the privilege has been granted to us entirely; the treaty with France has been negotiated altogether by Canadian ministers, and all the credit of it is due to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). France is a wealthy country and we have reason to believe that this new treaty will develop a new era in the history of our trade relations with France and that increased trade will also bring an increased current of immigration from that gifted country. At all events one thing is certain, whatever may be the benefits of that treaty, and I think they will be considerable—although they are already questioned by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden)—it can be claimed for the treaty that it is not an unimportant step at this juncture. France and England have filled the world with the history of their quarrels, but a new era dawned in the civilization of the world when the entente cordiale took place between the two countries. Thanks, as has been said, to the efforts of His Majesty, a war between France and England would be almost as improbable, certainly almost as criminal as civil war would be, and it is perhaps not claiming too much for us to say that in negotiating this treaty we did our little share to contribute to that entente cordiale.

The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in his observations has been very inquisitive and has intended to be very charitable towards some members of this House. He has anticipated, I should say, the usual ministerial explanations that are given when any changes take place in the cabinet. As a rule these explanations are not given in the debate on the address, but I have no difficulty at all in satisfying the very fastidious curiosity of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). He wanted to know why I had passed over so many members on this side of the House and selected gentlemen outside of the House to fill cabinet positions. I may say to my hon. friend that, if I have some reasons that I shall give later on, I was not, in adopting this course, taking a leaf out of his book—he has not yet been called upon to form a government —but I did take a leaf out of a lesson given him recently by an hon. gentleman sitting just behind him. In the speech which my hon. friend delivered at the Monument National, he stated in a moment of modesty that from among the gentlemen who surround him he could at once make up a cabinet three times the strength of the present cabinet. Immediately the hon member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who spoke after him told him that if he were called on to do that he would do well to call Mr. Tom. Chase Casgrain to his cabinet as Minister of Justice. I look about the House among the gentlemen who could make such a strong cabinet, I look in all directions and I fail to see the figure of my friend Mr. Tom Chase Casgrain. This is a lesson which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden), if he is ever called on, as he may some time—I do not know whether it will be perhaps as soon as he and his friends anticipate——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You will not see Mr. Casgrain on this side of the House after the next election ; you will see him over there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly ; I never prophesy. I have seen so many prophesies made on the other side that I do not indulge in them, but if we are to judge of the value of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) as an election prophet by the prophesies of his predecessor, I have no apprehension whatever as to the result of the next elections. But I want to say to my hon. friend that when he is called upon to form a cabinet perhaps he will do well to follow

the rule which I may say in all modesty I have followed myself. When I was called upon in 1896 to form a cabinet, I went out of the representation to select the very best material that I could get. I went out to Nova Scotia and I asked my hon. friend near me, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, to join the administration. He was not in the representation at that time, he accepted and not a word of complaint was uttered and I have had nothing but satisfaction ever since for having invited him to join the government. I went to the province of Ontario and I selected that veteran, Sir Oliver Mowat—and I never had any cause to regret it. I went into the province of New Brunswick and I asked my friend the late hon. Mr. Blair. Now, I have had many differences with Mr. Blair, but I am glad to say, though he cannot hear me, that I never regretted having called him to the cabinet. He was an able man, a strong man—I knew later how strong a man he was, but I must say that in all my differences with Mr. Blair I never had with him a word which I can regret. I am glad to say that to the day of his death I remained his friend and he remained my friend. I went to the west and I took Mr. Sifton, and a more able man could not have been selected. There are able men in this House whom I could have called to the position, but every man in this House has had this much confidence in me, that no one ever questioned my judgment under such circumstances.

The hon. gentleman thinks that there are men on this side of the House who are very much mortified because they have been passed over. Let me say to my hon. friend that Liberals are not like Conservatives, and that if he judges the members on this side by the members on his own side, he need not waste any sympathy upon us. No one on this side of the House feels any anger or jealousy at what I have done in this matter. It may be that there is jealousy on the other side, but it is confined to that side. There is none on this side.

My hon. friend took some exception also to the fact that we had appointed members of parliament to the Senate and to the bench. We appointed Mr. Laurence, formerly member for Colchester, to be a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. Why did we appoint him to that position? We did so because we thought he was eminently fitted to discharge the duties of that important office. I do not myself know Mr. Laurence very well. I saw him in this House and formed a very high opinion of him, but I had on one occasion last session a certificate of character given of him, which I did not forget, by a prominent member of the bar of Nova Scotia, who was therefore in a position to know Mr. Laurence's qualifications, and he told us that out of a number of men named we might very well appoint Mr. Laurence; and that gentleman was the distinguished member for Carleton, the present leader of the opposition.

The hon. member stated that it has been a rule maintained by the Liberal party that no member of the House of Commons should be appointed to a high office unless he had been out of parliament for at least two years. May I ask my hon. friend when that was a rule of the Liberal party? He will not find it in any platform of the Liberal party that I know of. Perhaps it will not be bumptious on my part to say that after all I have something to do with the policy of the Liberal party, and I defy my hon. friend or any of his friends to find a word of mine in favour of such a policy. I know of one man only in the ranks of the Liberal party who at one time and at one time only held that opinion. That was my friend Sir William Mulock, who introduced a Bill——I forget in what session.

Mr. BERGERON. 1895.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps in 1895.

Mr. LENNOX. In two sessions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, only in one session, if I remember rightly. He introduced a Bill, but that Bill never went to its second reading, because the feeling on both sides of the House was overwhelmingly against it. Sir, it is not in accordance with the traditions of British parliamentary government that members of the House of Commons should not be appointed to office. On the contrary, it is one of the traditions of the British parliamentary system of government that certain important officials should go from the House of Commons to the bench. As a matter of fact, the Attorney General always goes up to the bench when there is a vacancy; so as a rule does the Solicitor General; and I do not know that there is anything wrong done by the government when we appoint to the bench men from the floor of the House of Commons. If we compare the records of the two parties on this point, I think they are about equal. If there is anything more wrong on one side than on the other, I am ready to take all the blame, if wrong there be; but I do not consider it to be wrong. As to the character of the gentlemen whom we have appointed to the Senate, I think they are all good men. My hon. friend asked if they had resigned before they were appointed. I stated very frankly that I did not know at what time their resignations came; but I did not make such appointments without having communication with my friends beforehand and ascertaining whether they would accept such a high office. My hon. friend may say that this was undue precaution. At all events, I met with no refusal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rumours we had were as to the precautions taken by one of the gentlemen.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the Quebec bridge. Upon this point I have only this to say, that I do not think the time is fitting or opportune to discuss the Quebec bridge to-day. We all deplore the disaster. The blame and the responsibility must rest on somebody. If the government is to blame, we shall have to take the responsibility. I am not prepared to say that we are; but at the present time this subject is being investigated, and so long as we have not the report of the investigation I do not think it is fair to lay the blame on this one or that one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I ventured to ask was whether or not the plans had been approved by order in council, as provided by the Act of 1903.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to that I cannot say, but I presume that the law has been observed. I have simply to say to my hon. friend that whether the plans which were approved by myself and my colleagues were faulty or not, it would be very difficult for anybody in the Council Chamber to pass upon a matter of that kind. We had to act on the report of the engineers, and we had always the advice of good and competent engineers. I have only one other remark to make on this point, and that is with reference to the article of the Scientific American, in which we are blamed for a lack of funds. With reference to that I have only to say that the article is based on the evidence of Mr. Cooper, and that evidence has since been contradicted by Mr. Cooper himself. However, the matter is under investigation, the report will be laid on the table at an early date, and then will be the time to discuss the whole subject and discuss it fully.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in the course of his address, brought within the scope of his observations many topics which are not to be found inside the four corners of His Excellency's speech. Of this of course I make no complaint. The hon. gentleman was quite within his rights. He travelled very far afield indeed; but there is one subject of which he never spoke, and yet of which we have heard a good deal of late, both from himself and his supporters. The year 1907 has seen many important events. It has seen, for instance, the construction of the new platform for the new Conservative party. I have read that platform with some care. And I must say in all candour to my hon. friend that, in my humble judgment, it is a remarkable structure. It is not remarkable, however, for the quality which one would look for in such a document or in such a structure, but rather for the very reverse. It is remarkable, not for its solidity, but for its elasticity. It was built, not of oak, but of India rubber. Its planks are not the ordinary boards, but nameless, shapeless things, intended to contract or expand according to time, place and circumstances. Having read that platform with some care, I do not think I am at all unduly severe if I say that, in my humble judgment, almost every proposition advanced in it is coupled with a qualification—coupled with an 'if' or a 'but,' which makes it susceptible of a double interpretation. Every idea is combated by the succeeding one. Every step forward is followed by a step backward. And in the task of expounding it, of explaining what it means, my hon. friend reminded me very much of a caged squirrel, always in motion, but always revolving in a circle and accomplishing nothing.

Some surprise has been expressed because the party were not called together in convention to discuss the political situation, to exchange views, to give advice as to what should be the policy of the party from a Conservative standpoint. For weeks, nay for months, the press of the party was full of the suggestion, and that the suggestion was taken into consideration in the inner circle seems to be beyond doubt. We have heard the rumbling echoes of discord and thunder within the inner party circle. Of course we do not pretend to be in the secrets of the party, but there are some secrets which are as public as stage whispers, and one can easily understand that it would have been quite natural for the party to have wished to be allowed a voice in the framing of their policy. It cannot be expected that the party would be so lukewarm as to be indifferent to the attitude of its leader on public questions. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden)—who is in correspondence with his followers in every part of the Dominion, who received expressions of the opinions prevailing in the east, west and centre—knew very well that if he were to draw the party together in council, if he were to bring my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), and my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) together on a question of the ownership of public utilities, if he were to bring together my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and some of my hon. friends, whom I see opposite me, coming from the western provinces, on a question of protection, he would have anything but a harmonious deliberative assembly. He would have an assembly in which all the demons of discord would be let loose and which would become a veritable pandemonium. So my hon.

friend thought it better to frame a policy himself. And he framed it in such sibylline terms that everybody could find in it, as in the oracles of old, whatever suited his own convictions, passions and prejudices. And having thus delivered himself, my hon. friend started on a missionary tour. With that of course I find no fault—quite the contrary. He started to evangelize the country, setting his sails closely trimmed so as to catch every passing breeze. Now one would expect that in a platform of the Conservative party, the word 'protection' would be writ very large indeed. But in this platform the word 'protection' is writ very small, so small indeed that it is not visible to the naked eye. I do not pretend, however, that the idea is not there. It is there, but so hidden that it is impossible to find it without great effort. How far we are from the flamboyant rhetoric of the old national policy! The word 'protection' has always occupied such a prominent position in the councils and the policy of the party that one cannot conceive how in this document it could have been omitted otherwise than accidentally. On the other hand one cannot conceive that a document of this importance, which was to be the law and the gospel and the prophets of the party, which was supposed to contain a panacea for all our evils, any omission of the word 'protection' could have been otherwise than wilfully designed. What is the key of the mystery? The key is that my hon. friend was in a sore trouble. In these later days there are in the ranks of the Conservative party protectionists and protectionists, just as the French say there are fagots and fagots. We know that in the Island of Lilliput there were two rival factions—the Big-endians and the Small-endians. Between them there arose a fierce controversy as to how eggs to be eaten should be broken—whether broken at the big end or at the small end. And in the modern island of Liliput—I mean His Majesty's opposition—there are big Endians and small Endians; there are big protectionists and small protectionists. There are protectionists in the city of Toronto and in some other places who would have the tariff raised as high as Haman's gallows, and in the west they are protectionists who would have the tariff brought so low that protection would not be distinguishable from free trade. And between these two factions my hon. friend hesitated. If he brought them together, he knew there would be a terrible smashing of eggs before they could agree upon the end on which their eggs should be broken. But my hon. friend managed to give good hope to the one and to the other without committing himself to either. Some few years ago my hon. friend did give us his idea of what protection ought to be—that it ought to be 'adequate' protection. But it would appear that, in the course of time, and according to experience, 'adequate' protection became inadequate. Therefore under the work of commentators on the party platform adequate protection has given way to 'reasonable' protection. But what is reasonable protection and what is unreasonable protection no commentator has yet told us, and where the line is to be drawn between reasonable and unreasonable protection we are left to surmise. My hon. friend himself simply ignored the difficulty and told us not what his policy was, but what his policy would do. These are the words of my hon. friend.

> We therefore stand for a fiscal policy which will promote the production within Canada of all useful articles and commodities that can be advantageously manufactured or produced from or by means of our natural resources, having due regard to the interests of the consumer as well as to the just claims of our wage-earning population.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to favour me? Would he kindly read the plank of the Ottawa Liberal platform of 1893 on that subject?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I had it under my hand I would willingly do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, you've lost it entirely.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. I can say that there was in it an absolute denunciation of protection. Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has told us what his protection policy would do, but he has not told us what would be the legislative enactment that would perform this miracle. Indeed, this is a secret of the gods—and among these gods I do not include my hon. friend himself, because he does not himself know. He could not define his policy, but he has managed to give hope to him who hopes to see the tariff raised as high as Haman's gallows, and also to him who hopes that the tariff will be reduced to the lowest possible level; and both may live in the same delusion until they become victims of the same deception.

Next to the fiscal policy, the most important plank, if I may say so, which has been introduced into the platform by my hon. friend is that dealing with the government ownership of public utilities. I said introduced by my hon. friend, but I must withdraw the word, because it does not correctly apply to the situation. It is not my hon. friend who has introduced that plank into the platform. In this matter he is not the leader, but a follower—and a reluctant follower. The gentleman who has introduced that plank in the platform is not the leader of the party, but sits a little below the leader, and we see him (Mr. W. F. Maclean) smiling as I speak. I must give him his due. He is the leader of the party in this matter as in some others also. We were told last session that he was no longer admitted to the caucus of the party. Sir, this is a matter of no consequence, for whether

within or without the precincts of the caucus he is the leader so far as this question and some others are concerned, and the party dances to his music. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is a stalwart. He has taken a bold plunge into the cold water of state socialism. But my hon. friend the leader of the party is not so advanced, if we may judge him by his utterances. He does not approve, yet he does not condemn and repudiate; and whilst my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is splashing about in midstream, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is on the bank, now and then thrusting a timid foot into the cold water, but promptly withdrawing it, and unable to make up his mind either to go in or stay out.

So far as the question of government ownership of railways is concerned, my hon. friend's utterances have been singularly inconclusive and elusive. He has said enough to give hope to the ardent, the enthusiast, the unthinking, but he has tried to avoid committing himself absolutely. And in order that I may not do an injustice to my hon. friend by giving my own version of his speeches let me quote the words of the Halifax speech, the one in which this platform was announced. I will quote from the report in the Halifax 'Herald':

> Whether or not state ownership and operation of railways can be made a success in Canada remains to be determined. State ownership is repeatedly challenged because of incompetent or corrupt administration, and there does not seem to be much argument against it. Let us not forget that all private enterprises afford instances of failure or incapacity. The denial of our capacity to operate successfully a great public railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific seems no less than the denial of our capacity for self-government. Shall all private enterprises be condemned because of business failure or corrupt methods? Are we to renounce our right of self-government because of repeated acts of maladministration, because of political graft, because of Saskatchewan valley land deals and grazing lease scandals? And last, but not least, are we to hand over our government railways to private corporations because their management has been very greatly discredited?
>
> Speaking for myself, I believe that state ownership is no more to be condemned for error of administration than is the general principle of self-government. The remedy is to amend the methods.

Now, Sir, if this language means anything it simply means that government ownership is a sound principle which ought to be adopted by the party and by the country, as it has already been adopted by the hon. member for South York. If this language carried any weight, if it carried conviction, then such was the conclusion of those who heard it; but such was not the conclusion of him who spoke. After he had given a plethora of arguments in favour of government ownership, after he had stated that 'the denial of our capacity to operate successfully a great public railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific seems no less than the denial of our capacity of self-government'; after he had stated that 'speaking for myself he believed that state ownership is no more to be condemned for errors of administration than is the general principle of self-government'—when he had reached that climax, when he had soared almost to the sun, suddenly his pinions gave way, suddenly his heart sank within him. And what was his conclusion? Was it government ownership? Not at all, but simply that the Intercolonial railway should be put under a commission. And for that I will quote the very language of my hon. friend. After having given these preliminary arguments, this is the conclusion of the Halifax platform:

> We stand for the operation and management of our railways by an independent commission, free from partisan control or interference.

Is this all that was expected by those hon. gentlemen supporting him and applauding him? Was that all the hon. gentleman was ready to commit himself to? Yes, that was as far as he intended to go. But in this instance, as in the other instance he wanted to please all parties; he made an argument for the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), and drew a conclusion for the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). But my hon. friend should not forget that he who sows the wind will reap the whirlwind, and he has already reaped the whirlwind,. It is vain for him to atttempt to confine himself to the conclusion of his own arguments. The stalwarts of the party, the hon. member for East York and his friends, simply brush aside his restrictions and claim that the policy of the party is that of government ownership. Well, Sir, whether my hon. friend is willing or not, that is the position in which he has placed himself. Let him examine the Toronto 'World,' and he will find that he is commended every day for a policy, not the policy which he advocated, but the policy which the member for South York advocates. And so, willingly or unwillingly, kicking and resisting my hon. friend to find himself carried forward in the strong arms of the hon. member for South York. We read of some savage tribes who force their leaders to the front, even when their mature judgment would prevent them from risking a battle and a defeat.

But this matter is too serious to allow of any equivocation. It is better that we should know where we stand on this question, and what is the policy of all parties with respect to it. Sir, there is a tendency in this country at the present time, a tendency which did not originate in this country but which came from the other side of the line where it originated in the Populist

movement, to denounce all corporations as enemies of the public weal. Examine the newspapers of that school, and you will find in almost every issue that corporations are made the butts of their attacks and their sneers. The truth is that corporations, like all other human institutions, are a mixture of good and evil. The truth is that while they are important and render great service to the country, on the other hand they are not free of serious blemishes. The truth is also that corporations have been one of the most potent agencies of modern civilization in the creation and distribution of wealth amongst all classes of the community. It is undeniable, even the hon. member for South York who almost daily declares himself the enemy of corporations, and especially of railway corporations, cannot deny that corporate capital, corporate labour, corporate effort, will do more than could ever be accomplished by individual effort. What are corporations after all? Corporations are simply aggregations of individual forces, and it stands to reason that aggregations will always accomplish more than individual effort. It is also undeniable that whilst corporations have done a great deal of good in this way, railway corporations especially have become such enormous organizations as to constitute a possible menace to the state. It is equally undeniable that corporations cannot escape the reproach of having often been actuated by greed and of having disregarded the interests they were created to serve. If such be the situation, and I think I have correctly described it, it is clear that it is the duty of the legislator to interfere. But in what sense and to what extent is the problem. The hon. member for South York says, down with corporations, down with railway corporations, and let the state itself provide this kind of service for the public. The hon. leader of the opposition argues one way and concludes another way, and therefore abdicates into the hands of the hon. member for South York. But a person who looks at the question calmly and dispassionately must come to the conclusion that the interests which are served to-day by private enterprise are better served than they possibly could be by the state. The true remedy, I apprehend, is not to entrust railways to state management, but it is to leave them to corporations subject to the control of parliament, who will see that they properly discharge the duties they are called upon to discharge in the public interest. Sir, I do not hesitate to say for my part that if the policy of the hon. member for South York were adopted, it would be a calamity to this country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it a calamity in Germany, in Russia, in France, in Australia?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Thank God we are not coming here to take our examples from Germany, or France or Russia.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the right hon. gentleman say what he thinks of New Zealand and Australia, daughter states of the great empire which he upheld this afternoon?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think Australia and New Zealand are young experimenting communities, and they have gone further in state socialism than I care to go. For my part I believe that our system is preferable to the system which has been adopted in Australia and New Zealand. I say to my hon. friend that if you remove the incentive of ambition and emulation from public enterprises, you suppress progress, you condemn the community to stagnation and immobility.

Sir, I will give my hon. friend a concrete example taken from our own history. I will not go to Germany, I will not go to Russia, I will not go to New Zealand or to Australia; right here in Canada we find a concrete example to which I call his attention. We have the Caandian Pacific Railway. It was at one time possible to build it as a government railway. Mr. Mackenzie had commenced to build it as a government railway, not from choice but from necessity, because private enterprise failed to come forward and offer to build it. When the government of Sir John A. Macdonald came to power he changed that policy, and determined to have a railway built by private enterprise; and so far as I remember I do not think that a single word has ever been said against that policy. There was dissent with the terms given to the company, but so far as it was a choice between government ownership and company ownership, I do not remember, speaking under correction, that a single word has ever been spoken against the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald. Now it has been built as a private enterprise, and will the hon. gentleman pretend that it would have served the country as well as a government enterprise? Why, Sir, consider what has been done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It has in a great many instances, and in a multitude of manners, built up other enterprises as adjuncts to the railway which never would have existed if the railway had been built as a government enterprise. My hon. friend knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has covered their lines with hotels. There is a hotel in Quebec, a hotel in Montreal, a hotel in Winnipeg, a hotel in Vancouver, a hotel in the Rocky Mountains, and this system of hotels has brought thousands and hundreds of thousands of tourists who never

would have come in but for these hotels. The company has erected smelters in the mining districts, it has opened collieries in the Rocky Mountains, it is putting in operation a system of irrigation which will make of Calgary another Grenada. It has covered the great lakes with lines of steamers, it has established lines of ocean steamers plying both from the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. And will the hon. gentleman pretend that if this railway had been built as a government enterprise all these subsidiary enterprises would have been attempted? Why, the thought is absurd. I know what the hon. gentleman's answer will be. He wil tell me that there has been complaints, especially in the new provinces against the tolls of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; that the railway was not properly discharging the duties it owed to the public. I am aware of these complaints. I believe that some of tnem were well founded, but what is the remedy after all ? Suppress privatet enterprise—no, but subject the company to control through the government and through parliament. Therefore, on this question I have this to say to my friends on the other side of the House : We know where we are at tne present time ; they stand for national government operation of railways, and we stand for the control of railways by the government of parliament.

In regard to telephones and telegraphs the remarks of my hon. friend also have been just as inconclusive and just as elusive as his remarks about railway ownership. But, in order to do him no injustice I will quote what he said upon this part of his programme :

It has been demonstrated——

Said he——

—in Great Britain that telegraphs and telephones can be successfully operated in connection with the Post Office Department. I see no reason why a similar system should not be inaugurated and carried out successfully in Canada. Few people realize that at the present time Canada owns and operates 6,586 miles of telegraph lines. These lines have not been remunerative for the reason that they have been established in thinly settled portions of the country where private enterprise could find no adequate return. If we are prepared to invest national capital in thinly peopled and unremunerative localities, why should we hesitate in those portions of the country where operations can be carried on at a profit? I do not forget the necessity that our great railways must be equipped with telegraph and telephone lines, nor do I forget the principle of justice to invested capital which I have already invoked. Having regard to these considerations, our policy should include the establishment, after due investigation, of a great system of national telegraphs and telephones under conditions which shall be just to capital already invested in these enterprises.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Sir, the central argument which is found in this paragraph is simply this, that because at the present time we have some 6,000 miles of telegraph lines which are unproductive, which bring no return, therefore, we should have telegraph lines in those parts of the country where we can expect a return. Could anything be more fallacious ? It is quite true that we have 6,000 miles of telegraph lines and if we have it is not from choice, it is not because we favour that policy, but we have built these telegraph lines where no company would build them because there was no return to be had from them. We built them simply on account of the national ends to be attained. More than half of these telegraph lines are on the lower St. Lawrence and on the gulf shores intended as an aid to navigation, and with our present system of telegraph lines wireless telegraphy, telephones, buoys and lights, it is our intention to make the St. Lawrence route from Belle Isle to Montreal as safe for ships as the streets of a city are for pedestrians. Already, with our equipment, imperfect as it is, we have had a reduced number of casualties, and this past year we have been singularly free from them. Should a casualty take place the telegraph line enables notice to be sent to Quebec, and immediately help is rushed forward to save life and property. But, my hon. friend asks : If we do this in a part of the country where no returns are to be expected why should we not do it also in those parts of the country where there should be some return ? For the very obvious reason that those parts of the country are already served by telegraph lines. There is no necessity for having any other lines there. My hon. friend must recognize that because he says :

I do not forget the necessity that our great railways must be equipped with telegraph and telephone lines, nor do I forget the principle of justice to invested capital which I have invoked. Having regard to these considerations, our policy should include the establishment, after due investigation, of a system of national telegraphs and telephones under conditions which shall be just to capital already invested in those enterprises.

What does he mean by this ? Does he mean that we are going to expropriate existing telegraph lines ? As to this my hon. friend is silent. Does he mean that we are going to build rival telegraph lines ? As to this my hon. friend is equally silent ; in fact, to these conundrums silence is the best answer that he can give. However, in one statement he is perfectly clear. It is that before we commit ourselves to such a programme there should be due investigation. Indeed, it is well that this matter should be investigated because when the matter is investigated my hon. friend will find that the statement with which he opened his remarks on this question :

That it had been demonstrated in Great Britain——

——is not borne out by the facts. The last report of the Postmaster General of Great Britain, Mr. Buxton, has shown this very conclusively. I have the report in my hand. I will not quote it—it is very extensive—but I will quote an article from the Montreal 'Gazette,' a very able paper, as everybody knows, a paper not connected with the party to which I belong, but whose capacity every one must admit, and it has given this very suggestive comment upon this subject. The Montreal 'Gazette' says :

British telegraphs and telephones.

There appears to be prevalent in Canada an impression that the British Post Office reaps a handsome profit annually from the operation of the telegraph and telephone services. There is no foundation for a belief of this kind. Mr. Sidney Buxton, in his last annual report as Postmaster General of the United Kingdom, admits that the net deficit in working the telegraphs for the year was £652,055, and that if interest on the capital be added the total deficit amounts to £923,746, or $4,495,870. Mr. Buxton further reports that during the year the number of messages handled, including free and government messages, was 89,493,000. Dividing this into $4,495,870, it will be seen that there was an average loss of a trifle over five cents on each and every one of these messages. A service which produces results like these cannot be said to be on a paying basis. There is no guess work about the figures given. They are the Postmaster General's and taken, as he gives them, from his annual report.

Then, as regards the telephone system. Mr. Buxton says that 'the year's working of the whole telephone system shows a balance of £451,787, after payment of working expenses, while the whole amount required to provide for depreciation of plant and interest at three per cent on the capital expenditure of £7,255,000 is £432,726.' This shows an apparent profit of £19,061. Mr. Buxton is the first Postmaster General to take the public into his confidence respecting the financial results of the telephone business, the figures heretofore having been included with those of the telegraphs. In this year's report he shows that the total capital expenditure on telephones is £7,255,000. He divides the £432,726 allowed for interest and depreciation into £215,076 for depreciation and £217,650 for interest. The interest allowance works out exactly at 3 per cent, and the depreciation allowance at 2·96. Unfortunately, 2·96 per cent is a ridiculously small allowance for depreciation on a telephone plant. It contemplates a life for the plant of more than thirty years. On this continent experience has shown that a safe allowance for depreciation must exceed seven per cent of the gross capitalization. Increase Mr. Buxton's allowance to this figure and instead of a modest profit of £19,061 there remains an ugly deficit of £273,713. The total income of the telephone department last year was £908,246. To have brought it out on an even basis the receipts should have been twenty per cent greater and the expenditure no larger than it was.

A telegraph department which loses five cents on every message it handles and a telephone department doing business at twenty per cent less than cost can hardly be presented as successful examples of government ownership, however pleasant it may be to those who make large use of the service.

Upon this point, as upon the other, we on this side of the House have to say that the remedy for this situation—and a remedy is called for and we are prepared to introduce legislation upon this subject—is not government ownership as advocated by my hon. friend, but private ownership and government control. My hon. friend asked me to give him an explanation of this paragraph in the speech from the Throne. Our intention simply is that we shall introduce legislation to increase the power of the commission which exists at the present time, to increase its membership as well and to give it control over the telegraph and telephone as it already has over the railways.

I stated a moment ago that when my hon. friend opened his campaign he trimmed his sails in order to catch every breeze and, speaking in the city of Halifax, I charged my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) with having pandered to local prejudices on the question of Japanese immigration. Speaking recently in this city my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) expressed the view that I had been unfair to him and that I had no ground for speaking as I did. I shall tell my hon. friend what I meant. I shall tell him how and in what respect, in my humble judgment, his conduct and his language have been unworthy of him and unworthy of the high position which he occupies in this House and in this country. Before I do this allow me to quote from the speech delivered a few days ago in this city by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) on this question. I quote from the report of the Ottawa 'Evening Journal' :

I for one am prepared to maintain that the western provinces of Canada ought to be and must be dominated and inhabited by the same great colonizing races which have occupied and developed the eastern provinces of this great Dominion. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has uttered some words of reproach with respect to my attitude upon the Japanese question. He has accused me of appealing to passion and prejudice. I am at a loss to understand to what it is that he alludes. I have said that the views of the people of the west ought to be accepted with respect to a solution of this question. Was that an appeal to passion and to prejudice? If so, what has he to say to his own words in 1896, when he sent this telegram to the people of the west: 'Chinese immigration restriction not a question in the east. Views of Liberals in the west will prevail with me.'

Sir, it is true that in 1896 I sent this telegram to the west with regard to Chinese immigration, that it was not a question with us in the east, that it did not affect us. What was true in 1896 is true in 1907. No one in

the east, so far as I know, cares whether we have in the western provinces of British Columbia a Chinese immigration or not. I repeat what I said in 1896 that Chinese immigration is not a question with us here in the east and upon that point I was quite willing to allow the views of my friends in the west to prevail and be my guide. But with regard to Japanese immigration I will insist that the conditions are altogether different from Chinese immigration, and this is what I reproach my hon. friend with, that he should not have made the distinction—and there is a wide distinction—between Chinese and Japanese immigration. He himself this afternoon has given the reason : Japan is no longer a nation that we can treat with contempt or indifference. Oriental nations have been long dormant but they are now wakening ; Japan indeed is fully awake, and Japan insists on being treated as one of the civilized countries of the world. That is not all : Japan is an ally of His Majesty the King. This alliance was completed some fifteen years ago after due deliberation, and if to-day, which God forbid, there was to be a war in the orient or in the Pacific ocean in which it would be the fortune of Britain to be engaged, the heroic Japanese fleet would be by the side of the British fleet. This is not all : we have a commercial treaty with Japan, that treaty was urged upon us from all sides, it was approved in this House without a word of dissent. To-day we are enjoying the advantages of this treaty, we are selling goods to the Japanese, we are selling flour, we are selling lumber, we are selling cattle ; and these goods do not come from British Columbia alone, they come from the province of Ontario, and all other provinces of the Dominion. At this moment Ontario is sending cattle to Japan. Under these circumstances I say that this question is not at all a question for British Columbia alone, it is a question which interests the whole people of Canada whether in the east, west or centre. It is a Canadian question, nay it is an imperial question. It is with this that I charge my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that he ignored all these things and put the Japanese question on the same level as the Chinese question. Sir, I do nothing of the kind. I say we cannot ignore the situation which has arisen, we cannot to-day treat Japan as we might have done 25 years ago or even less. But whilst I recognize that we must treat Japan with all respect, whilst I recognize Japan as an ally of our country, whilst I recognize Japan as a friendly nation with whom we have friendly and commercial relations, at the same time I am well aware that race prejudices are slow to die and that there are race prejudices in the west against the Japanese population. I do not share them, I say to my friends from British Columbia—I say it openly—I do not share those prejudices. But I know they exist and we must take full account of them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

If we take no account of them, if we allow Japanese immigration to go unchecked, we are liable to have disorders as we unfortunately had some time ago, disorders which might create irritation between ourselves and Japan.

What then is our duty ? Our duty is to pursue the course that we adopted some six or seven years ago when we passed the last Chinese Immigration Exclusion Act, I think in 1900. By that Act we put a capitation tax on Chinese immigrants. We were urged by some of our friends to apply the same rule to Japanese immigrants and to impose a capitation tax on them also. We refused to do so, for the reasons I have just given, that Japan to-day is one of the civilized countries of the earth, that it is an ally of the King, that it is a country with which we could have large and increasing trade relations ; but at the same time we asked the Japanese authorities themselves to restrict their immigration to this country, so that we could avoid the clashing which might take place and, indeed, has taken place recently. This understanding was come to in 1900 and it has been preserved. I shall some day give, confidentially, communication of the correspondence on this subject to my hon. friend. This understanding has been kept up to this year ; I do not think it has been violated. Few immigrants have come from Japan to this country since 1900, perhaps 500 or 600 per year, but this year there has been a sudden influx of several thousand which unfortunately has caused a ripple, nay, a great deal of agitation in British Columbia. I do not believe the position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) was logical or was anything but an appeal to passion and prejudice. What did he say ? He repeated to-day the language he used in British Columbia. He said either the government deceived the House or they should ask the repeal of the treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Should be in a position to ask for it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In a position to ask for repeal—I say nothing of the kind. My hon. friend had no reason to suppose that we had deceived the House, and he should not have hinted that the treaty should have been withdrawn. Why, Sir, is that treaty of no use ? What is the position of British Columbia to-day? British Columbia has no neighbour except the orient. It has several growing cities—Vancouver, Victoria, Prince Rupert within a few years, all with magnificent harbours, all hoping to develop a large trade. With what country are they going to trade ? Where is their trade coming from to-day ? I venture to say that the greater part of that trade, the imports at all events, comes from the orient. This is a good reason why we should retain good relations with Japan, and the suggestion that we should repeal

the treaty is a suggestion that is not conceived in the best spirit that should prevail on an important question like that. We took a different course. My hon. friend has asked us why we sent my colleague, Mr. Lemieux, to Japan. I will tell him frankly. We do not suppose that the government of Japan has gone back on the understanding which we had with Japan ; but our contention is that certain parties have eluded the understanding—that instead of sending their immigrants to British Columbia, which the Japanese authorities would have prevented, they sent them to another country, to Honolulu, whence they were passed over to British Columbia. Then we sent our commissioner to Tokio in order to have an understanding on this point and to have the understanding respected. This is the position we are in at the present moment, and I think it is a position that will commend itself to the judgment of the people of British Columbia when it is properly expounded to them. The people of British Columbia have certain views upon this question. I would not be honest with myself and with them were I to say that I share those views; but whilst I do not share them, I am bound to respect them. We are bound to see that the views of all people in a free country like this are given respect to. But when they know that it is our aim to have continued the condition of things which has prevailed in the last six or seven years and with which they found no fault, they must be satisfied with the position we have taken on this question.

But, Sir, I have another reproach to make against my hon. friend and a far more grievous one with regard to his conduct and language in British Columbia, and it is that the hon. gentleman, yielding to the importunities of Mr. McBride, the Prime Minister of British Columbia, has undertaken to reopen the question of the provincial subsidies which was closed here last year. My hon. friend alluding to that in his speech in Ottawa, said :

Mr. Fielding and some of his subsidized organs are distressed and disheartened because of my attitude in respect of the financial relations between British Columbia and the Dominion. From 1902 to 1904 I made a pretty careful study of this subject and in the latter year I made the following pledge to that province:

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

Nothing has since occurred which in my opinion takes away the binding character of that pledge and during my recent campaign I told the people of British Columbia that it still held good.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that since he spoke as he did in 1904 nothing has occurred which in his opinion takes away the binding character of that pledge. Why, Sir, everything has occurred to remove the binding character of that pledge. My hon. friend is aware, everybody is aware, that that question was considered in this House not later than last session, that a new arrangement was made with the provinces to which they were all parties, and not a word of dissent from it was heard on the floor of this House, and that the resolutions have since received the sanction of an imperial Act of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And which struck out the words 'final and unalterable.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the body of the Act, I understood.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not in the body of the Act ; but I will tell the hon. gentleman what took place. This question of provincial subsidies has been one of the most dangerous questions which this confederation has ever had to deal with. From the first the arrangement which was made was not satisfactory to any province. It was satisfactory to certain provinces that the provinces should be allowed to share in the revenues collected by the Dominion ; but the arrangement embodied in the Act of Confederation was that that portion of the revenues to be allotted by the Dominion to the provinces should be fixed and permanent according to the population of 1861. I say that this arrangement was one of the weakest points in the Act of Confederation. It brought confederation indeed, upon more than one occasion, perilously near to a dissolution. The ink of the Act of Confederation of 1867 was scarcely dry when the provision there enacted was violated in favour of Nova Scotia ; the year after it was violated in favour of New Brunswick ; and year after year new arrangements were made, now with one province, now with another province. Such a course must have been extremely mischievous. When special provision was made with one province, it created jealousy in another, and immediately that other province made a demand for similar treatment. This went on from year to year until the provinces themselves came to the point of protesting against it, and asked for a readjustment of the subsidies. In 1887 a conference of the provinces took place at the city of Quebec, and they asked for a new settlement. Another conference took place some years afterwards, and a third and a fourth ; and after we had been ten years in office we determined to have a last conference here in the city of

Ottawa with the Dominion authorities with a view to obtaining a final and permanent settlement of that question. This conference took place here in the city of Ottawa in the month of October, 1906. At it all the provinces were represented, and it will not be out of place that I should give to the House the composition of that representation.

From the Province of Ontario: Mr. J. P. Whitney, Premier, Mr. J. J. Foy, Attorney General, and Mr. H. Mathewson, Provincial Treasurer.

From the Province of Quebec—Hon. Lomer Gouin, K.C., Premier and Attorney General; Hon. W. A. Weir, Minister of Public Works.

From the Province of New Brunswick—Hon. J. L. Tweedie, Premier and Provincial Secretary; Hon. Wm. Pugsley, K.C., Attorney General.

From the Province of Prince Edward Island —Hon. Arthur Peters, K.C., Premier and Attorney General; Hon. G. E. Hughes.

From the Province of Manitoba—Hon. R. P. Roblin, Premier, Minister of Railways and Minister of Agriculture; Hon. C. H. Campbell, K.C., Attorney General.

From the Province of British Columbia—Hon. Richard McBride, Premier and Minister of Mines.

From the Province of Saskatchewan—Hon. Walter Scott, Premier; Hon. J. A. Calder, Commissioner of Education.

From the Province of Alberta—Hon. A. C. Rutherford, Premier; Hon. C. W. Cross, K.C., Attorney General.

All the provinces were represented and ably represented. The province of British Columbia made a special claim, and I shall show presently how it was dealt with. But all the provinces agreed that there should be a new basis of calculation and a new arrangement. And they passed the following resolution:

This conference is of opinion that a basis for a final and unalterable settlement of the amounts to be yearly paid by the Dominion to the several provinces for their local purposes and the support of their governments and legislatures, may be found in the following proposal:

Instead of the amounts now paid, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, to be according to population, and as follows:

(a) Where the population is under 150,000, $100,000.

(b) Where the population is 150,000 but does not exceed 200,000, $150,000.

(c) Where the population is 200,000 but does not exceed 400,000, $180,000.

(d) Where the population is 400,000 but does not exceed 800,000, $190,000.

(e) Where the population is 800,000 but does not exceed 1,500,000, $220,000.

(f) Where the population exceeds 1,500,000, $240,000.

B. Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed, the annual payment hereafter to be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, until such population exceeds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000.

These resolutions were passed unanimously by the representatives of the provinces there assembled and were assented to by the Dominion government. British Columbia had a special claim based upon its mountainous character, vast territory and sparse population, and all the members of the conference, both the provincial and the Dominion members agreed that it was just and equitable that British Columbia should have a special allowance apart from all the others. The only question at issue was what should be the amount of that allowance. British Columbia demanded in its memorial that the question should be determined by a commission or a committee of arbitration to be composed of three members—one to be appointed by the Domion government; one by British Columbia and the third by the imperial government. This question was considered by the conference and it passed this resolution:

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

What better arbitrators could British Columbia have than the men there assembled—the premiers and ministers from all the different provinces? Could a commission of arbitrators, appointed as suggested by British Columbia, be more competent to deal with this question than the members of that conference. What was the purpose of that conference which sat here in Ottawa? It was to settle this very question. They considered it thoroughly and resolved:

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

So that under the resolutions adopted, the province of British Columbia is to receive a large extra subsidy and in addition to the extra grant, which she receives on a par with all the other provinces, she is to receive a special grant of $100,000 a year for ten years. These resolutions came before this House for ratification. They were submitted to this parliament. They passed without a word of dissent from my hon. friend or anybody else. Still he tells us that from the year 1902, he has given a good deal of attention to this question. He tells us that from 1902 to 1904 he made in the city of Ottawa a pretty careful study of this sub-

ject. But if he had made for two years a deep study of this subject, when it came before this House for settlement was the time to give the country the benefit of this study. He said however not a word on this subject. It seemed to him, as it did to everybody else, that the arrangement was a fair one. But he went to British Columbia and there he came within the magnetic influence of Mr. McBride, and he swallowed the bait that Mr. McBride offered him. My hon. colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) called it a bribe. What else could it be called? My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) spoke of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) as having said that the Conservative party had had a large fund, and the only reply we heard from my hon. friend was that he was ready to show that we were just as bad as he and his party were.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said nothing of the kind. The right hon. gentleman, I think, will remember that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly not. Of course he said nothing of the kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What then did I say?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend did not say: You are just as bad as we. But he said this: Give me a commission, and I will show that you have spent just as much as we have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Neither did I say that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot quote the ipsissima verba, but if the hon. gentleman meant anything else, I would like to know what he meant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I meant just what I said—that we were ready for any investigation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly, ready for any investigation, and that investigation shall be not only into what was charged by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) against the Conservative party, but into some other charges against the Liberal party also.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the right hon. gentleman object?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not the question. But if the hon. gentleman's meaning was not that the Liberal party is no better than his, I do not know what he meant. This however is not the question. I agree rather with my hon. friend in his concluding remarks when he said that there has been too much money spent in elections and that it was advisable to restrict that expenditure as much as possible. But if it be the object of my hon. friend to have clean politics, is it clean politics to have this question of the British Columbia subsidy, which was settled by this conference, re-opened again? Does my hon. friend call that clean politics when he went to British Columbia and said to Mr. McBride: Just as soon as I am in office, I shall reopen this question and give you the increased subsidy you ask for. If that be clean politics, in the opinion of my hon. friend, I think we had better let the electors of this country judge between us.

I shall say no more on this occasion, though some of the questions I have discussed will bear further elucidation as the session progresses. This much, however, I will say to-day. We have been eleven years in office. I have no doubt—indeed I am quite sure—that we have made many mistakes and have committed many errors. But when the time comes at the end of this parliament, to go before our judges, for my part I shall submit with confidence our record with all its mistakes and errors against the wild schemes of the new, though still self-styled Conservative party.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman, in his agitation over our platform, has altogether forgotten his own. What about the All-Red Route?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have simply to say at this moment, I have no communication to make concerning the All-Red Route.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did not the right hon. gentleman make it before?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have already stated that it is our intention to do so, though I am not in a position to make any communication at this time. But I hope to do so later in the session.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto.) Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has cut out a great deal more material than I supposed he would. Therefore, I find a rather hard task placed upon me—especially considering that I am labouring under the difficulty of a tremendous cold. I fear my voice will scarcely carry me through a half-hour speech and that it will be difficult for me even to touch upon all the points which the right hon. gentleman has dealt. I hope the House will be lenient towards me, as it has always been. I shall try to make myself as well heard as I can. The right hon. gentleman has covered a great deal of ground, but one thing above everything else has struck me as being very peculiar in his speech. While, in his closing words, he has admitted that there was a great deal in the speech from the Throne which he would like to touch upon, and which he intends hereafter to touch upon, yet he travelled far from that speech. He failed to perform his duty by

his own document, in his very great desire —for some reason or other—to take up and discuss the manifesto of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden.) It almost seemed that matters had been reversed and that the real speech from the Throne was the manifesto of the Liberal-Conservative leader. I have had a seat in this House for a good many years, but I have never seen such proceedings indulged in by a prime minister in the debate on the address. Leaving the points with which it was his clear duty to deal, and which he himself declared important, he devoted nearly the whole of his time and energy in attempting—in his own peculiar way—to cast ridicule upon the platform laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) beside me. The first fifteen minutes of his address upon that subject was very good opera bouffe, but it was not much else. It seemed to be sufficient to please hon. gentlemen behind him, and I hope they will long have a lively recollection of the comic way in which their leader treated this part of his subject. But what was the matter with my right hon. friend? He had been studying that manifesto; he had been swallowing that manifesto; he had been trying to digest that manifesto—and it had evidently proved a pretty hard process, so hard that he has been obliged to set at naught the rules of practice in the discussion of the King's speech from the Throne, and give his whole force to an endeavour to break the strength of the platform of the Liberal-Conservative party. While I call attention to this fact, I wish to have a word or two to say upon the right hon. gentleman's comment upon that document. He declared that this was not solid nor was it liquid; it was elastic and capable of expansion or contraction; that everything in it was qualified; that each clause had an 'if' or a 'but;' that there was no finality in it; that the hon. gentleman who proposed it argued one way and concluded another; his argument being good so far as it went. but his conclusion tending in one instance to the conclusion declared for by my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who sits here to my left. Now, really, was that an accurate statement? An ounce of fact is worth many pounds of such highfalutin as we have heard from the right hon. gentleman here to-night. I have here the platform as it was laid down. I challenge the right hon. gentleman to read it clause by clause and to point out the 'ifs' and 'ands' and 'buts' in it. They are not there—they are only in my right hon. friend's imagination. That was a peculiarly apt summing up of my right hon. friend that was made by one of the members of the colonial conference in England. When they were discussing some question—I have forgotten exactly what it was—some one suggested that what was wanted was a name or a phrase that would strike the public imagination and win favour, and the answer came, quick as a flash, 'We must apply to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for that.' So these 'ifs' and 'ands' and 'buts' are in his imagination—though he had the document in his hand which contradicted the statement he made. These declarations of the platform are plain and definite. Let me read one :

Mr. FOSTER.

Honest appropriation and expenditure of public moneys in the public interest.

Are there any 'ifs' or 'ands' or 'buts' about that ? Is there a single redundant word? Is there a man who sits behind the right hon. gentleman who does not understand it, and he knows that the people of this country are beginning to understand it, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific they are calling out against men who do not honestly appropriate or honestly expend the public moneys in the public interest and are calling for men who will carry out this plank of the platform. And here is another:

Appointment of public officials upon considerations of capacity and personal character and not for party services alone.

Is that not direct and to the point? Does not that carry its meaning upon its face? Does not my right hon. friend understand it ? He understands it only too well, for he knows that if ever the leader of a ministry in this country has been guilty of bedevilling the public service that man sits opposite me in the person of my right hon. friend. He it is who has trafficked in offices, from judgeships down to the lowest. This commenced when he bought and sold judgeships and governorships to his friend Langelier almost before his feet had begun to tread the paths of office to which he had been called. It has been his strong point; it has been his invariable practice from that time to this, until there is no department of the public service, inside or outside, that does not show the deleterious and injurious effects of this policy and these methods that have been brought into our administration by the right hon. gentleman himself. There is no doubt about it. The hon. gentleman does not know it? The right hon. gentleman certainly knows that he has thieves and embezzlers in the public service to-day. When it was brought to his attention and he and his supporters were challenged on it, he stood up like a little man and voted that it was right and proper to keep these thieves and embezzlers in office. Every man in the civil service, outside and in, knows what all Canada knows about this. But how can you expect men to be filled with the pride, the emulation and the ambition which my right hon. friend spoke about to do their best in the service of the country, when that service is bedevilled in that way from one end of it to the other, outside and inside ? I think that is plain enough. There are no 'ifs' or 'ands' about that.

More effective provisions to punish bribery and fraud at elections, to ensure thorough

publicity as to expenses by political organizations, to prevent the accumulation of campaign funds for corrupt purposes and to prohibit contributions thereto by corporations, contractors and promoters, to expedite the hearing of election petitions, and to prevent collusive arrangements for the withdrawal or compromise thereof, and to provide for a thorough investigation of corrupt practices, and if necessary to appoint an independent prosecuting officer charged with that duty, to simplify the procedure therefor and to enforce the laws so amended.

No 'ifs' or 'ands' or 'buts,' or beating about the bush in that platform. From the Atlantic to the Pacific all honest men in this country have subscribed to the sentiments which are embalmed in these words, in that clause of the platform of the Liberal Conservative party. The people of this country are sick at heart, they are disgusted, and the outcome and measure of that disgust is falling on these gentlemen in by-election after by-election, wherever the people can speak their minds with reference to it. What have you done since you came into office to make it harder for the political thief to do his work, and to make it easier for the honest elector to deposit his ballot and have it counted? You, sir, have stood up in this House against an investigation of these crimes, against an investigation of this corruption. You, sir, in the theatre down yonder, put your hand upon the shoulder of Geo. W. Ross and appealed to the people of Ontario for his re-election, saying, this is my right hand, I want you to make that right hand strong. The right hand shielded you, and shielded those who worked for you, who bought for you, who sold for you, who conspired for you, and you to this day have entered into the fruits of their labours, and not until that right arm was shattered were the processes of law able to catch the scoundrels and bring them to punishment. Where, Sir, in this House or out of it, has the right hon. gentleman stood up and made one simple strong, honest protest against those guilty of electoral corruption ? When and where ? Is it in the memory of any man within this chamber ? But every man who sits here knows that he has interposed his powerful influence time and again to prevent it, and has prevented it. Well, I think that is pretty plain. I think the people of this country will consider that it is pretty plain, and they intend to have an accounting therefor. I tell my right hon. friend that we are not afraid of the judgment day before the electors of this country. We are willing, whenever you choose to bring it on, whether it be now or later. It is straight cut sentences such as those I have read, showing forth the policy of the Liberal Conservative party, that are being taught in the households of this country and sinking into the hearts of the electors, and will make themselves felt when that judgment day comes, in favour of honest government, and of a fair chance at the ballot box for the electors of this country.

Such reforms in the mode of selecting future members of the Senate as will make that chamber a more useful and representative legislative body.

That is fairly explicit. Does the right hon. gentleman think that in enunciating a platform the leader of the opposition is bound to draw up a Bill such as he will introduce ? All he can do is to place before the people of the country the principles upon which he will act. But my right hon. friend says, I don't want any 'ifs' and 'ands' about it, I want to know just what you are going to do. Well, I might give the answer that my hon. friend himself gave once. Do you want to know how we will do it ? Well, then just let us over to that side of the House and we will show you. That is the reply I have heard the right hon. gentleman give before this. It is sufficient for us to show the principles upon which the party means to act.

What has my right hon. friend done with reference to reforming the Senate ? Has his recollection entirely gone from him ? Why, he could not find his platform if he were asked to do so. Here this evening he had it not by his side. Has he seen it within the last ten years ? Now that is a fair question. Has my right hon. friend preserved a copy of it ? Were the planks of that platform made of wood, or of cardboard, or of rubber? Were they elastic, could they contract, could they expand? Where is there a single plank in that multitudinous platform that my right hon. friend can say he is standing upon to-day ? Is there a single one ? Will the right hon. gentleman not inform the House, satisfy our curiosity—one single plank ? One plank of a great and powerful leader, that is all we ask for. Thirty or forty planks in the platform—one single one that has been preserved, and upon which they are standing to-day? And still we cannot have even that little measure of grace.

The management and development of the public domain (in which are to be included great national franchises) for the public benefit and under such conditions that a reasonable proportion of the increment of value arising therefrom shall inure to the people.

Is that plain enough ? My right hon. friend understands it quite too well ? In his heart to-night, as I am speaking here before you, the right hon. gentleman knows that although he was good enough to call his whole party together and pledge them and himself to the sacred principle that the lands were to be sold and used for the settler, and not for the speculator, he has nevertheless connived at, he has stood up for, he has placed his powerful approval upon, a more or less wholesale alienation

of the lands to political favourites who today sit behind and beside, affluent in the result of these favours they have got from my right hon. friend and from the members of his cabinet.

The Finance Minister journeyed to Truro and he journeyed back. He told them several wonderful things down there, but one of the wonderful things that he did tell them was that during their regime lands, which, when they came in, were worth only $2 an acre, had gone up to $6—actually gone up to $6 an acre. But there were several things, Mr. Speaker, that he did not tell them. He did not tell them what had been done with these lands, which, in 1902 and 1903, were selling at a minimum of $5 and $6 an acre; he did not tell him that a colleague of his, the Minister of the Interior, that strong man that my right hon. friend, looking over this whole Dominion, searched out in the west and brought here to set up as one in his cabinet, had taken 250,000 acres of homestead lands along a stretch of 115 miles of built and running railway, and which had been reported upon by his own officials as lands of quality and capacity, and allowed them to be—sold?—no, simply looted in favour of a gentleman who supported him in the west and that gentleman's associates at $1 an acre, payable, half in scrip and that these gentlemen, before two years had passed, had sold these lands for $2,000,000 or more and had put a million and three quarters in their own pockets and the pockets of their associates. He did not tell the people of Colchester that, nor did he tell them how one Robbins floated in to the Northwest on a summer's day without capital, friends, or affluence, made an application to the obliging Minister of the Interior for 380,000 acres of land upon which he should not pay a penny until 1910, got the franchise within six weeks or so, handed it over to his dear friends and the dear friends of the Minister of the Interior, Messrs. Hitchcock and J. D. McGregor, who put it alongside 100,000 acres of an irrevocable grazing lease for which they had to pay two cents an acre, and who, with Robbins, in six months floated a company and made a profit of $800,000 in stock or money. He did not tell them that. My right hon. friend does not tell us that. He thinks that this platform is not plain enough. I think it is plain enough, I think that the people of this country think it is plain enough and the Liberal-Conservative party, let me tell my right hon. friend when they build a platform, build it not only to get in on, but to stand on after they get in. But, what is the use of going over more? These are samples from the platform and I think they indicate sufficiently plainly in common English and the way in which they are phrased what we propose and what I believe this country will stand by us in proposing and carrying out as a public policy.

My right hon. friend said: Oh, but this is only one man's policy. Why did he not call the party together? That is what he should have done. Well, that is a good deal as you look at it. There are two ways of doing a thing. One is to call your party together from east, west, north and south, have the faithful here, one thousand, two thousand, three thousand, on sweltering summer days, go in and move amongst them as their leaders, make them the solemn pledges of public men, matured, wise and experienced, place these pledges in a public platform of so many sections, declare by unanimous vote that that is the policy of your party, and pledge them by your word of honour that when you get in that is what you will carry out. Having done all that in the light of day, above board, dismiss that convention, send them to their homes and then refuse to carry out a single pledge that you have made to that convention after you called it together. That is one way. That is the way of my right hon. friend. Another way is to build up your platform out of your experience and the needs of the country, back it up by votes in parliament on which there is perfect unanimity amongst the Liberal-Conservatives—as more than half of these clauses in this platform have been backed up in this parliament—back it up in by-election after by-election and back it up by placing it before the people of the country from one end to the other with scarcely a dissenting voice. I ask my right hon. friend if he was perfectly fair in that. The leader of this party has gone through this country from one end to the other. The audiences to which he addressed himself, the newspapers that were friendly and those that were not friendly—even my hon. friend is one of the auditors and readers—and I suppose hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of people have read that platform and have studied it within the last six or eight months. What is the body of opposition that is shown up against it? My right hon. friend can only, in one single instance, bring the example that upon one point, the 'Gazette,' a very excellent paper in the province of Quebec in the city of Montreal, did not see eye to eye with my hon. friend on the railway policy. Well, my right hon. friend must be forgetful in regard to this matter. Does he see eye to eye with the members of his own cabinet on that point? Does he sees eye to eye with the new ambitious rising, and I hope also, successful Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham)? Does he? He should read his speeches. The speeches of a new minister always have to be scanned. Older ministers have a certain license. You expect them to make mistakes but you will not

tolerate the mistake of a young man. I find that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals spoke a night or two ago in the province of Ontario and transportation was one of his themes. In his speech he declared that:

Mr. Borden had declared in favour of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Pacific. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the Mackenzie and Mann railway would both be at the Pacific soon and these, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, would make three transcontinental lines.

These would make three. What are the three?—the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Mackenzie and Mann. Why does he say that these will make three transcontinental lines?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will pardon me. He has forgotten the Canadian Pacific Railway, the one already built, and I did not mean the Intercolonial Railway at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman did not? Very well.

The Grand Trunk Pacific and Mackenzie and Mann railway would both be at the Pacific soon——

Yes, my hon. friend is right.

—and these, with the Canadian Pacific Railway——

That is right..

—would make three transcontinental lines, and all would have as much traffic as they could handle. It might be necessary to go to the Pacific with the Intercolonial Railway, but the same Mr. Borden and his party who now cried for this new line to the Pacific opposed the Intercolonial Railway extension to Montreal.

Indeed he would like to ask if they thought it worth while to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the heart of Ontario.

My right hon. friend was asking a conclave of good supporters, supporters of himself, supporters of my right hon. friend. What was the answer?

'Oh no, the corporations are the best hands to handle railways, not government.'

Was that their answer?

The question is I would like to ask do you think it worth while to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the heart of Ontario? (Loud cries of assent.)

From the faithful.

I do not say it is settled as a policy,——

——said Mr. Graham,

—but I know that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's cabinet is prepared to meet every demand of trade for quick transportation and reasonable rates and it might be found that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Ontario would help to regulate the rates.

Mr. BERGERON. It might.

Mr. FOSTER. It might. Where is the ex-Minister of Railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend ought to read that whole speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I am going to read every speech my hon. friend makes; I am anxious to size him up, to know how well he speaks and what wisdom he has. But there is undoubtedly a squinting by my right hon. friend and the new Minister of Railways of this government (Mr. Graham) towards extending the Intercolonial up to Ontario and possibly still farther west. But my right hon. friend has not travelled west; I am afraid he has not read well the sentiments and feelings of his western constituency. What have the Liberals in Alberta done, his own children? They have passed a resolution in favour of having the Hudson Bay Railway constructed and owned by the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. That is the voice of Liberalism in the province of Alberta. Will my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) undertake to go up there and convert them from the error of their ways and towards the corporations for whom he has so strongly pleaded here to-night? The Liberals of Saskatchewan passed a resolution to have the road constructed and owned by the Dominion government. There is the voice of his followers in another of the great new provinces, and, if I mistake not, the present Minister of the Interior last year set apart or proposed to set apart a portion of the odd numbered sections of the land in order that the government might, with the proceeds of these lands, build the Hudson Bay Railway. I am not sure whether my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) proposed to apply this as subsidy or in the line of the construction of the road by the government. These same provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba have already, with the evident assent of their people of both lines of political feeling, gone into the business of building and owning and operating government telephones in those three provinces. Great progress has been made in Alberta and before very long a large proportion of that province will be covered with government owned telephones. So I advise my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to put his ear to the ground, figuratively speaking, and find out what the people behind him and to a certain extent beneath him are thinking upon this question. No man can more quickly change his opinions than my right hon. friend, and I do not despair, if he hears the voice calling sufficiently loudly, that he will make very short work of his arguments of to-night and replace them by what would seem to him very much better ones.

He wanted to know where protection came in in this platform which was laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). He found it there but he said it was writ very

small. There is one place where my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) can find that it is writ infinitely smaller, that is in the Liberal platform of 1893. We see one party, with its thousands of supporters, pledging itself in all the fervor of its multitude, assenting to a great and broad principle that there shall be no writing of protection at all in all the documents, and yet, after having so pledged themselves, they can go out into the next eleven years of administration and write protection over every bit of their policy and of their administration.

Mr. BERGERON. And write it large, too.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two ways of doing it, you take your choice, but I think I would rather have the manly way of stating what you propose to do and doing it than of stating the opposite and then introducing and keeping protection in the fiscal legislation and administration of this country, to an extent, more burdensome than it has ever before fallen on the people of this country. My hon. friend told an amusing story as to which end of an egg you were to bite off before you made an omlet. My hon. friend did not bite off either end, he swallowed the whole egg, there were no bits about it, it was protection through and through, the whole of it was put down, aye, and not bolted in an honest, open fashion; he went behind the screen to do it, protesting all the time by all that was good and great, that he was an enemy of protection and a friend of free trade.

My hon. friend made a laboured argument with reference to government ownership of railways as well as telephone lines. He seemed to pay special attention to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), in fact he forgot that there was any other audience about him for a time and he directed his gaze and his argument entirely to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) and a great compliment to my hon. friend from South York. What is there in the wind? Is there to be another vacancy in the cabinet? I saw a hint in some good Liberal paper whilst the selecting process was going on, before these two fortunate gentlemen could read their title clear to mansions in the skies, that it was supposed that Mr. Maclean would be a Cabinet Minister in the ministry of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and as I say, listening to the almost perfervid tones in which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) addressed himself to the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and observing the smiling way in which my hon. friend from South York took it, I almost came to the conclusion that there was a deep, dark conspiracy somewhere which it would take more than Judge Winchester to hunt out. What was the whole argument of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with reference to railways? On the platform in the city of Toronto in 1904, he declared, when he found that the Intercolonial Railway had been a failure in certain respects, that it was not due to my hon. friend here who was once Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) or to the then Minister of Railways or to any Minister of Railways; it was due to the vicious system which prevailed. Now, the whole argument drawn to a logical conclusion urges my hon. friend, drives him inevitably in what direction with his Intercolonial Railway? His whole argument has been against government ownership, that it operates against efficiency, that it does not instill the emulating, ambitious spirit in its officials and workers to make the road a success as compared with what private men, a corporation would do; he condemned it by every argument. Does he propose to hand this over to a private corporation as well? Logically he cannot escape from his argument, if his argument is sound.

He twitted my hon. friend with arguing in one way and concluding in another. Then he proceeded to do the same thing himself. He argued against government ownership. Is he prepared to give up the government ownership of the Intercolonial Railway? His argument is worth nothing unless his actions will carry out the strength of the argument. It was refreshing to hear my right hon. friend praise in such dulcet tones and with such luminous language the Canadian Pacific Railway. In times gone by I have listened to my right hon. friend when he was not so complimentary to that corporation and that railway. I have listened to him when he denounced in every mood and tense the Canadian Pacific Railway—this giant monopoly, as he then called it. To-day he is coming nearer to the measure of justice, and he has absolutely declared that the Canadian Pacific Railway is the great beneficient machine which has done more for the development of this Canada of ours than perhaps any one agency in the whole country. I agree with him in that. Nobody proposes to fight corporations in so far as corporations do their proper work, in so far as corporations treat the people that they serve in a just and reasonable way. But it is an equally fair statement that there are regions and areas and directions in which government ownership in all these things may be put into proper execution. He finds fault with my hon. friend because he does not come out and say that he is going to confiscate every corporation and undo a system which has been accumulating for ages. No sane man would do that. The circumstances of the case must be taken into account. But, Sir, if we were commencing again in this country, with the knowledge we have now, there would be far more things owned and operated by government than are owned and operated to-day. In the illimitable development which Canada faces as the years

pass, there is ground, outside and beyond that which to-day is pre-empted and well worked by the corporations, for the beneficent working of government ownership in a thousand different ways and with great advantage to the people of Canada.

Let me go on now with the Japanese and Chinese question. I do not think I ever heard quite such an argument as my right hon. friend put before the House and this country to-night. Mr. Speaker, what was that argument? Will you allow me to present it, just in plain English? You cannot, he says, treat the Japanese as you would treat and have treated the Chinese. Well, why not? What are his reasons why? One power is powerful and has a big stick, the other is weak and disunited. and therefore you must treat it justly, but you can be unjust to it. What an argument for the right hon. gentleman who heads the government of Canada. Another argument: the one has rich gain in her lap for you ; the other you have not much chance of getting trade gains from ; therefore treat them differently, because sordid, selfish gain would prompt you to do it. The argument is immoral, publicly immoral. If there is anything like right and truth and justice, the Chinese should have his measure of it just as much as the Japanese. It should not depend on might or power, pelf or gain, getting or giving. It should depend on the real rights of men to certain treatment in certain cases. I take issue with my right hon. friend as to the question: suppose you were going to put yourself into disfavour with either people, which would you put yourself into disfavour with ? It is not necessary to put yourself into disfavour with either. I make no disrespectful allusion to the great progress and the quick development of the Japanese when I tell you that that old civilization which lies on the other side of the water opposite to Japan, with its three or four hundred millions of patient, diligent, sober people, has in it possibilities which so far outshine and outsweep those that belong to Japan, with its smaller country and its confined areas, that to the sagacious statesman looking to the future there is no question at all, if you put it on that low ground, as to whose susceptibilities we should be careful of. Does my right hon. friend think the Chinese are altogether uncivilized ? Has he forgotten that for fifteen hundred years or more the germs of a great and mighty wisdom have settled into their hearts and minds and moulded their character, and that in these late years of inspiration and upheaval such a change has taken place in the mighty empire of China as has not taken place amongst any other people in modern times? But again, I come back to this, that you should treat the peoples of the earth from right and justice, and not from expediency of gain or from fear. Now my right hon. friend comes again with his private correspondence. It is the old North Atlantic Trading Company again. There he had something which he would show to the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition thanked him and said, what is good enough for me is good enough for my followers behind me, and it is fair that all should be treated alike. Now my right hon. friend comes and says, I have private correspondence which I may some time show the leader of the opposition which will exonerate me. For my own part, I am not disposed to press this question unfairly. I will state simply my own view of it. When I voted on that Japanese treaty ratification last session, I did it on the strength of the representations that were made by the Prime Minister as to the limitations of emigration from Japan and on my own knowledge of what I thought the commercial result might be to us. That I did understand ; the other I knew not. But when my right hon. friend made the statement, which of course he acknowledges to have made, and which he leaves us to infer he made in good faith—and I am not going to question it for a moment—then I say that responsibility for the ratification of that treaty fell off my shoulders and the shoulders of gentlemen on this side of the House and in this House generally. But there has been some miscarriage. My right hon. friend is not going to charge the Japanese government with failure and we do not wish him to do so, If the Prime Minister's version of it turns out to be true, there must be this simple explanation that in a moment of inadvertence and in the press of work after the great war the Japanese government forgot the limitations it had placed in the hands of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ; and no doubt, as soon as its attention is brought to these limitations, that government will honourably carry out every pledge it gave. I am willing to let the matter rest until that is solved, and I let it rest in the hope and the belief that a just solution will be reached. I am not disposed to draw a colour line in this country. I am not disposed to put up a race line. I am not disposed to say that any man in the universe, because of a certain colour or race, no matter what may be his attainments and character or qualifications in other respects, shall be shut out from this country. But I am bound to maintain that we have the right to keep this a white man's country and not allow the interests, the institutions and the labour of this country to be dominated by any other element. And I have no doubt, if we are wise and patient, we shall have no trouble in preserving our integrity and preventing any such result as we would all deplore. British Columbia, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says, has no neighbour but Japan. He has forgotten

that, not so very long ago, he and his followers were shouting throughout the country, from one end to the other, that the United States was our natural market. My hon. friend has forgotten that great nation with its eighty millions of people, lying to the north and south of British Columbia, and apparently believes that the future of that province depends entirely upon her trade with Japan. I should be sorry for British Columbia, if she were limited to that trade. While I believe that there is a profitable trade to be developed between British Columbia and Canada in general and the great empire of Japan, I am still of the opinion that the possibilities for trade are infinitely greater with the 300,000,000 Chinese who lie equally near to us, whose resources are so great, whose wants are so many and who, when stirred by the life breath of a patriotic and reviving nationality and unity will develop an area for trade and commerce unequalled in any part of this world. The Japanese propose to manage as they have a perfect right to do their own industries; they propose to carry their own trade. They propose, if their government has to mortgage its last dollar, to do both these things with government aid. And taking the conditions of labour and wages, the outlook is not of the best for great expansion of trade between British Columbia and Japan. A good trade, I hope will be done; but I look for a better and more remunerative trade with the great population of China.

Now we come to the British Columbia subsidies. My right hon frined forgot a passage in his past life. He forgot his compact with the late Mr. Mercier. He forgot the hard and fast bargain which he made with Mr. Mercier before a general election, when he said to him: If you will give me a majority in the province of Quebec, I will grant you the better terms you want for your province. That episode is a matter of history. It is writ in history, and it is not writ small. It is writ large. My hon. friend can read it if he pleases. Yet he comes to my hon. friend beside me (Mr. R. L. Borden) and says that when my hon. friend made a promise in 1904 that he would see that justice was done British Columbia, if injustice were established — that he would right the matter in so far as he could, if he came into power—my hon. friend says that such a promise was bribery and corruption. Yet a wholesale contract to deliver up a province for an express subsidy—that has faded completely out of the mind of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That has gone where the planks of his 1893 platform have gone. It has gone into the oblivion of the past. The last provincial conference, the right hon. gentleman says, has been held, and the last settlement has been made. My right hon. friend is powerful and mighty in some matters but he cannot do what the Almighty alone can do. When he declares that the last conference has been held between the provinces and the Dominion and the last rearrangement of provincial subsidies made, he is making a declaration which it is absolutely out of his power to make effective. Neither he nor any parliament can do that. No parliament can bind its successors in these matters. That arrangement, which the right hon. gentleman says is the last, is one which was dissented from by one of the provinces represented at the conference. Consequently you cannot make it of binding force on that province. British Columbia could never have been brought into confederation if it had persisted in refusing to join. Neither can you make, by a vote of a majority of the premiers, a hard and fast settlement from which one of the provinces dissents and by which it will not consent to be bound.

I shall not weary the House much longer, but wish to refer just for a moment to the first part of my right hon. friend's speech. It is infinitely interesting to watch the growth of a legend. If I had the time to-night, I would like to analyse that growth. I would like to show where the first seed dropped, who watered it, how long it took to sprout, the length of time it took to throw up tender shoots and grow stronger, until it at last developed into a wide spreading tree covered with foliage. I shall not however describe the whole process to-night but simply analyse briefly the three legends which my hon. friend has built around himself, or which have been built up around him by his adoring followers. If the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) were here, I would be strongly tempted to give him a warning. Did he not know that only last year, the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) fairly exhausted his imagination and rhetoric in his effort to heap flattery on the right hon. the First Minister. He lauded the right hon. gentleman to the very skies, he lifted him up into the loftiest ether. But where is the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) to-day? He is to-day in what my right hon. friend and his supporters, a few years ago, were wont to describe as the old women's retreat. His flattery of the First Minister did not bring him the place he coveted. Let the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) beware lest he should receive the same treatment.

The right hon. gentleman was questioned regarding his cabinet changes. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked why he had passed over his followers who had served him so faithfully during the past fifteen or eighteen years. ? Strong men they were. Well did they fight his battles. They went out into every campaign and fought for him under whatever flag he unfurled. They stood by him in this House even when

their better judgment and conscience told them they were not doing right. They fought for him in the committees even when they knew they were violating every canon of just and fair inquiry into the expenditures of the country. Yet when a choice has to be made of a cabinet minister, these men are counted out. What was the answer my right hon. friend gave? I had, he said, to go out and look for the best men. And the best men he could only find outside the ranks of those servile followers, who have followed him so faithfully from 1878 to the present day, and many of whom, I am bound to say, are of equal ability and experience to the two hon. gentlemen he has chosen. These old veterans have still to go on doing the mucking and such work, and when a foreman has to be called in, he is taken from the outside.

The Liberal of the old time, who has served him faithfully, comes to him and says: If yon have honours and rank to bestow, do you not think it would be well to give them to men who have never wavered in their Liberalism? Equal ability? Anything like equal ability? What does party service for eighteen or twenty years require that it should be regarded as unfitting men for the higher grades of office? My right hon. friend has a great penchant for looking after the flotsam and jetsam of the Liberal-Conservative party. When, under stress of weather, the old Liberal-Conservative ship was partly dismantled, my right hon. friend's heart was aroused to sympathy. Straightway he sends out his wreckers, takes up the wreckage, dries it off and lands it in the Senate, or in office. I thank my right hon. friend for having taken care of a great deal of that kind of material that was at one time part of the old Liberal-Conservative ship. And this is the last and most brilliant example. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) and myself are old acquaintances. We respect each other; yet we criticise each other; we have had a good deal to do with each other. And my hon. friend will not take it amiss if I recall to his memory—for fear it may slip like the lapsing memory of the Prime Minister—that, up to 1896, he was an ardent follower of Liberal-Conservative principles. He accepted the Liberal Conservative nomination in the county of Kings and he fought the battle, until it was found that he could not fight it successfully, when he was practically asked to retire for the sake of the party.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not so sure of that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is my version—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is perfectly good until a better one is shown.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has had some failures in New Brunswick himself.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) went down to the city of St. John, and, with great astuteness—I shall never deny him that quality—took his stand upon a platform which would make it delightfully easy to step off on one side or the other according as the signs showed in the political zodiac. These signs favouring the star of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a lesser star has taken its place in the firmament, and adds its rays to those of the overwhelmingly brilliant galaxy that to-day shines upon us from the front benches. It may be that, within the next two or three years, before an election comes, there will be other floatsam and jetsam to be picked up. I commend it to the merciful care and sympathetic handling of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

But he wanted to get the best. Did he ask Hon. Clifford Sifton to take a place in his cabinet? It is commonly stated that he did. I do not know whether any cabinet minister stated that or not, but it was so repeatedly reported that I think the right hon. gentleman ought to tell us whether he did really make an honest effort for the best man in the person of Mr. Sifton, and when he could not get him fell back on the next best man. If so, he does not always get the best. My right hon. friend has his chance and I hope he will explain to this House and to the country whether there was any truth in that statement, and, if so, what were the particular reasons why the gentleman to whom he first applied as the best man did not fall in with his proposals. But it may be satisfactory to all these ardent gentlemen who fight so strongly for their party and for the Prime Minister, that it is now plain that, so long as my right hon. friend is Prime Minister, whenever there is a vacancy in the cabinet he will go into the wider fields and search for the best man. While these hon. gentlemen behind him may be well enough, for what we may call the unskilled labour, when skill is required it must be sought outside.

Now, as to these three legends; what are they in brief? One is that at the colonial conference the right hon. gentleman played the part of the doughty hero on behalf of the threatened liberties of Canada and her sisters the daughter states of the empire. My right hon. friend surprised me this afternoon when he made the statement that he had to withstand the men who wished to make Canada and others of the daughter states mere satellites to revolve around Great Britain, occupying a position of humiliating dependence upon that power. I asked him the names of the men who took that position. But he had forgotten them—his memory failed him again. I ventured the assertion that he could not name them. And when he stated that it was a matter of appreciation, I said that, to my mind, it was a matter of fact, and I stated that I had read the records very carefully and

failed to find a single man who tried to put Canada and the sister states in that position. Now, I do not grudge my right hon. friend the foremost position that, in one way, he took at that conference. It was Canadas right, and I was proud to see him stand for the premier colony. But there is no need for pretense and posing. From the time the conference opened until it closed, there was not a single aggression made upon the rights of the daughter states—such a thing cannot be pointed to in the record.

What was the discussion about? It revolved around the two questions of the name that should be given to what was known before as the Colonial Conference, and about the functions of the secretariat that was to make the doings and the work of that conference more effective and more consecutive. Now I challenge my right hon. friend. Will he take that record and point out from any statement or any member of that conference where any one of them took a position of that kind ? It cannot be done, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deakin was there, Sir Joseph Ward was there, Dr. Jamieson was there, Mr. Moor was there, General Botha was there, and these were the chief men of that conference. Every one of them stood on exactly the same high plane as did my right hon. friend. They declared they were simply discussing a title, that they thought Imperial Council would be a better title for the old Colonial Conference, but they were unalterably opposed to any change at all in the functions of that council. Is not that true ? I think my right hon. friend will bear me out in that. But lest there should be some doubting Thomases, I propose to call his attention to the matter, where it is set out in the record when the discussion commenced on the second day of the conference. After some remarks from the chairman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier proposed that Mr. Deakin should give his views with reference to this change of name and change of function, if there was to be any. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said :

> Canada has made no suggestions upon this point. I may say that in our country, as we have stated in our despatch, we do not view it with much favour——

That was the stand my right hon. friend took.

> —but we approach it with open mind. I would at this moment observe relative to the suggestion of Mr. Deakin that he should take up at once the first proposal of the Commonwealth of Australia. 'That it is desirable to establish an imperial council to consist of representatives of Great Britain and the self-governing colonies chosen ex-officio from their existing administrations,' and that the title should be the last thing to be determined.

My right hon. friend properly argued : first, let us know what you are going to have the functions, the constitution, the powers, and then let us put a name to that after we know what it is going to do. Here is what Mr. Deakin said about it :

> We found in the despatch from the previous imperial government a proposal to adopt the title 'Imperial Council.' This we understood was intended to be conferred upon the existing conferences without any substantial alteration in their powers, or in the principle of their constitution. We were prepared to mark our appreciation of the intention by the adoption of that title. It appeared to us a fitting cognomen for such a body, and if its constitution were elaborated to some slight degree, it might have been a judicious thing to accept it, even at this stage; but the intention of this general resolution of ours was to retain these conferences precisely as they have existed—this conference as it now exists—unaltered in personnel or in procedure, except so far as we might with advantage connect its several meetings during the intervals of the assembling, and provide for a more efficient means of keeping its members in touch with one another and with the government of Great Britain. Our idea was not to endow the new body under whatever title it was known, with any legislative or executive power.
>
> The body we had in view was a conference that was to have no such power as, according to the government of Canada, are associated in their minds and in the minds probably of those whom they represent, with the name 'Imperial Council,' which to us would not have meant more than 'Imperial Conference.' We are perfectly prepared to accept that title. I do not need at this stage to detain the conference further. Our object is to retain the conferences as they at present are, in respect to their authority, to their constitution and to their periodical meetings.

I could read statement after statement from Mr. Deakin in the same line. Now let us see what Sir Joseph Ward said, as I find it on page 30 :

> Whether the organization is termed a council or a conference, to my mind is not of very great importance, so long as the position and duties of the council are defined, and speaking for my colony, I lay it down as one of the cardinal principles of such an organization, that there should be no interference with the present rights and powers of the governments of those self-governing countries; and in that respect if we are safeguarded, as I am perfectly sure every one is desirous of doing, what we term the meeting of the Prime Ministers does not mattter. If it is covered by the term 'Conference,' in deference to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's wish, I have not the slightest objection, and I should be only too glad to fall into line with it. Why I preferred the word 'Council' is because it indicates a permanency, and it is with the object of having a permanent institution established that I think we ought, if we can, to arrive at some decision of a definite nature in dealing with this matter.

He went further, and asked that the Crown colonies should be disassociated from the self-governing dominions, so anxious was he that the status of the self-governing dominions should not be compromised or

mixed up with the management of the Crown colonies. He and Mr. Deakin went further, and they argued for taking the presidency of that council or conference out of the hands of the Colonial Secretary, and vesting it in the Prime Minister, thinking to give it additional status and additional standing by removing it entirely from the imputation of being in any way under the Colonial Office, the old Colonial Office. Now let us see what Dr. Jamieson says, on page 33 :

> Nothing will be done unless we are all unanimous, and I was very glad to hear the extremely moderate and very lucid statement of Mr. Deakin on the question of conferences. I was glad to see from that lucid statement that he was able to remove from the mind of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the idea that he had any elaborate scheme to propose with regard to the constitution of this so-called imperial council, which I may say at once I would be glad to see changed in name to the Imperial Conference. We did not wish to initiate any new scheme whatever, as Mr. Deakin has explained; all that we desired was to make more efficient the work of the conference as the conference stands at present.

Mr. Moor, representative from Natal made almost exactly the same statement; and General Botha did not want to have things disturbed at all. In fact General Botha gave me the impression of being rather disinclined for any changes of any account at the present time, in any regard, largely I think from the idea that in a short time when his own and the other provinces should be united as Canada and Australia have been, they could speak with more power and occupy a more representative position. However, I think I have read enough to prove that there was no member of that conference who proposed to take a position derogatory to the outside dominions ; every one of them declared it to be his intention that the autonomy, rights and position of the outside dominions should be kept as good as they were, and enhanced as far as they could be. How has the legend then grown up that in some manner the right hon. gentleman stood as the champion of the autonomy of the outside dominions, and made a valiant and successful battle against those who would have demanded the colonies of that position, and put them into the position of humiliation ? So much on that point.

There is another point. I have heard it attributed to my right hon. friend by one of his ardent supporters that for the first time the conference came together as a consultation between government and government, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's hand was the guiding and powerful hand which brought that about. Sir, before my right hon. friend opened his mouth in this conference, the chairman of the meeting—no, the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, Sir Campbell Bannerman, made the pronouncement on behalf of the British government that this was no longer a conference between a British Minister and the outside Dominions, not a colonial conference, but that it was to be then and henceforth a conference between the government at home and the governments outside—governments outside—governments with governments which idea was hailed with de light by my right hon. friend and by every other member of the conference. Give every one his due, but why should enthusiastic supporters wish to place the right hon. gentleman in a position which is historically inaccurate ? We give him credit for standing for Canada, but we do not want to discredit the other sister colonies who stood equally for the status and position of all the Dominions with the right hon. gentleman.

Now, there is another legend. That is the legend of this French treaty which was placed on the table. The legend was given credence and currency by the right hon. gentleman himself who came down to the Manufacturers Association banquet in the city of Toronto and declared—I will not have time to read the whole of his utterances—that heretofore British diplomacy had ruled the affairs of Canada, that heretofore British diplomacy had been only a blundering diplomacy, that now, without any revolution, in the twinkling of an eye, all that had been changed and to-day Canada had the negotiation absolutely to herself of her own commercial treaties and that a treaty had just been signed in which two of his colleagues, without any help, without any intervention, without any mechanism at all from Great Britain or her Minister in Paris, had made a treaty, had signed the treaty and had finished and completed the whole business. Canada herself. And, Sir, where do we find the fruit ? Everywhere. The very first indication we saw of it was down in the city of Quebec where these gentlemen, who brought home the treaty, before they had divulged what it was, were banqueted, because they had made a treaty and where the address to the ministers declared in so many words : This is the first treaty that was ever negotiated and completed by Canada herself—honour to the braves who have wrought this great victory for us. And so it has gone from place to place, editorial to editorial, and has been given currency by the right hon. gentleman himself that this is the first. What is the use of trying to read history backwards ? If the right hon. gentleman wants the facts of the case here they are. The time is not so very long ago when Britain made the treaties and the colonies had no say one way or the other about them. That was followed by a better and more generous method when Canada and the other great colonies, but Canada especially, were invited to send their representatives who became representatives of the British government working along with the British representa-

tives, with the British Minister at Washington, for instance, and working out the details of the treaty. That was the second step. The next step, concurrent almost with that, was that no treaty would be forced on any colony without the assent of that colony, and in 1893 the next step forward was made when Sir Charles Tupper was appointed plenipotentiary by Great Britain, and when he went to Paris and with Lord Dufferin, the British Minister to Paris, entered into negotiations with the gentlemen who conducted the matter for France, Sir Charles Tupper carrying out absolutely all the negotiations, the British minister simply introducing him, simply giving him all the resources at his command, and after Sir Charles Tupper and the French minister had arranged the treaty it was signed by Lord Dufferin, signed by Sir Charles Tupper and signed by the French minister, and it became a treaty. From beginning to end there was absolutely no constitutional or practical difference between the matter in 1893 and the matter in 1907. What is the use of reading history backwards and trying to make it appear that under this regime a great advance forward has been taken and a great right has been wrested from the British government ? The right hon. gentleman said that Canada knew her own business best and could do her own business best. So Canada can up to a certain point, but everyone of us with half an ounce of common sense in his head knows that there is one thing Canada cannot do. She cannot make a treaty and she cannot enforce a treaty. Just as long as the present constitutional circumstances and conditions stand Canada may have all the say in reference to her own business in the way of a treaty with another country, as to-day she has, but she has to say it in a constitutional way, and when the treaty is signed it is Great Britain's plentipotentiaries who sign it and when the treaty is completed it is the power of Britain that enforces that treaty.

We have the other legend and that is wholly made by the right hon. gentleman himself. That is the all-red route.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He forgot that.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman forgot it. He did not forget it when he came back to Quebec for this is what he said :

During the last five days of the conference I announced a new idea which has almost become historic—the all-red line.

Is it possible that the right hon. gentleman uttered these words ?

My proposition was the establishment at once of fast boats on the Atlantic and Pacific. I am thoroughly convinced that my ideas are in the interest of Canada and the empire, and although I have grown old and white in the service of the country I am prepared to work with all my energy to further the cause.

Mr. FOSTER.

That was the new idea. The all-red route. What was it ?—a fast line of steamship communication from Great Britain to Canada, fast railway communication across Canada, as fast as possible steamship communication with the Orient, Australia and New Zealand. That was the new idea, and I see it written in this book that when the matter came before the conference Sir Wm. Lynne, the Finance Minister of Australia, said that they had been advocating that for ten years in Australia, and that they called it there the all-red line. Ten years ago ! Five days ago ! Memory at fault ! Historical accuracy ! Who is responsible ? Sir Wm. Lynne or is it my right hon. friend ? But we need not pursue that further. My right hon. friend was here in 1888, he was here in 1889, he was here in 1900 ; he was here and he and his followers fought with tooth and nail the proposal of the Liberal-Conservatives of that day to put on the statute a subsidy for fast line steamers across the Pacific running to China and Japan, New Zealand and Australia, and for a fast line across the Atlantic, both lines contributed to by Great Britain and by Canada, by New Zealand and Australia as well and the whole argument was the all-red line, as swift communication as we possibly could have between London, Vancouver, Hong-Kong, Yokohama, Auckland, Melbourne and Sydney.

That was the slogan of the Liberal-Conservative party then and in spite of the efforts of these gentlemen the legislation was put on the statute book, the steamers were put upon the ocean, the subsidies were contributed and with reference to the Atlantic side, the contract was made and within two or three years we would have had the actuality resulting from the contract, but my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) thought it was no thing to conjure with, the all red line ; he tore up the contract and went into the bottle-necked steamer business and the Petersen and Tait business, until after dilly-dallying for years. prices rose so that in those days they were frightened at the amount of money that would have to be paid to get an all-red line. I must tell my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) candidly that I doubt if he added much to his own reputation and to the reputation of Canada by the course he pursued in that conference with reference to the all-red line. On the 14th day of the sessions of that conference, only one day before it rose, he put in a resolution demanding that there and then steps should be taken to put on a 24-knot service across the Atlantic and an 18-knot minimum service on the Pacific, and that Great Britain and Canada, Australia and New Zealand, should contribute to the same in equitable shares—and he occupied three minutes or less in putting that proposition before that conference. There sat the British government, represented by business men ; there sat the representatives

of all the colonies, business men, and here was this right hon. gentleman who sprang the motion on nearly the last day of the conference and refused to listen to any change in that resolution which would satisfy the business-like inquiry as to what the cost was likely to be, whether the service was to be cargo or cargo and passenger or passenger alone. The representative of the British government told him to his face: It is unfair this treatment of us, you are trying to rush the question; do you mean to tell us that we must vote and become responsible for it, without your giving us a single item of information with reference to its cost or anything connected with it? The right hon. gentleman counted the distance and decided to his own satisfaction that it could be done in about three weeks with a 24-knot service on the Atlantic, more than 18 knots if possible on the Pacific and the Canadian Pacific Railway across this country and he fought, Sir, for an immediate assent to that resolution of his, fought for it until the end of the day, and at last, convinced of his lack of business, he gave way and allowed it to be amended by the insertion of a proviso: If it can be attained at reasonable cost. Sir, it reminds us of the great Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. There was a period when time would not wait and when, as one of his ministers said, Cox would not wait, and here before the empire the premier of Canada brought a proposition like that in an unbusiness-like manner before the empire and tried to push it and rush it through without an item of information as to its cost—but he took good care to declare in the name of the people of Canada that cost what it might, Canada was willing to share and shoulder a larger proportion of the cost than any other. That all-red line was what my right hon. friend fought for ten years, bungled for some two or three years and then, on the spur that was applied to him that he had done mighty little for Canada at that conference and that he had better bring home something for an election cry, he sprung his brand new, five-day old scheme of an all-red line and pushed it as far as he could but had to give way in the end. He has not given it up, his hair is gray, but he has buckled to for many another hard day's work and will not rest until we get the all-red line. I hope we will have it; I hoped for it twelve years ago and worked for it twelve years ago as did hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, to be rebuffed by this right hon. gentleman, but in spite of that the lines were started, the lines have been eminently successful, and the keel has been laid for that coming fleet of swifter vessels which in due process of time, by the co-operation of all these great portions of the empire, will carry our passengers and mails—our cargoes they will not carry—on swift wings from the east to the old east from the orient to the mother country in an ever-growing and ever-increasing channel of prosperity and development for all these countries.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 3, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

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

That the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House under rule 10, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the select standing committees of this House be given power to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the right hon. gentleman tell us when we are likely to get the report of the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I have difficulty in giving a definite answer, but a member of the commission assured me that before the Christmas vacation he expected to have the report ready.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: The Bill is the same as that which was reported by the Select Committee last session but reported too late for the House to deal with it. The hon. the Minister or Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was in Europe when the report was brought down, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who was then leading the House, asked that the Bill should stand over until this session. The Bill requires masters and mates of ves-

sels in inland waters to be British subjects. It was discussed during several sessions and was sent to a special committee last session which reported. I am introducing the Bill in exactly the same language as that which was reported last session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENTS.

Mr. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said : This Bill requires protection to the people upon level crossings in cities, towns and villages. It was sent to the Senate twice and was rejected by the Senate last year. I shall ask the House to send the Bill back to that body for reconsideration. It was passed unanimously by this House, and the Bill I am now introducing is exactly the same as that which this House passed last session with the exception that it will come into operation a year later.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act. He said : I wish to amend that clause of the Act which deals with the beginning and the completion of a railway. I wish to make that clause operative and have the effect the House intended it should have. At present there is a clause in each railway charter compelling the company to begin construction within two years and complete within five years. That clause enables the railway company to evade this obligation. What happens in many cases is this. Railway companies get charters here by the dozen covering hundreds and thousands of miles of territory. They are supposed to begin construction within two years and in some cases they do. But if a company is not ready to go on with its construction before the end of the second year, all it has to do is to grade a mile or two of track, and then it is not obliged to do anything more for the next three years, so that at the end of five years nothing whatever is done worth mentioning. Then at the end of five years the company comes back and gets a renewal of its charter. Thus we find many railway charters issued and nothing done. If that were the only bad effect, it perhaps would not be so serious, but another bad effect is that other railway companies are prevented from getting charters and constructing a railway over the ground covered by the first charter. Suppose a second company should get a charter covering the same route and should attempt to build its railway, the original charter holders would go right on with their road. In my part of the country there are two or three charters which have been in existence a number of years, and practically nothing has been done towards building the railways, and no other railway company can come in and build the road. The company holding the charter claim they cannot get the men or the material to build the branch line. But I notice that these companies seem to get plenty of men and material to build branch lines in those parts of the country where they hope to cut out the lines of other companies. What I propose in this amendment is this : Within two years of the granting of the charter, at least ten per cent of the mileage of the railway under charter shall be completed and put in operation ; and during the third year ten per cent additional and during the fourth year another ten per cent additional shall be completed, the whole to be finished, as now provided, within five years. I do not say that these are exactly the right percentages. In a short railway it would be too small, and in a long railway it might, perhaps, be a rather heavy demand for the first two years. But I would be quite willing to change the figures if good reason is shown for so doing. This matter has been discussed to a certain extent in the Railway Committee. It is a matter of very serious import. I trust the House will pass this Bill so that we may be able to compel the railways either to build the roads they are chartered to build, or drop their charters. That is the main object—if a company will not build the road let them drop their charter inside of five years and give some other railway company the opportunity to come in and do the business.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INDUSTRIAL AND CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) respecting Co-operation. He said : This Bill was presented last session, discussed in the House and referred to a special committee. That committee held many sittings and went fully into the merits of this legislation, examining employees from the Department of Agriculture and outside witnesses also. The result of the committee's consideration was that the Bill was fully endorsed and commended as one calculated to help the development of agriculture and fruit culture, and as a very useful credit and loan measure. The report of the committee is very extensive, covering over two hundred printed pages. It goes very fully into the merits of the measure. There is an appendix in which are given the laws of other countries that have adopted legislation on co-operation. In this report, which was unanimous and favourable to the measure, the committee recommended that the Bill be taken charge

of by the government and passed as soon as possible. If I have taken the liberty of introducing the Bill now, it is chiefly because of the absence of the Minister of Labour (Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux) who was principally charged with the administration of this proposed law. Having no understanding with him as to what would be done with this measure I thought it better to introduce it in order that it should be brought to the notice of the House and that members of the House should be given occasion to study the report which was prepared and which gives very valuable information in regard to the working of co-operation. I need hardly say that if the government adopts the unanimous suggestion of the committee and takes up the measure I shall be very glad to relinquish it to any of the ministers who is prepared to take charge of it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill was introduced by me last session. It deals with the subject of demurrage, providing a kind of reciprocity in that matter. The Bill proposes to enact a penalty against the company in the interests of the shipper if the company fails to provide cars when required. It provides a penalty against the shipper and in the interest of the company if the shipper fails to load the cars provided. It provides a penalty in the interest of the consignee and against the company if the company does not put cars on the siding as requested, and a reciprocal penalty against the shipper and in favour of the company if he does not unload the cars when so placed. Provision is made expressly reserving the right of every shipper and every railway company in respect of any damages one may claim against the other in regard to any losses outside of demurrage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending March 31, 1907.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Civil Service List of Canada, 1907.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, may I ask the Minister of Finance (W. S. Fielding) if copies of the French treaty are being printed for distribution?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I was under the impression that they were already printed for distribution.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean for distribution outside—copies in addition to the usual two copies given to members. There are inquiries for copies from boards of trade and men in business life, and there seems to be no way of meeting these inquiries.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot answer as to the number printed, but I agree with the view that there should be a liberal supply.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION—INQUIRY FOR DOCUMENTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) I would like to ask the government whether they will lay upon the table of the House the documents alluded to by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher) on his return from Japan in 1903? I refer to the statements in writing which he declared he had received from the government of Japan with regard to the limitation of immigration from that country to other countries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). That will come up under notices of motion which are on the Order Paper.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in his opening remarks yesterday stated that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in his speech had gone into a good deal of new and unexpected matter. I should be glad to return the compliment to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), but I am afraid I cannot do so. I fear that we must recognize the fact that the speech he gave us yesterday, after all, contained very little that was new. It was a repetition of the old attacks, of the old sound and fury which we have heard so often in this House, attacks which have met their effective answer not only in this House, but from time to time in the verdict rendered upon them throughout the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Colchester, for instance.

Mr. FIELDING. We will have a word about Colchester before we close. I was reminded by the violence of my hon. friend's attack of a little incident in my own early modest political career. In the provincial legislature of which I was then a member, I had introduced a Bill which I regarded as of considerable importance, but it was one as to which several of my good friends seemed to entertain doubts. We were able

to satisfy most of them that their doubts were not warranted and that the measure was a good one. So the day came that the measure had to be taken up. We had not a large majority at the time and a member or two more or less had to be carefully considered. There was one young man who was half Scotch and half Dutch; that is a combination which produces a large degree of determination, I might almost say, of obstinacy; and that good friend remained unconvinced. So we had to proceed with the debate with the possibility of his voting against us. Then an hon. gentleman on the other side rose and commenced an attack, as the hon. gentleman commenced yesterday and with almost equal violence. Before he had spent many minutes, my doubting friend came over to my side and he said, It's all right, Fielding, that fellow has fixed me. Now if there was a single doubting, hesitating member in the party which supports my right hon. friend in this House, the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday would undoubtedly have fixed him in his loyalty and devotion to the chief. That is the effect which I am sure it has had in the House, and I believe it will have outside.

The hon. gentleman, and the leader of the opposition also, devoted a considerable portion of time to the discussion, sometimes grave and sometimes humorous, of the circumstances under which two new ministers have been brought into the cabinet of my right hon. friend. Now one would have thought that this was not a most fruitful subject for discussion at this time. Some years ago an advertisement appeared in a London paper to this effect, that a man who had been very successful in business and was about to retire, offered for a small consideration to communicate to others the secret of his successful career. A small fee was asked, and a great many people applied; and to every one a slip of paper was sent with these words: 'My success is due to the fact that I have always tried to mind my own business and let other people do the same.' Now one might think that the selection of ministers for the cabinet was particularly the business of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and that there was no particular reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should ask more than the usual formal ministerial explanations. But it appears they thought they should go more deeply into the matter, and should inquire into the motive that prompted the selection of this, that and the other man, and that they should pour out their sympathy upon various members of this House who had not been honoured with seats in the cabinet. Well, if my hon. friends opposite had not been restrained from that discussion by the motto of that successful business man, one might think they would be restrained by regard to the somewhat old proverb about certain people who live in glass houses not being the proper persons to throw stones.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have not had to do anything in the way of cabinet making for some considerable time, and there is small prospect that they will be called upon to engage in that honest enterprise and industry. Still they have had something to do in the way of promotion. It is not so long ago that they had occasion to select a gentleman who, to some extent, corresponds with the man who holds the rank and dignity of a minister of the Crown; and if it be right for them to inquire carefully into the circumstances under which a minister is brought into this House, and to sympathize with those who did not obtain places, we, not to be lacking in generous sympathy may devote a moment or two to inquiring how it was that the leader of the opposition came by the place which he now fills. Many hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that there are many men over here who had laboured faithfully in the ranks for ten or twelve years and yet they were ignored. Well, are there not many men over there who have laboured even longer than that and yet have been ignored by the Conservatives. Why, the hon. member for North Toronto asked, did not years of faithful labour count in this case? Did they count in the case of my hon. friend himself? He has laboured long, and I hope I may say, faithfully, in the vineyard; but when the time came, strange to say, though he had been in this House and laboured in and out in the cause of his party for many years, he was ignored, and the gentleman who sits beside him became a leader. I follow the methods of the discussion yesterday—Was it an insult to the hon. gentleman from North Toronto? Did he not measure up to the standard—again I am quoting the leader of the opposition—did he not measure up to the proper standard? Was he lacking in ability? Was he lacking in experience? Why was it that they passed over my distinguished friend, and selected as leader of the opposition a gentleman who came into this parliament many years later?

Mr. FOSTER. A conundrum?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a conundrum. Then there is my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who sits on the left of the member for North Toronto, and who had laboured in the vineyard much more than ten or twelve years. My hon. friend was in this House nearly a quarter of a century before the leader of the opposition came in. He had been a cabinet minister, he had been a close associate of Sir John A. Macdonald's. Why, Sir, I remember more than once, in my early days of public life, before I came into this House, when I tried to see Sir John A. Macdonald on public business, and

it seemed to me that my hon. friend from Lanark was always going into see him, and I could not. He was a close friend of the great leader. He is an experienced public man. Did he not measure up to the standard ? Was he insulted by the fact that another gentleman was taken as leader of the opposition ? There is my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) sitting immediately behind the leader of the opposition, not many years the senior of the hon. gentleman in political record, but the senior in this respect, that he was chosen leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, and it might reasonably be supposed that when a leader was required for the party generally, the gentleman holding that position in the great province of Quebec would have been considered as fairly in the line of promotion. I do not know why my hon. friend was passed by. Would it be because he was leader of the province of Quebec, and was not acceptable in that respect ? I should be slow to think it. There is my genial and quiet and studious friend, the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) with a thousand qualifications the chief of which is his excellent good humour, on which I congratulate him. This hon. gentleman had also been labouring in the vineyard for a long time. He had been seventeen years in this House before the hon member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) came here at all. Did he fail to measure up to the proper standard ? Did he lack ability ? Did he lack integrity ? Did he lack qualification ? Why is it—observe, Sir, that I am merely following the example of yesterday—why is it that he was ignored ? One would suppose that his excellent qualities would have commended themselves to the members of the Conservative party when they assembled to select a leader. Was it again because, notwithstanding all these good qualities he came from the province of Quebec ? Well, we on this side, thank Heaven, do not care what province a man comes from, or to what race or creed he belongs. The Liberal party is big enough to take a man for the man's sake, regardless of his province, his race or his creed. Then there are others. There is one whom I have not the pleasure of seeing here to-day, but who was formerly very active in public affairs, I allude to the former member for the county of Pictou. Did he fail to measure up to the standard of ability, of integrity, of the other qualifications ? Certainly the hon. member for Pictou, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, was one of the great fighters of the Conservative party. Why is it then—again I am asking the question as they asked it yesterday—why is it that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was passed over in order that the hon. member for Carleton might become the leader of the Conservative party ?

Mr. FOSTER. He is coming.

Mr. FIELDING. He is coming? Well, I do not know whether he is coming or not. Whether he is coming as a leader or follower, the first point is that he shall come at all. I am not in the least depreciating the abilities of that gentleman, but I venture to say that if he is going to come back as the member for Pictou he has got to be a busier man in the matter of politics than he has been in the past few years. Then, there is my hon. friend the whip, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I find that that hon. gentleman had been twelve years in this house before the hon. member for Carleton, Ontario, was called to come here at all. Nobody will question his fidelity; nobody will question his energy.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right; he leads the leader.

Mr. FIELDING. Just so. Nobody will question his industry, his energy, his fidelity to his party, and how is it that his twelve years of faithful labour in the vineyard were ignored and that this young and comparatively unknown man was taken to be the leader of the rising hosts of the Ontario Tories ? There are others. My hon. friend here mentions the name of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). That hon. gentleman is not in his seat to-day. I am sorry he is not here. My hon. friend from Grey was nearly twenty years in this house before the hon. member for Carleton, Ontario appeared here at all. Why was he ignored ? Who will question his intelligence, who will question his knowledge of public affairs, who does not know that he is the head of a great organization which has done much for the Tory party of Ontario ? That hon. gentleman had a thousand claims to the position, but it appears that he did not measure up to the standard that was required. Was he insulted? Was it a gross offence to him that this comparatively new man was taken to be the leader of the party? But, there are others. There is my hon. friend the member for South York (Mr. Maclean). If there are those who think that that hon. gentleman has not the special capacity for the leadership he certainly is not among the number. That hon. gentleman surely has been a zealous member for his party. He has, in addition to the service he has rendered to the party in this House and on the platform, been a most zealous supporter of his party in the press. How is it that he was not recognized, how is it that he could not measure up to the standard which was necessary in this case? I see that we have with us, and I am glad he is here, the veteran member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) who has put in an appearance for the first time to-day. He has a record in this house of having been a faithful and energetic, and honourable man who is worthy of all respect, and I am glad

to see him here with us, but I wonder whether it was an insult to him that he should be passed over because he failed to come up to the standard. I see in the corner there my respected old friend from Sunbury and Queens, (Mr. Wilmot). He has been a veteran in the fight, he was here for many years before the hon. member for Carleton, Ontario, and yet he has been ignored. In order that I may be just to the different sections of the Dominion I should mention the name of my hon. friend, the senior member for Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. Martin) who is an old veteran. Who will question the zeal of my hon. friend at all times whether the tunnel is up or not, and yet he seems to have been ignored and overlooked. It seems to me that for some extraordinary reason all these men—eminent men, able men, faithful men in the party—have failed to measure up to the standard required and they have had to be ignored.

Now, if some hon. gentleman will say that all this is not fair and generous criticism I will have to agree with him. But I say that it is just as fair, as sensible and as proper as the observations that were made by the hon. member for Carleton, Ontario and the hon. member for North Toronto as to the manner in which the Prime Minister exercised his right of selecting his own colleagues. The others, said the hon. member for North Toronto, were left to do the muck raking. To use the same illustration, these gentlemen, whom I have named are left to do the muck raking. This is the manner in which my hon. friends have referred to the hon. members who sit behind them.

Then, we had a discussion on the question of surpluses and in the course of that discussion it appears that the hon. leader of the opposition was induced to delve into some ancient history. He has been studying up the files of the Halifax newspapers of a quarter of a century ago and some of a later date. It is in some respects an interesting subject to study, but I wish to warn my hon. friend that there is dynamite in these files. I desire to warn him that there is danger and that if in his desire to establish some little inconsistency on the part of the Minister of Finance he should come across a report of a Liberal meeting at which he himself took part he may discover that the inconsistencies are not to be found all on one side of the house. Inconsistency is described by Ralph Waldo Emmerson as the bugaboo of little minds. If my hon. friend wishes to come within the classification of the philosopher I need not quarrel with him about it but I do not think we are much concerned with each other's consistency. We are not so much concerned with that which he or I did or said twenty or thirty years ago as we are concerned with what we say and do and are willing to do in our positions as public men in these early days of the new century.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend misunderstood me. I was citing it for the good sense it contained.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes—well, I was referring to a time when the hon. gentleman had good sense. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends of the opposition have a strong dislike to any mention of surpluses. A surplus, when mentioned by a Liberal, seems to start them up at once to arms. Well, we must make allowance for the hon. gentlemen. They did not have very much to boast of in the way of surpluses in their own day, and it seems that they look with displeasure upon the record of their successors who, by whatever cause it may have been brought about, have been in the happy position of being able to present an excellent financial record to the country. I have here very briefly, because I do not wish to detain the house at any great length, a few summarized statements on the surplus question and I take two periods of eleven years. This government have been eleven years in power and I take eleven years of the period of our predecessors which is a fair comparison. I find that during the eleven years of Conservative government, prior to their retirement, they had total surpluses amounting to $9,594,000. But, then, they had deficits of over $12,339,000, so that they had an average deficit during the whole eleven years of $249,000. Now, I turn to the record of the last eleven years and I find that we have had, during these eleven years, making allowance for the one deficit which occurred at the beginning of our term, surpluses amounting to nearly $94,000,000. The total surplus is over $94,000,000 and after deducting $519,000 of deficit, we have a net surplus for that period of $93,626,000, an average of over $8,500,000 per annum.

The mere mention of these seems always to be unpleasant to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Reference has been made to the use to which surpluses might be put. We are very glad to invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to that also. The surplus in a country like Canada is understood to be the amount by which the revenue exceeds the charges on consolidated fund, which is the ordinary every day expenditure. But there are special expenditures; there are large expenditures on what is called capital account. Now we have taken these surpluses which have been very large and we have applied them to payments for what would otherwise have been an addition to the public debt. I find that for eleven years from 1886 to 1896, there were special expenditures outside of ordinary routine, amounting to a little over $80,000,000 above the ordinary charges. The

Conservative government had to provide for these moneys, and how did they provide for them ? They provided for them by charging $62,000,000 of the $80,000,000 to the public debt account of the country and left that $62,000,000 to bear interest for future years. We have had in our eleven years of office larger charges of that character ; we have had to provide for capital and special expenditures amounting to $127,000,000 and of that $127,000,000 over and above the ordinary expenses of the country, we have provided out of our daily receipts every dollar, except $5,000,000. When the Conservative government with $80,000,000 of capital expenditure had to charge $62,000,000 to the public debt, and when you find that the present government with $127,000,000 capital expenditure have only added $5,000,000 to the public debt, I think that is a record to which our side may occasionally refer with pride, and we must make some allowance for hon. gentlemen opposite if the comparison is distasteful to them.

We are told that the taxation of the country has been enormously increased. The leader of the opposition and the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) described the amount of money collected in 1896 and the amount that is collectetd now, and they drew the inference that there was a tremendous burden resting upon the people. They did not tell the people, however, that whereas the percentage of duty and the total values of goods imported for the year—I have here the figures for 1882 in connection with some reference the hon. gentleman made yesterday to that year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you refer to ?

Mr. FIELDING. I was about to refer to the percentages of customs duties collected. Let it be sufficient to say that comparing the rate of customs taxation in 1896 and the rate of customs taxation last year there has been a substantial reduction in the rate of taxation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that referring to anything I said ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it was the hon. member for North Toronto who spoke about the increased taxation, but I think the leader of the opposition also spoke about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I said was that on a particular quantity of any article such as a yard of cotton which I took for illustration, owing to the increase of price the actual taxation paid to-day would be greater than it was years ago.

Mr. FIELDING. But if we took the total valuation of goods and the totals paid——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister understands.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I understand the point. If we take the total imports of goods, either including or excluding coin and bullion, you will find that there is a material reduction in the rate of taxation now as compared with 1896. The hon. gentleman conveyed the wrong impression that there had been an increase of taxation. True, there was some increase of taxation on a few articles of luxury, but upon the great mass of the common things used in the country there was a substantial reduction of the duties ; and indeed, that very reduction is one of the crimes laid at our door, because hon. gentlemen opposite used to take the ground that the tariff should be higher. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) took the total amount of taxation and he said that so much was collected in 1896 and so much more was collected last year, and therefore there is a great burden on the country. Well, let us get it down to the case of the individual man. John Jones is a labourer ; in 1896 he probably got $1 a day and the national policy did not make him rich; he was not likely to spend a great deal of money on extravagancies out of that wage, and he paid a very small amount of taxation at that time ; he could not afford to buy the goods and if he could not afford to buy the goods he did not have to pay the taxation. If he was forced to wear one coat when he ought to have two, he only paid the taxes on one coat ; if he had to use one barrel of flour where two were necessary for his family, and if flour were an imported article, he would only pay the tax on one barrel of flour in 1896. But times have changed. Now, John Jones probably gets $1.75 a day or $1.50 at least as a labourer; he can afford to wear two coats now; his family can have two barrels of flour, and so the customs returns show that the amount collected is larger. But ask John Jones which of these two years was the better for him and his family ; ask him if he wants to go back to 1896 when he paid less taxation because he could only afford the one coat and the one barrel of flour ; ask him whether he would not prefer the better days of 1906 when he paid more taxation into the customs and paid it voluntarily and cheerfully because it was an indication of his greater progress, of his steadier employment, of his higher wages, and of his advanced happiness in every way. Ask him and I think John Jones will answer that he prefers the existing conditions. If the government has been taxing the people enormously, if the fiscal policy of this country is imposing burdens on the people as the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Foster) would make out, one would naturally ask : Why does not the Conservative party try to change it. There was a time when they did seem to have a tariff policy of their own ; it was vague and indefinite but at all events there seemed to be a tariff issue between them and the government. Some years ago these gentlemen opposite were

strong in empty and meaningless resolutions in favour of adequate protection. But, by and by, the agitation on the tarif question was crystallized, and this government after careful effort brought down a revised tariff. That was the moment to hear about adequate protection. Prior to that it was a mere abstract question, but now it has become concrete ; the government laid their tariff policy on the table of the House and hon. gentlemen were invited to criticise it. What happened ? These gentlemen opposite abandoned adequate protection and accepted the tariff policy of this government. Never was there a more complete surrender to the government in regard to the fiscal policy than that which took place when the last revised tariff was brought down. Hon. gentlemen opposite had no desire to continue the discussion ; they were ready to close the debate and go on with other business, and if there was a tariff debate at all it was because some hon. gentlemen on this side thought they would like to avail themselves of the opportunity to speak on the question. But it is not only in parliament that hon. gentlemen opposite have abandoned the tariff question ; it is not only here that they have flung adequate protection to the winds. The leader of the opposition, in the discharge of his duty—it was very proper that he should do so—recently made a tour of western Canada. When a party leader goes through the country to discuss public questions one would naturally expect that as there are greater questions and minor questions, he would give the more important questions priority. But, turn to the Toronto 'News,' to the letters of Mr. C. F. H., who cannot be regarded as a gentleman hostile to the leader of the opposition, who in fact is known to be in close sympathy with my hon. friend, and who always manages to say a good word for the leader of the opposition and his policy. In his summing up in the Toronto 'News' of the whole tour of the hon. gentleman in the west, 'C. F. H.'—though I have not the paper at hand, I think I can give the exact words—said : 'Two very delicate questions were for the most part skated over'—what were they ? 'the tariff and the Northwest school question.' Why, Sir, if any man in this House, any man on this side of the House at any rate, were asked to state what were the two biggest questions that have engaged the attention of this parliament since the general election, he would say that they were the tariff and the Northwest school question ; and yet the hon. gentleman, in the whole of that tour out west, of which his friends have said so much, confined his talk to all sorts of little questions. He talked of the Robbins Irrigation business a hundred or a thousand miles away from the scene of operations, but he did not talk of it at Medicine Hat where the facts were known.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that it was not discussed at that meeting?

Mr. FIELDING. No, but I said that the hon. gentleman did not discuss it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman knows that at some meetings I did not discuss the scandals at all, because that was done and done most effectivey by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron).

Mr. FIELDING. And to which member of my hon. friend's distinguished party did he commit the duty of talking of the tariff and the Northwest school question?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I spoke of the tariff on several occasions.

Mr. FIELDING. For or against it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For or against what? Why, I pointed out that this government had paid the Conservative administration of the past the most tremendous compliment that ever was paid to any party by denouncing for eighteen years the national policy and then coming into power and adopting it.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend forgets that when the tariff policy of this government was brought down and laid on the table of this House the leader of the opposition of that day, the old genuine Tory leader Sir Charles Tupper, did not call it the National Policy, but said he could hear the wail coming up from the people in the manufacturing industries of the country to condemn this policy. He predicted ruin and destruction as the result of this policy, which was not the old national policy, but the wicked device of the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. But, as the years rolled on and that policy was vindicated throughout the country as it has been, a different story was told.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask my hon. friend a question ? Did he or did he not, during the last session of parliament, when the tariff was under discussion repeatedly defend various items in it on the principle of protection?

Mr. FIELDING. The principle of protection has been in the tariff ever since I knew what a tariff was.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it there now?

Mr. FIELDING. It is there now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was or was not the principle denounced by the hon. gentleman's leader, and did his leader not promise absolutely to destroy protection?

Mr. FIELDING. He never did in my hearing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman never seen that statement in any reports of his leader's speeches?

Mr. FIELDING. The policy of the Liberal party in tariff matters was proclaimed at the Liberal convention. That policy was to endeavour to reduce the tariff, but with due regard to existing industries, and that policy has been carried out. While the duties on some few articles of luxuries have been increased, those on the great common necessaries which the people consume have been subject to serious reductions. I will not weary the House with the details now; I brought down a list showing that in hundreds of items the tariff was reduced. It was reduced so much that the leader of the opposition of that day declared that it would ruin the industries of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you went to work to remodel it?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the tariff of to-day is not materially different from the tariff of 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. Which tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is perhaps thinking of the time when he brought in a second tariff in the same month and when he had not the courage to declare that it was the result of greater study and better knowledge on his part, but said that the changes were all corrections of clerical errors.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many items did you change?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know. If I got greater light and better information I would change every item in the tariff, and I would not blame it on the clerks either; I would take the responsibility myself. If the hon. gentleman goes back to the time when this tariff was introduced into the House and recalls the tale then told by his leader of that day, he will be ashamed any more to say that this government has continued the old National Policy.

Then my hon. friend had something to say about the French treaty, and I do not think he can be very greatly congratulated upon what he did say. He admitted, after he had made some progress in the discussion, that he did not know anything about it. Well, to an ordinary man it would seem that under such conditions it would have been the part of wisdom not to have said anything about it. But then my hon. friend is not an ordinary man; his mind is not an ordinary one. One who could compound the Halifax platitudes can hardly be described as an ordinary man.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us that story you told down in Halifax.

Mr. FIELDING. So my hon. friend had to be permitted to blunder along and see what capital he could make out of the French treaty before he had any knowledge of its contents, and looking over at my respected friend the Minister of Agriculture he said: The Minister of Agriculture is a great temperance man; look at what he has done; he has reduced the duties on rum, the duties on gin, the duties on alcohol. When I ventured to say that that was a mistake, that there was no such reduction, even then my hon. friend was not content; at all events, he said, you have reduced the duties on champagne. He was not more successful there, for I was obliged to point out to him that the duties on champagne, as they appear in the French treaty, are the reduced duties as they were established by the old French treaty which was negotiated by Sir Charles Tupper, and which was brought down to this House, somewhat hesitatingly, I must say, by my excellent prohibitionist friend, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who recommended it to the House. Now, the member for North Toronto was more cautious—I will do him the justice to say that. He discussed the general circumstances under which the old treaty was negotiated and the circumstances under which the present treaty has been negotiated, but he refrained, and properly refrained, from saying anything as to the merits of the treaty or its contents. I do not know whether this is a case where one can apply the old quotation as to a certain class of people rushing in where angels fear to tread. Perhaps it would not be proper for me to do so—first, because courtesy would not permit me to call the leader of the opposition a fool, and truth would not permit me to call the hon. member for North Toronto any angel.

Very much has been said from time to time regarding the Liberal platform. My hon. friends have made merry over it, but let me tell them this—and they cannot deny it—that we have a platform which has been carried out to a very much greater extent than political platforms are usually carried out. We have no difficulty in showing how the Liberal platform adopted in 1893 has been largely carried out. But apart from that, let me call attention to the fact that we have had to defend our action as to that platform throughout the country as well as in parliament. We have defended it in two general elections and are quite ready to defend it in a third. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated again and again that this government has paid no attention to the Liberal platform. Well, we have had to render an account to the people on that point. We did render an account when we went before them in 1900. We then appealed to the people, and the popular verdict was that we had carried out our platform and policy to their entire satisfaction. We went again to the people in 1904; and despite the jeers of hon. gentlemen opposite, again the people said they were satisfied with the manner in which this government had carried out its pledges. And not only were Liberals satisfied, but old time Conservatives came and joined our ranks. There is one thing which

Liberals can say, and that is that they were not afraid of having a platform and did make a platform which met the approval of the mass of the people. We did not hesitate to call together the representatives of Liberal principles in order that we might prepare a platform which would suit the requirements of the country. But how is it with my hon. friends opposite? For some years we have had discussions among them as to how they might get a platform. Again and again we have had it announced that at some future time, the next summer or the next recess, some time in the early future, a great Conservative convention was to be held for the purpose of framing a platform. That convention, however, has never yet been held. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was reminded about his failure to call such a convention. Let me read to him an extract from one of the papers; and in order that I may not be charged with partisanship, I shall read from a Conservative paper. Here it is, in striking headlines:—

A Conservative convention is demanded by western men.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, 'demanded.' And demanded for what purpose? To draw up an advanced platform.

Winnipeg, September 18.

Yesterday Mr. R. L. Borden, leader of the Commons opposition, spent in Winnipeg, and was in conference most of the time with the leaders of the party in Winnipeg and Manitoba. A petition was presented to him demanding that he call a big Conservative convention to draw up a progressive and advanced platform.

They already had the Halifax platform, which had been published and scattered to the wide world. But that was not good enough. It was not liberal enough, broad enough and advanced enough. So these Conservatives met the hon. gentleman, and they met him—if not with a shot gun, with something very much like it. They wanted him, not to dictate the platform, but to get the party to make one. It was pointed out to my hon. friend that only by holding a big convention could proper enthusiasm be aroused and a platform, agreeable to both east and west, be formulated. But there was no platform, and I suppose that is the reason why there was not much enthusiasm.

The petition stated in plain terms that if the request were not granted the support of the party in Winnipeg and Manitoba and likely in Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia would be withdrawn.

Mr. LALOR. Is that the 'Eye Opener'?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is the Ottawa 'Evening Journal,' edited by a gentleman who, jointly with the correspondent of the Toronto 'News,' may be described as the two closest political friends and apologists in journalism of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). At all events we have this condition of affairs. Th Liberals had sufficient faith in their leader and their principles and their ability to agree on questions of principle, to assemble together from ocean to ocean, in the city of Ottawa, under the shadow of parliament, and lay down the policy which they thought the country could adopt. And whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say regarding that policy, this will stand to the credit of the Liberal party, that, according to the true principles of Liberalism they did not allow two or three men to get together in a dark chamber and devise something, and say that is to be the policy of our party. No, they gathered together the representatives of the mass of the people, the representatives of the democracy of Canada, and they made a platform which has been their guide from that day to this.

My hon. friend made some references to the Post Office Department, which calls for a passing notice. He said that he had just been out west, and had discovered that the postal service there, and he believed generally, was in a very inefficient condition. Well, if the service which is rendered to-day be inefficient, in Heaven's name what must have been the condition in 1896? There is no department of the government which has done more to improve the facilities and convenience of the Canadian people. I do not say that it has done all it should. In the speech from the Throne, we have the declaration that the surpluses which have been accumulating in that department, should and will be applied in securing more liberal accommodation for the people. But let us not omit to take notice of the tremendous progress which has been made. In 1893 or 1894, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will remember in one of his budget speeches he said that some portion of the Canadian people were clamouring for a two-cent instead of a three-cent rate, but that the country could not afford it. And so long as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) remained in power the country did not afford it. What was the condition of the Post Office Department at the close of the last year of Conservative administration? There was a deficit of about $650,000 on that year's operations, and there were accumulations of deficits of former years to an amount somewhat in excess of $650,000; and a vote had to be taken to clean up the old account and pay off the old deficits. But in 1896 these hon. gentlemen, who are supposed to possess in such an extraordinary degree the instinct of government, had to give place to other men—we are too modest to say better men. What then happened? I have already told you that there was an accumulated deficit in 1896 besides a deficit for the year. But what has been the result since? In 1907, instead of a de-

ficit of $600,000 in the year and a three-cent rate, we have a two-cent rate in all Canada, we have reduced postage to the old country, we have reductions all around, and yet, at the close of the last year, the Post Office Department shows a surplus on the year of $1,440,000. That in itself is something to be proud of.

But that is not the whole record. Turn now to the question of accommodation. The hon. gentleman tells us that the accommodation provided for the people by the Post Office Department is entirely insufficient. Well, if it is insufficient, we will take good care that a more liberal policy is adopted in the future. But what are the facts? In 1896 there were 9,103 post offices in Canada; in 1907 there were 11,377 post offices in Canada. In 1896, the number of postal notes and money order offices was 1,310, and in 1907 the number was 9,091. In 1896 the post office savings banks numbered 755, and last year the number was 1,043. I will not detain the House with further figures though I could give similar comparisons with regard to the miles of travel, the number of letters carried, the number of articles carried and so on. But I think the figures I have given are enough for the purpose. If the hon. gentleman finds that the post office accommodation for the people in insufficient to-day, what must have been the condition of the country in 1896 in the light of the figures I have given ?

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has had something to say on the question of the provincial subsidies. In his speech at the Russell theatre the other night he said that I had had the audacity to speak of his action in British Columbia touching the subsidy to that province as an attempt to bribe the province. I said that, and I regret that I am obliged to adhere to the opinion I then expressed. There is no doubt in the world that the attitude of the hon. gentleman on that question was a most unfortunate, a most unhappy one, calculated to breed trouble amongst the several provinces of Canada. Let us glance at the history of these provincial subsidies. Twenty years ago an agitation began amongst the provinces for an increase of their allowances. The men engaged in Dominion affairs can easily imagine that it is not necessary to have a greater provincial revenue; but the men who had been engaged in the provincial legislatures —and there are many of them here—know how restricted those legislatures have been in their operations because of the lack of finances. I do not wish to discuss the merits of our system of provincial subsidies It is enough to say that all the provinces of the Dominion complained that the share which they received from the public treasury was insufficient to enable them to carry on their business and that they appealed to the Dominion government for a readjustment. When the Conservative government was in power. they declined to listen to that appeal. Years rolled on, and, even after the Liberal party came into power, there were difficulties in the way of meeting the wishes expressed by the provinces. But, after a time, this government said to the provincial premiers: If you are able to agree among yourselves as to the distribution of this money, perhaps we can meet your views. Now that was a very reasonable proposition. This subsidy question has been one of the most delicate with which public men have had to deal since the establishment of confederation. I remember very well that when what are called 'better terms' were granted in 1869, to Nova Scotia, there was a very strong feeling of hostility in Ontario. Ontario was too big a province to feel the small amount which was given to Nova Scotia, but it was strongly disposed to claim that the granting of the sum was a breach of faith,—that these subsidies were in the nature of a treaty and should not be disturbed except by common consent of the provinces. And, as years went on, and some grant was given—for good reasons or without good reasons—to one or other of the provinces, there was a feeling of jealousy, or rivalry; and no province has manifested that so strongly as the province of Ontario. Not that Ontario would care—as I have said—about the small sum involved. for Ontario is a great rich province, too big to think of that; but the men in Ontario took it as a matter of principle, that these subsidies were a treaty between the various provinces and should not be disturbed except by common consent. So, when we came to deal with this matter with the provincial government, we said: We do not want to make difficulties, to cause dissatisfaction and jealousy and rivalry. But if your provincial governments will come together and reach something like a unanimous agreement as to the distribution of this money, we will take the matter up and see what we can do for you. And to that end a provincial convention was held in this city about a year ago. As a result of that conference, a scale of payments was adopted for the several provinces. Now, I turn to the attitude of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in British Columbia. He goes to British Columbia and tries to disturb the arrangement made at that conference amongst the provincial premiers of the Dominion. I complain of the hon. gentleman in this, not only that what he did was a disturbance in itself, but that he conveyed the impression to the people of British Columbia that this was a quarrel between the British Columbia government and the Liberal party. He tried to lead the people of British Columbia to believe that they were being oppressed by the government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and that when the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. R. L. Borden) and his friends came

into power, they would grant relief from this thing that the Liberals were doing. That is the chief offence that I lay at his door. He knows he was not fair, he was not candid in so speaking. Who composed this convention? Who agreed to this scheme of distribution? Foremost among them was the Prime Minister of the Conservative province of Ontario. All the governments of the Dominion are not in harmony with the Dominion government of to-day; and I suppose that it is not at all likely that all the provincial governments will be in harmony with the Dominion government at any time. We had at this conference in Ottawa, Mr. Whitney, the Premier of Ontario; Mr. Foy, Attorney General; Mr. Matheson, Treasurer. We had Mr. Roblin, premier and Mr. Colin Campbell, Attorney General, representing the great Conservative province of Manitoba. We had also, representing the other provinces, their premiers and ministers whose names are well known. Mr. McBride was here to represent British Columbia, and he is the head of a Conservative government. He came forward with an apparent determination that nothing you could do for him would satisfy him. It is evident that he had not come to get an arrangement for British Columbia; he had come there to find a grievance. He did not want to agree to anything that the conference would agree upon. He said: I want a Royal Commission to look into the case of British Columbia. Now, there was no reason why we should grant a Royal Commission to one province and not to another. This was a matter, as I have said, which had been agitated for twenty years. The provinces needed the money. The time was ripe, not for commissions and further inquiry, but for action. If it was right that Mr. McBride should be given a commission for British Columbia, why should not Mr. Whitney say: I am not satisfied with this arrangement, and I want a Royal Commission to investigate for Ontario? And so with the Premier of Quebec, the Premier of Nova Scotia and the rest. To grant a commission meant a disturbance of the arrangement. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said yesterday that no commission was better qualified to deal with that question than were the men at that conference. They were men who had a general knowledge of the affairs of the Dominion. They were not prompted by an ungenerous spirit towards British Columbia. I can speak of that with the most perfect certainty. I have said elsewhere, and I repeat now, that I went to some of the members of the conference before it assembled, and asked them to consider British Columbia's claims as favourably as possible, to strain a point in her favour, and treat her generously. And I am glad to say that they were disposed to do that, and that a proposition was made to treat British Columbia generously.

Mr. FIELDING.

I do not want to pander to any particular section of the Dominion. British Columbia is a big, rich province. Her people are not a party of children, and I do not believe they need a Baby Act for their protection. They came into confederation of their own free will, and if they were asked to live up to their bargain they would have no right to complain. But when the whole condition was known, and the other provinces were disposed to treat them generously and liberally, the premier of British Columbia should have responded and accepted the consideration with which he was treated. He wanted a commission, and the matter was considered. The conference considered it, Mr. Whitney considered it. Again I say, the leader of the opposition has done his best to make the people of British Columbia believe that this was a quarrel between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the province of British Columbia. It was not. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister took no part in that transaction that was not heartily supported by the Hon. J. P. Whitney and all the other Conservatives present at that conference. And that conference, not a Liberal conference, but made up in the manner I have described, having heard Mr. McBride's argument, having heard what he could say, passed this resolution:

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

Why should the claim of one province be referred to arbitration? Why should we give arbitration to British Columbia when the province of New Brunswick might think it could present even stronger claims.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. New Brunswick did have an arbitration, so did Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING. Not as respects subsidies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In respect of claims.

Mr. FIELDING. I am talking of subsidies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am talking of the entire subject.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has no right to interpose other questions in connection with subsidies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask what is the difference in principle?

Mr. FIELDING. This is the difference in principle. If the province of Nova Scotia had a claim, it was a claim for property, and was a proper subject for arbitration. A claim for property of any province in the Dominion may be claim for arbitration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was not a claim for property it was a claim for money.

Mr. FIELDING. It was a claim for property which the Dominion of Canada had taken over and insufficiently paid for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it not a money claim ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was a money claim for property. But the claim of Mr. McBride was a money claim, not for property. Does my hon. friend see the difference ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I do not.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I am sorry for it. I think if the Dominion of Canada had a property transaction with any individual, that individual might claim the right to go to a court or an arbitration and see whether he could get justice, and if the arbitration or court awarded him $100,000, no province in the Dominion, as a province, would feel it had thereby any grievance. But if there was a treaty as to subsidies between the provinces, and then some scheme was divised whereby one province would get something and the other province would get nothing, that is quite a different transaction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it depended on a treaty, how could you alter that treaty without the consent of British Columbia ?

Mr. FIELDING. I say you could not insist upon a large number of provinces coming to an absolute agreement, you could not expect it. We took nothing away from British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman does not understand my question. If the hon. gentleman puts the case as that of a treaty, how can you alter that treaty without the consent of British Columbia?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is proposing to do it absolutely without the consent of the other provinces. I say the attitude of the Dominion government in the matter was absolutely fair. We said to these provinces : Now, there may not be absolute harmony among you, although we wish there could be. But whatever you agree upon, try to be unanimous. If you can agree as to what is fair and reasonable we will take the responsibility of asking for the legislation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the province of British Columbia, through its Prime Minister, agree that the question as to its right to arbitration should be determined by the Prime Ministers of the other provinces?

Mr. FIELDING. There was no question as to the right of British Columbia to arbitration. How can the hon. gentleman say there was any question of right ? He may give any body a privilege if he likes, but there was never any question of the right of British Columbia to arbitration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood the minister to say that the question was left to the members of the conference composed of the prime ministers and their colleagues from all the provinces; that question was left to them to determine, and they decided adversely to the province of British Columbia. Now what I do not know, and what I am desirous of ascertaining is, whether the province of British Columbia, through its Prime Minister, consented that that question should be left to the adjudication of these gentlemen, and to be bound by their determination ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it did not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought not.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not said anything to the contrary. The position the government took was this : This is a delicate question as between the provinces. We remembered past differences, as to which I have already called the attention of the House. Now, we said, we are not going to get into a quarrel with you on this matter ; but if you can come to something like an understanding—we would like it to be unanimous—then we will take the responsibility of asking parliament to vote this large amount of money. We found in the end that the hon. gentleman who represented British Columbia apparently was not satisfied with anything except the appointment of a commission. Now I understand that there is no more right why that gentleman should ask for a commission than that the premier of Ontario should ask for a commission. They had equal rights. They both came into the union voluntarily ; and therefore I say that the hon. gentleman's idea that British Columbia had a right to get a commission is absolutely without foundation. This question had been dragging along for twenty years. The provinces represented to us that they needed the money, and there was almost an unanimous agreement. When Mr. McBride demanded a commission for British Columbia, if we had granted him that commission we would have been obliged in fairness to grant it to any other province in the Dominion who asked for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did any other province ask for it ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the other provinces said: We do not want commissions, we do not want delay, we have been delaying for twenty years, we want action, we want the money. That is what the other provinces said, not what we said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have they got it yet ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and they are delighted. The gladest province of all is the province of Ontario, I am quite sure. I had a very polite acknowledgment from my friend, the premier of Ontario, who said he was very glad to receive the money ; no doubt they all were. It was no

longer a time for delays for inquiries, the time had arrived for action. Mr. McBride's proposition was in effect to fling the whole matter to the winds and leave it where it had been for ten, fifteen or twenty years. And the government said, Mr. Whitney said, Mr. Foy said, Mr. Matheson said, Mr. Roblin said, Mr. Colin Campbell said, and all the others said: We will have no more delay, we will not consent to a commission taking up this matter, we will accept this scheme, we will waive these objections—and Mr. Whitney filed something like a protest to them—we will waive these objections, we want the thing settled. And that settlement which was made, not between my right hon. friend and British Columbia, that settlement which was made as much by Mr. Whitney and the other Conservative gentlemen as it was by me—that is the settlement that the hon. gentleman is trying to set aside. I say that the action of that hon. gentleman was a breach of faith with Ontario, a breach of faith with Quebec, a breach of faith with New Brunswick, a breach of faith with Prince Edward Island, a breach of faith with Manitoba, a breach of faith with Saskatchewan, a breach of faith with Alberta.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you forgetting Nova Scotia ?

Mr. FIELDING. I say the attitude of that gentleman was a breach of faith with all these provinces, and that as a public man he should have been willing to act in the interests of harmony instead of stirring up difficulty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? There was some reference made by me yesterday with regard to the Imperial Act, and I understood I was under some misapprehension, from an observation made by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Finance. Would the Minister of Finance be good enough to explain whether any change was made in that Act in its actual drafting, and what the change was ? I may have been misled by inaccurate newspaper reports.

Mr. FIELDING. If I remember right, the hon. gentleman thought that the expression 'final settlement' had been put in the Act, and then stricken out. That was incorrect. That was never in the Act. It is in the address adopted by this House. Of course, no Act of parliament can be final or unalterable, least of all an Act of the imperial parliament which is the paramount parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is the same as other parliaments in that respect, I should say.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, within its proper functions, but this Act contains as a schedule the address of this House. The Act does not say in the enacting clause that it is 'final and unalterable,' but the schedule which is attached and which is a declaration of what this parliament wished and declared and upon which the Act was founded is exactly as it was sent from this House and it does include the expression 'final and unalterable.' The difference between the Bill as first introduced and the Bill as it was finally passed is that in the original Bill, owing to a circumstance which I am not called upon to enter into at this moment, the schedule was not included, but when the Bill was finally disposed of the schedule was put in in order that there should be attached to the Act the declaration which this parliament made that, at all events, as far as we were concerned, the settlement was 'final and unalterable.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I gathered from what was reported to have been said in the British House of Commons that the Bill as proposed by this government to the imperial government did contain in the body of it the phrase 'final and unalterable.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING. No, as a matter of fact we did not propose any Bill. We sent over the address of the parliament of Canada and it was left to the proper officials of the Colonial office and the parliamentary draughtsman to prepare the legislation. We did not prepare any Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies make some allusion to some change in that regard?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not quite catch the purport of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Winston Churchill, when he introduced the Bill or at the second reading made some allusion to that change.

Mr. FIELDING. No, we never proposed any Bill; we simply sent over the address which contained the words 'final and unalterable.' In the original Bill the schedule was not attached, but the Bill was amended in the end by the House of Lords by attaching the schedule; so that, while the words 'final and unalterable' are not to be found in the enacting clause they are to be found in the schedule which is attached and which says that in so far as the parliament of Canada is concerned it was designed to be final and unalterable.

In consequence of some references which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister made to this question yesterday the hon. member for North Toronto attacked him for what he called a compact with Mercier. The hon. member for North Toronto said that my right hon. friend had made a compact with the late Hon. Mr. Mercier to this

effect that if the province of Quebec would give my right hon. friend a majority he would see that the province of Quebec got an increased subsidy. That is the statement the hon. gentleman made yesterday. Now, he has given us no evidence of any such compact, and I am bound to say that while I do not wish to discredit the hon. gentleman too much I would like to have some evidence of a compact because I have never seen it. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he is labouring under a delusion. As in the case of the hon. gentleman who sits beside him in dealing with the French treaty the hon gentleman (Mr. Foster) had not taken the trouble to get the facts, because if he had he would not have said that my right hon. friend had made a compact with Mercier. Anybody hearing the hon. member for North Toronto yesterday would assume that the question under consideration was that of an allowance to the province of Quebec; that it was a question between my right hon. friend and the province of Quebec. I want to tell my hon. friend that there never was such a question as that referred to by my hon. friend of granting a subsidy to the province of Quebec. The subject referred to was a proposal to grant subsidies to all the provinces of the Dominion. Therefore, that which he has described as a compact with Mercier in Quebec was as much a compact with Ontario and with the other provinces of the Dominion. But my hon. friend unfairly described it as a compact with Mercier for the special benefit of the province of Quebec. I think he spoke without a knowledge of the facts, and if he looks into it he will see that I am correct in saying that there was no compact with Mercier, and that any transaction, any communication, any discussion in that regard between my right hon. friend and the late Hon. Mr. Mercier had reference not to something for Quebec only, but to an equitable distribution among all the provinces in the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then there was a compact ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend says so. I have asked him to produce the evidence. I do not know that there was.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the hon. gentleman said there was.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know what my hon. friend may call a compact. I remember seeing it stated that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said that he approved of the resolutions which were adopted by the Quebec conference. If that makes a compact, then it was a compact with Mercier, with Mowat, with Felding and with all the provincial premiers of that day. If my hon. friend had said that the crime of my right hon. friend was that he was willing to add to the subsidies of all the provinces I would have no complaint to make. But his statement was that this was a compact with Mercier for the special benefit of the province of Quebec.

Now, I have been occupying the time of the House too long, I am afraid.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition had something to say about the Quebec bridge and he said it had always been a marvel to everybody that this government had made this arrangement with a company to build the Quebec bridge. A marvel to everybody ! Nobody could understand it ! It was not a marvel to the hon. gentleman on October 22, 1903, when the record of this parliament shows that on that day the project to which he refers was brought into this House and when the hon. gentleman allowed it to pass without a single word of complaint. It passed unanimously. It became an expression of the whole parliament of Canada and not of this government only. Then the hon. gentleman went down to Quebec and at a public banquet that was given to him there he took credit to himself for co-operating with this government in bringing about the construction of the Quebec bridge. Well, the bridge, of course, has gone down and we can all be wise after the event. My hon. friend has discovered that he marvelled much, but the record shows that he did not marvel when the Act passed. I want to warn my hon. friend against this weakness that he has of allowing things to pass without opposition—very often supporting them—going out and taking credit for them, and then, when something unexpected happens, turning around and condemning the government for the thing he supported. I think my hon. friend should guard against that.

There was one important question that the hon. gentleman discussed towards the close of his speech, and I must say that he did so in rather more temperate terms than usual. It was the question of corruption at elections. I want to say that when that hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman in this House, claims that there should be some improvement in our election laws in order that we may avoid such things as have happened too often, as has been shown in the disclosures of our election trials, I am most heartily with him, and if my hon. friend had taken that ground, if he had recognized the situation frankly—if he had come to this parliament and gone to his supporters and said there has been looseness in this respect, men on both sides have committed faults, there has been a lack of careful reflection, many men have gone into elections in a way they should not have done, both sides have been guilty and we should unite in making the conditions better—that would have been a position which we could all commend. But, has he pur-

sued that course? Has he not gone through the length and breadth of the land and endeavoured to convey the impression that the Liberal party was the party of corruption and the Conservative party the party of purity? That is the inference to be drawn from the attitude of the hon. gentleman. It was not a fair inference, it was not generous, it was not accurate. We need not fear comparison with the Conservative party in the matter of election trials. Unfortunately, too many men have allowed their zeal to outrun their judgment and have committed acts in connection with elections which do them no credit and which we should all regret. Did all these thing occur on the Liberal side? If the records be examined it will be found that of the men who have been unseated in this parliament of Canada from confederation down, the numbers stand about half Liberals and half Conservatives. One party or the other, I forget which, had two or three more than the other party, perhaps it was the Liberals. But, compare that statement with the inferences to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's speeches and from the attitude of the Conservative press. If time permitted I could give the record of all the men who have been unseated in the Tory party, but let me take a few of the more eminent. Sir John Abbott, a Prime Minister, was unseated, Sir Hector Langevin was unseated, Sir Charles Tupper was unseated, Sir John Macdonald was unseated twice, and in the case of the Kingston election the judges reported there was gross corruption throughout the whole election. If time permitted I might give a longer list, but all I desire to call attention to is that this inference that the corruption has been all on the Liberal side and that there has been none on the Conservative side is not fair, and is not calculated to advance the interests of reform. I think my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was unseated——

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I take it back. But I can tell him that the gentleman who sits on his right (Mr. Foster) was unseated in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. TAYLOR. Another prominent man unseated was the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but he got back with three times the majority he had before.

Mr. TAYLOR. He used three times as much money.

Mr. FIELDING. I am going to have a word about that when we make comparisons. There is this to be said: that the Minister of Finance went into the fight; he challenged his opponents to do their best; he went through it to the end and the record of the case is before the country, and the judges recorded it as their opinion that not a single act of corruption direct or indirect applying to the Minister of Finance was proven. But I must not forget my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Who would have thought as you heard him denounce corruption last night, that he ever could have been unseated. It is a good many years ago I admit——

Mr. FOSTER. That was a very pure election.

Mr. FIELDING. Was it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, we wil see about that. The statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) obliges me to say something that I perhaps would not have said otherwise, for I do not like going into these old things. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was elected and the usual proceedings of an election trial took place. One witness testified as to a certain prominent gentleman who for convenience I shall call John Doe, but who my hon. friend knows by another name. Mr. John Doe's name was mentioned in the proceedings; a witness testified that he met John Doe on the train and that he suggested to John Doe that it would be a nice thing to have a little money in a certain parish, and John Doe asked the witness if he would handle it for him, and a day or two afterwards John Doe gave the witness $80 for that little parish and afterwards he gave another $20. But the witness did not tell more than that; the court adjourned and the following morning we had a fine illustration of the case of Davy Crocket and the coon. You know the old story is that Davy was such a good shot that the moment he pointed the gun the coon said: 'Don't shoot I'll come down.' And so the morning after the mention of John Doe's name the solicitors for the hon. member (Mr. Foster) came to the court and said: For Heaven's sake don't go any further, we will throw up the sponge.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend vouch for the literal accuracy of his words?

Mr. FIELDING. In all things except as to the name of John Doe. My hon. friend does not wish me to give the real name of John Doe because he knows him as well as I do. But the Minister of Finance acted differently. When it was shown that some man in over zeal had paid a fellow $4 or $5 for his vote, the Minister of Finance did not say: For God's sake stop the trial. The Minister of Finance said: Go right on, if there is anything wrong about this election let us see what it is, let us know all about. The member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who says he is not afraid of the judgment of the people seemed to be so much afraid of the judgment of that

court that he would not go on with the trial.

Mr. LALOR. I suppose the Minister of Finance answered all questions that were asked him ?

Mr. FIELDING. I did not hear the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) adds so much to the wisdom of the House generally that I would like to know what he is saying.

Mr. LALOR. In his examination did the Minister of Finance answer all questions asked him ?

Mr. FIELDING. I answered every question in relation to my election certainly. I answered every question which the judges said was a proper question.

Mr. LALOR. And you added that your counsel would not permit you to answer others.

Mr. FIELDING. I say I answered every question which the judges ruled was a proper question. Is that right ? But I want to say a word more about John Doe. Now, what became of John Doe ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the question.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the question. Any one who heard the hon. member (Mr. Foster) denounce corruption yesterday ; any one who saw him point at my right hon. friend and declare that he kept corruptionists in the service and put corruptionsts in the service, would expect that John Doe must have been consigned to the penitentiary in the days when my hon. friend (Mr Foster) was in power. But John Doe did not go to the penitentiary. John Doe was appointed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to one of the most lucrative offices in the province of New Brunswick. Now, I do not refer to these things by way of recrimination. I say that every man who knows anything of the public life of our country knows that some men, and good men too, men who in the ordinary relations of life are good men, have allowed their zeal in politics to overthrow their judgment and they have done foolish and improper and corrupt things. And if we will fairly recognize the fact on both sides that such is the situation, and without trying to put the responsibility on others endeavour to bring about a better state of things, a better election law and purer elections, we will deserve and receive the commendation of the people. But, Sir, those who approach that question in a spirit of hypocrisy, those who pretend that it is all purity on the Conservative side and corruption on the Liberal side, they will not receive the commendation of the people of Canada.

A word or two about Colchester. I do not object to my hon. friends opposite having a measure of joy over their capture of the seat. As the game of politics is played they are entitled to that. But they had better not rejoice too much. Is it not something like the Dutch taking Holland ? With one or two exceptions Colchester has been Conservative for thirty years. This is the record : in 1874 Colchester was Conservative, was Conservative by 116. In 1878 Colchester was Conservative by 376, in 1882 Colchester was Conservative by 435, in 1887 Colchester was Conservative by 627, in 1891 Colchester was Conservative by 803, in 1896 Colchester was Conservative by 177, and in 1897 the Liberals squeezed in with a majority of 6, and in 1904 the late member was elected by a majority of 191. There is no county in Nova Scotia that I regarded as more doubtful than Colchester. It has been historically a Conservative county ; it was a miracle that we carried the whole eighteen counties in Nova Scotia in 1904 ; it might be too much to expect it could be done again. I am not surprised or disturbed by the result in Colchester ; I knew it was a very risky county and we were prepared to take the risk. My hon. friend spoke of changes in the public opinion of the country. When I was in Colchester I did not see so much indication of change, except that I found some people who were complaining about economies on the Intercolonial Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I found that the efforts in the direction of economy which were so vigorously employed by my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) and which are being followed by his successor, seemed to get upon the nerves of a good many people there, and that was the only indication of displeasure I found. I had intimations that if certain things could be done, that if we would not insist so much upon economy and efficiency, perhaps a section of the people would feel more kindly towards us. However, we could not agree to that, and they in the exercise of their rights voted against us. I found no manifestation of change in public opinion in Colchester other than that. So I do not think our hon. friends need imagine that they have a great deal to hope for in Nova Scotia. If my hon. friend cares to look into the political situation in Nova Scotia, say for the last three years and a few months, he will find this interesting fact, that the people of Nova Scotia have been called upon to elect either to parliament or the legislature within that period sixty-two members and that they have elected one who calls himself an Independent Liberal, six who were willing to call themselves Conservatives, and fifty-five Liberals. If my hon. friend has no better hope of that political change which he thinks is going to take place in the country than is to be found in Nova Scotia, then he deserves our sincere sympathy and pity.

Nor need he look for it throughout the Dominion at large. We have had since the general election thirty-eight by-elections in Canada, and of these twenty-nine have been carried by gentlemen who call themselves Liberals. There are one or two who may not see eye to eye with us; but of the whole number elected, I think I am correct in saying that there are only six or seven who are willing to call themselves Conservatives. In these figures I see very little indication of the coming change which our hon. friends opposite are so fond of talking about. Why should we regard seriously these boasts of theirs? Have we not heard our hon. friends proclaim in the past that they were going to sweep the country? I believe, Sir, that the people of this country can be trusted to deal fairly between this government and this opposition—a party which at one time was a constructive party, and which with all its faults did much for the building up of Canada, but which seems to have become a party of obstructionists. They obstructed the Grand Trunk Pacific for months, and are now tumbling over each other to say that they never opposed it at all; they obstructed the British preference for many years, and now wish to claim a share in it; they obstructed the tariff policy of this government for many years, and now find it to be so good that they hardly venture to assail it in parliament, and when they go to the west they skate over it as they do over the Northwest school question. The intelligent people of this conutry will weave into the hon. gentleman's Halifax platform the record of the Conservative administrations supported by the hon. gentlemen who sit with him, and will compare that with the record of eleven years of good Liberal government during which Canada has enjoyed as never before the blessings of peace, progress and prosperity.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. R. R. Hall) on his selection on this occasion to move the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I am afraid that I cannot congratulate those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have followed him, on the subjects which they have introduced into the discussion. The well-merited rebuke which was administered to the First Minister last night by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I fully re-echo, and the speech of the hon. Finance Minister. who has just taken his seat, has not been much different from that of his leader. I propose to confine myself largely to the matter in hand. I find quite sufficient in the speech from the Throne to occupy all the time at my disposal, and I trust that before I close I shall have an opportunity of pointing out to the Finance Minister what I conceive to be his duty on this occasion, which he has shamelessly avoided, and I think brought disrespect to the office he holds. The country, Sir, expected a different speech from the Finance Minister on such an occasion as this. He spent the first half hour of his address in suggesting who might be selected from the opposition to lead it. He told about the conversion in Nova Scotia of a man who was half Scotch and half Dutch. I should have judged, Mr. Speaker, that he was half Scotch and half soda, from the action he took on that occasion. I do not propose to pay much attention to the pleasantries with which the hon. gentleman has entertained that side of the House. These gentlemen are easily pleased, and they showed by their applause that they entered fully into the arguments of the Finance Minister when he was dealing what they supposed to be slashing blows at members of the Conservative party. If the hon. gentleman thinks he has reasonably and wisely discussed the speech from the Throne, I think that when he reads his speech to-morrow in cold type, he will be very much dissatisfied with the result. These times are not altogether suitable for levity, Mr. Speaker. When I heard the First Minister yesterday and the Finance Minister to-day speaking as they did, it seemed to me that they were very much in the position of Nero who fiddled while Rome was burning. These gentlemen made light of the situation; they did not see anything serious in it, and they thus made ridiculous what they endeavoured to bring before the country in the speech from the Throne.

Now, the first paragraph in the speech from the Throne sets out the great prosperity which this country enjoys. Mr. Speaker, there may be two sides to that statement. I for one do not see any great prosperity in the country at the present moment. What we expected to hear from the Finance Minister in regard to that was something quite different from what we did hear. We expected explanations from him on certain points which I shall have the privilege of calling his attention to before I take my seat. These explanations the country was looking for, but the country will search his speech in vain to find. I took the opportunity last evening of quietly reminding the Finance Minister that I would bring up one or two of what I consider important matters referred to in the speech from the Throne; but he has altogether avoided allusion to these matters. I do not, however, feel that I would be doing justice to my constituency, my province or my country, if on this occasion I did not mention the most pertinent items in that speech. With regard to the trade of the country, on which the hon. member for West Peterborough and the Minister of Finance have dilated so freely, if you read the figures, you will not, if you are a business man, come to the conclusion that they are very reassuring. On the contrary, you will

find in them subject for grave doubt, misapprehension and distrust as to whither this country is going.

Let us take up for a moment or two the Trade Returns recently published. I have here the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce down to August, 1907. I shall not weary the House with many figures but simply with a few which constitute a portion of my text. Take the figures beginning at 1900. The total imports of Canada were :

In 1900	$172,506,878
1901	177,700,694
1902	196,480,190
1903	224,813,719
1904	243,590,019
1905	251,617,119
1906	283,282,204
1907	330,770,281

And for the twelve months ending August 1907, $361,283,095. Then look at the exports for that same length of time. The exports for 1900 were $186,433,212, showing a balance of trade to our credit of between $7,000,000 and $8,000,000. In the following year they were $196,000,000, still showing a large balance in trade in our favour. In 1902 they were $21,640,286. And so on down through the years I have read until you come to the concluding year I have mentioned when our exports were $269,225,019. What therefore do we find ? We find that under the financial policy of this government we have bought the enormous total of $121,467,844 more than we have sold. When a business man examines his yearly returns, he works out what he has sold and not what he has bought, on which to reckon his profits. It seems to me that the reckless policy which the hon. gentleman is persuing is going to bring disaster, if disaster has not already begun in this country. $121,000,000 more bought than sold. Did any merchant or manufacturer ever contemplate with satisfaction a condition in which he had bought half more than he sold ? Our profits are made on what we sell and not on what we buy. These hon. gentlemen speak glibly of our trade amounting to $644,000,000. But our trade is simply our exports of about $250,000,000 ; and after we have sent out all our beef, cheese, butter and other products, we have to put our hands into our pockets and pay out $120,000,000 in cash to meet the balance. Is that good business ? Does that look like serving the interests of the country ? I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he has submitted his statement recently to any good banker. If not, I should advise him to do so at the earliest possible moment. If he can get a banker of any good standing in the country to tell him that it is a good balance sheet, I should like to know it. I never saw a business statement from a business firm, which would be regarded with satisfaction, if it showed that the imports were $120,000,000 more than the exports. If the hon. gentleman finds any comfort in that and thinks it is going to satisfy the public, I think he is very much mistaken. We have listened in vain for either the First Minister or the Minister of Finance to touch upon the important subject of the financial stringency, mentioned in the speech from the Throne. I thought that the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), when he spoke for an hour and a half, would have found time to say something about it, but he did not. He spoke of all sorts of questions in and out of the House and indulged in considerable levity, but although the speech from the Throne adverts to the stringency which is upon the country to-day, our Minister of Finance has nothing to say about it, has no panacea to offer, no advice to give, but treats it as a matter beneath notice. But there are some people who will not be satisfied with that kind of treatment. Some explanation will be called for from the Finance Minister and from some of those around him on this question. I do not think that things are quite as rosy as he depicts them. True the government has had things pretty much its own way the past few years, thanks to the financial policy started by the late Sir John Macdonald in 1878. Thanks to that policy the industries of this country were solidly planted, and the present government has had the benefit of the development which that policy started and which had been in operation several years when this government took office. This government came in when things were ready for the up grade through the development of the west and of the factories in the east, and for several years they have been ascending the hill of prosperity. They are yet on the hill of prosperity but they are on a toboggan, and if they do not come down a good deal quicker than they went up, I am no judge of present indications. There is going to be a mighty fall. The collapse of the Quebec bridge is but emblematic of the financial crash which the Finance Minister will have about his ears within two years time. That is a serious statement to make, and I do not make it without a good deal of thought. I believe that I am repeating what is in the minds of many financial men in this country. When the Finance Minister flits to and fro, offering financial help to banks which they never asked and which they refuse to accept, he is drawing a red herring across the trail. The people have lost faith in the government and its financial policy and not without good reason. Never did any government in this country court financial ruin to the extent this government has done. Our expenditures have increased three-fold in the last few years. They have jumped from $45,000,000 in 1896, when they took office, to the amount of $136,000,000 last session. Turning up the Public Accounts, which has just been placed in our hands, I find on page 81 that within the next

two years, or a little over, upwards of $100,000,000 of loans are falling due, which this government will have to meet. We have not heard a word from the minister as to how he proposes to raise the money. We are not aware that he has had the business foresight to look a little ahead. We have not been informed how he met the loan due last May or how he proposes to meet the loans falling due in the near future. Any business man would look ahead, but we have not heard from the Finance Minister that he has done so. It is just that lack of faith in him which has caused the stringency. The banks, some of them, took the precaution over a year ago to draw in and curtail and lay up reserves. Has this government done that? Not a bit of it. They have rushed head on, and now they are up against it. They are on the toboggan; and, if I am not mistaken, they are going to come down with such a crash as this country has never seen before. You say: Oh, you are in a pessimistic mood. I am in a pessimistic mood with regard to this government, but not with regard to our financial institutions which seem to be worrying the Minister of Finance. He told us of the immense prosperity of Canada, and quoted from the paper which I hold in my hand, but I wonder if he saw last night's 'News,' with this heading:

> Assistance for starving men sent by the House of Industry and many kind-hearted citizens.
>
> Bags of bread, sandwiches and cake were distributed Saturday evening. City to be asked to assist.
>
> The 'News' will insert situations wanted and help wanted advertisements free of charge.

Has the Minister of Finance heard of any thing of that kind yet? We are up against it in Ontario, and I want to tell him that, if it has not struck them in his province down by the sea, it is going to be there before long. We are up against it hard in this country now, and the minister's boasted prosperity has vanished. Take up any paper published in any town or city in Ontario that does an industrial business of any size, and see what it says of the conditions. Men are walking the streets. I had a man come into my office the day before I left home—an able bodied, hearty, healthy Englishman. He had canvassed every factory in Brantford for work. He had travelled to Toronto and Oshawa and had spent three weeks in an earnest endeavour to find a job, and he said to me: Mr. Cockshutt, what am I going to do? I can't find a piece of work in any of these places that I can do.' There are hundreds walking the streets of our cities to-day. The Minister of Finance ought to know, if he does not, that his vaunted prosperity has vanished. At the present time we are up against a financial problem in this country that is most serious.

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

And these hon. gentlemen opposite are like Nero, fiddling while the city burns—they leave untouched the pressing problems which the people have to face. Two sessions ago, they undertook to probe the insurance question. And what have they done? They have created distrust in the mind of every policy-holder in this country, and have created a disturbance with regard to the directorates of almost all these companies. They have left the insurance business paralyzed for upwards of twelve months, and to-day they have not a word to say about it. And these companies are tied up; their business practically annihilated, while these hon. gentlemen opposite make light of the situation, and tell us that there is nothing to cause alarm in the trade situation of this country. I do not know whether I have had a different bringing up in a business way from these hon. gentlemen opposite, but I know that to regard lightly these figures which the Minister of Finance presents in his report, I should certainly need to have been brought up in a different school from that in which I was trained. I think my school was the same as that of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). I do not think the minister will find very much to satisfy him in these figures which show a total balance of trade against Canada of over $120,000,000 in a single year. These figures are to me astounding, incredible. I never heard before of any government in any country—certainly not a government of a country so productive and with so many resources as Canada—that caused a change in five or six years from a favourable balance of trade of several millions to an adverse balance of over one hundred and twenty millions. If this is reassuring to the Minister of Finance, I cannot imagine why it should be so. It may be that he has his coffers full—they tell us that he has; but if what is told to me is correct, the government is one of the slowest paymasters in Canada. The Minister of Finance has told us that the subsidies have just been paid to the local governments. I think they have been looking for them for some time. And, if my information is correct, there are a good many bills past maturity and still unpaid. If the government want to help the financial situation, and if they have the surplus the Minister of Finance has told us about, I think it would be a kind thing on their part for them to pay the amounts they owe.

If the Minister of Finance has the surplus that is boasted, I think he is not justified in hoarding these sums in the bank. But I, for one, am very skeptical about this money in the bank. I would not be surprised if, in the near future, it should be found that the banks are able to give the Minister of Finance help that will be much more needed and much more useful than any he is able to give the banks. I may be

wrong, but that is my impression. And judging from what I have heard from contractors and others having business with the government, this government pays very slowly, I believe that some to whom money is due have been told that there is no money to pay them with, and, in some instances, they have been put off for months. Of course, I am not inside the office as the Minister of Finance is. He can tell us if I am wrong—I only repeat what I have been told by men who do business with the government. The Minister of Finance can repudiate it if he pleases. But he smiles at it, and I suppose that that is an indication that he accepts what I say.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) must not expect me to repudiate his mistakes as he goes along. That would keep me too busy.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Yes, Mr. Finance Minister, I will keep you busy. I think I have laid out a few items that will have that effect. I think that these loans of over one hundred millions coming due in the near future, and the equalizing of this unfavourable balance of trade, will keep the Minister of Finance busy for some considerable time. And I fancy that his coffers are not going to be so full as they have been—excuse me for expressing the doubt. You have taxed this people to the limit. You have taken over $10 for every man, woman and child in Canada, against $5 that the Conservatives took. But you have about reached your limit—

Mr. TAYLOR. They are bled white.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. You cannot go much further in the direction of drawing these taxes into your coffers ; you are going to be up against it in the near future, unless all signs fail. I am not speaking now any words that I have not spoken for the past two years, and therefore the hon. gentleman need not accuse me of being scary with regard to the outlook. I took occasion, two years ago, when I first had the opportunity of discussing the budget, to point out to the Minister of Finance the excess of imports over exports and to urge that this adverse balance should be righted. I pointed out to him again last year that he had an adverse balance of trade of $63,000,000. But he kept on, and now he comes to us with an adverse balance of trade of over $120,000,000. I say these figures are astounding, incredible, in a country such as this. You tell us that we have vast resources ; you tell us that we are growing wheat, that we are producing butter and cheese, that we are cutting down our forests and selling our timber, that we are delving in the earth and exporting silver ; but after all that is done, after we have parted with every thing that we have made or produced, we find that every man, woman and child has bought $20 worth more than he has sold during the year. In other words, the average Canadian is buying more than he can pay for, and to-day we have to find hard cash to the amount of $120,000,000 to pay this adverse balance. Is it any wonder that the times are a little tighter than they were ? But the hon. gentleman will point us to the United States and say : How do you explain the fact that they have a stringency ? Well, wait a little. It is coming our way. We do not get into it quite as fast as do the people of the United States, but we are getting there just the same. We have not speculated in this country to the extent they have in the United States. This country is largely free from the speculation which takes place upon Wall Street, and that is the reason we have not felt the stringency so acute up to the present. But we are going to feel it.

I want to tell the Finance Minister to-day that if he had his tariff to do over again, while he was flooded with deputations last year, he would have a good many more this year. The hon. the Minister of Customs was in our city the other day—I call it our city because he lives there as well as myself—and he said there, if correctly reported, that this tariff of upwards of eleven hundred items passed this House in the course of one day. He said there could not have been much kick about it, otherwise it would not have passed so quickly. Well, my recollection is that though it did pass in one day, the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) took occasion to deliver himself at considerable length against it, and though it passed in one day, it had to be repassed on several other days. If I remember rightly over five hundred changes had to be made before it was finally passed. We had change after change, ' change and decay ' we saw all around, especially decay in the government and change in the tariff ; and day after day the Finance Minister came down with this much passed tariff and told us of further changes. This went on, not for a day, but speaking without the book, and from the best of my recollection, it was nearer four months than one day before that tariff went through this House. I say all these items that he speaks of as being passed in one day were changed again and again, in many instances, before they were settled, and they did not get them all quite right even then, and there will be further changes required. Miserable as it is to have to say it, we to-day are dependent upon this tariff that the hon. gentleman brought in for not being annihilated by American competition. Only yesterday, I see, there was a pronouncement made in Toronto on that question. I think the minister has been informed about it—that goods are being dumped in from all the United States at the present time owing to the extreme stringency that prevails over there.

Mr. PATERSON. If they are coming in here it must be because people have got the money to buy them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That does not follow. Sometimes we get goods on credit, as this government has done, and has not paid for them all. I think not quite all the bills of the government are paid yet. Though you are pretty flush with your money, the time will come that your debts will have to be discharged. A good many people who are buying goods in this country are buying all they can afford. Reckless extravagance in this government has been a public example that has caused terrible distress in this country, and is going to cause a great deal more. This government has set a pace that cannot be maintained by Canada, with all its resources. Canada is a rich country, it is a prosperous country, it has got all the natural resources that Providence ever blessed any land with ; but it cannot stand the reckless handling these men have given it the last few years. We have come to the halting spot, and we are going to begin to come down. I say that you are on the toboggan, gentlemen, and that you are coming down with a crash. Now that is a prophecy. I do not know whether the Minister of Finance thinks that is worth anything or not, I give it to him as a business man, believing that it is true. Talk about the stringency of the times, but if you can look ahead one year you will see that not the half has been told. You talk about times being stringent now, they will be more so before they are better. That is a prophecy, but that is just about as sure to come true as that we sit in this House today. We have courted disaster. This government has run a most reckless course, extravagant to the last degree, spending three dollars where one would have done. That pace has been kept up. Take a farmer that has got his land cleared, and has put a mortgage on his farm. He spends his money by buying horses, carriages and so on, and he can have good times while the money lasts. But the bills will have to be met in the finish. That is exactly what these gentlemen have been doing, they have mortgaged our resources for five or ten years to come, and we are going to pay for it. The reckless pace this government has set is going to cause disaster. We have one of the most resourceful countries, and we have been able to prosper by careful economic methods for many years, and by a system of wise government, both under the late Sir John A. Macdonald and the late Alexander Mackenzie—because he was not a man of the stripe we have before us today. He had a man with a gun standing over the treasury. We have got men with their hands up, beckoning, 'come on and help yourselves, boys.' There is no man with a gun standing over the treasury today. The treasury has been open to all. Graft and greed, and get-something-for-nothing, has been the policy pursued. These gentlemen have handed the treasury over to their friends, to partisans, and have handed out to them money that was not earned, money for which this country got no value, but money which will have to be accounted for by the Finance Minister and those who surround him at the coming general election. Perhaps I have spoken enough in regard to this question. It is a question that I have had at heart for some years, and I have endeavoured to give the Finance Minister the benefit of my advice on previous occasions. I give it to him now, but it is too late. It is too late now. As I have told him, he is on the slide down. He may not think so, I do.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman tells me he is giving me this advice. I presume it is in relation to the tariff. I want to know, since he has repeated it half a dozen times, whether that advice was that we should raise the tariff as high as Haman' gallows, or reduce it as far as his friends in the west want it reduced.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman is very apt at turning a point.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am anxious to see it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have pointed out to him on several occasions, and now to-day about three times over, that it is the excessive imports over exports, that is the danger. Now he, as a business man, ought to know how to stop that. I think I could do it if I were in his seat, and do it quickly, and I would have done it long ago had I the opportunities that he has. It is his excessive imports over exports. But there is something more in the imputation of the hon. gentleman than a simple question. I would like to know who Haman's gallows is for. Will the hon. gentleman tell me who Haman's gallows is for ?

Mr. FIELDING. You will have to seek the gentleman in Toronto who used the expression. I did not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Oh, that is it. Well, I can soon enlighten the hon. gentleman. I can tell the hon. gentleman this, and I have said it in this House before, I am not now, nor ever have been, a member of the Manufacturers' Association. Notwithstanding that fact, Liberal papers from the Atlantic to the Pacific have dubbed me from day to day as being the president of the Manufacturers' Association, and held me up on Haman's gallows to the joy of the Grit crowd. But I am not the man, and I want to tell the minister that when he tacks his Haman's gallows to me he must look for his Haman somewhere else.

Mr. FIELDING. But I did not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I do not propose to hang here. I am not a high tariff man, nor have I ever been. I stand for Canada for the Canadians. I say produce in our country all that you can produce whether it is the product of the mine, the mill, the forest or the field. Do not buy anything outside which we can produce at home, and arrange the tariff in such a way as to see that these ends are met. That has been my policy and I have not changed it for thirty years. But the hon. gentleman endeavours to hang me upon those gallows. I was with my friend the leader of the opposition in the west and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) said that he had no protectionists with him and still he hails me as a high protectionist. I had the honour and pleasure of being with my leader for about ten days in the west. Of course the presence of a man that they accused of being a Haman's gallows man produced a stampede; they tacked it to me just as the hon. the Finance Minister has tacked it to me just now.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understood the hon. gentleman had charged me with being the president of the Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. FIELDING. I knew that the hon. gentleman was not the president of the Manufacturers' Association and I had not the slightest idea of connecting him with it. I was referring to a phrase which had been used, but with reference to another man. It was common talk in the press. I knew that the hon. gentleman was not connected with it and I had no idea of suggesting that he was.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman makes the explanation that he did not intend to attach that phrase to me, but it has been attached to me by the Liberal press and by Liberal speakers. I certainly understood the hon. gentleman to attach that gallows to me, but if he says that he has not done so, and if I have done him an injustice in that respect, I regret it. As personal friends neither of us desires to attach to the other anything that is not right.

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I wish to come to another matter in the speech from the Throne and upon which I have put a resolution on the Order Paper, and that is on the subject of immigration. The speech from the Throne is no more reassuring to me in that respect than in others; in fact, I have never read a speech from the Throne that fills me with as much disquiet as that speech, and I do not wonder that the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Finance have spoken with great care in this house and have avoided almost every point in it. Here is what it says:

> The stream of immigrants coming to Canada continues to increase in volume, the year now drawing to a close showing a larger number than any preceding year.

Then it goes on to express gratification that they come from the British Isles. I do not see very much gratification in this increase at the present time in view of what I have read from the Toronto 'News' and in view of what I know of the conditions of this country. There are other obligations on the government than that of simply bringing people here. There is something else to be done besides bringing them here and paying bonuses. You have to find them work after they get here. I ask the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Finance: What are you going to do with your immigrants? They are not getting work. They are going to be on the hands of charity this winter by hundreds and thousands and still they come on with a rush. I see the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) there. Perhaps he will tell us that they should take to the land. Well, there is not very much land to be had after satisfying all his friends out there, but if there is any land many of these people are not capable of going to the land. The Liberal papers tell us that these men can all find work on the Grand Trunk Pacific. That sounds very well, but I am rather doubtful about that statement. I read in a paper within a week that 8,000 men on the Grand Trunk Pacific at Kenora had been discharged and that most of them, if not all, would have to return to the countries from whence they came. That is a public matter published in the press and I presume it is right. Are you going to send these thousands and tens of thousands that the speech from the Throne speaks of out to work on the Grand Trunk Pacific? These men have been accustomed in many instances to city life and are not accustomed to railway construction. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), I notice is here. He has not had very much experience in running railways, but he has in running a press, and I believe that a press may be considered to be an engine in some respects, although it is not always an engine that draws in the right direction. He may tell us that they can find work on the railways. That, in his mind, may be a solution of the matter, but I am doubtful of it. I do not find anything reassuring in the statement in the speech from the Throne, that immigrants are coming in by thousands and tens of thousands when we cannot find work for those who are here. We are going to have soup kitchens before the winter is over just as sure as we are here.

An hon. MEMBER. We have had them before.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. We have had them before under Liberal rule and we are going

to have them again before long. Just as sure as we are assembled here to-day we will have soup kitchens in this country before the winter is gone.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a Liberal industry.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is an industry that thrived well under Mackenzie and it will thrive well under the right hon. Prime Minister. There is no doubt that we are going to have it in the near future, and many of those unfortunate immigrants that the speech from the Throne speaks of, when they arrive in Canada, will not be able to get work, will not be able to find a job where they can earn a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, and they will be confronted with the proposition that there is no work to be done and no money to pay them. That may be considered an exaggeration, as I have no doubt it will be by the hon. Minister of Finance and others, but I know that I am speaking by the book. I think I have a little knowledge of this question. I question if 25 per cent of the industries of Canada are running at full speed to-day. Some of them are closed and others are going to close. Some of them are running short time and some of them are cutting down wages. I do not suppose that the hon. Minister of Finance has heard anything of that kind yet, but he will hear of it in the near future and he will have to deal with it. Five hundred people are now being fed in the city of Toronto, I am told by a gentleman who sits here. That is only one place and the number does not sound to be very great, but it is going to be greater. It is going to be a time when men, to use a phrase which was well known among the pioneers of this country, will have to give more and spend less. Whoever has a pocket which is open to men in need is going to have his pocket taxed to the utmost this winter. I heard one gentleman saying that men have to be contented with two meals a day, but there will be others who will only be able to get one meal a day, and a very poor one at that. This is the boasted prosperity that the Minister of Finance has told us about. We are up against it now, but he has not found time to mention that phase of the situation. He tells us that things are just as glowing and just as good as they ever have been. In bringing down a statement of the $644,000,000 trade of this country, he omitted to point out the fact that $361,283,000 of this was represented by purchase and not sales. Is that the financial state of the country? If that is reassuring to the financial mind of the government I am sorry for him.

Surely they cannot be as pleased with the outlook as they would seem to make out. If the Minister of Finance has not yet begun his worries I can tell him that his policy has caused worry to many thousands of our people this year, and that if he remains in office his turn will surely come. I want to tell him that his misguided action with regard to the banks has caused more distrust than anything else that can be imagined. His efforts may have been well intended, but it stands to reason that if you circulate throughout the country that a man is wanting help when he does not want it, you do that man's credit great damage. It would be interesting for us to know from the Finance Minister, but he will not tell us what he did, what he offered, who accepted, who rejected, who asked and who needed. None of these things will be revealed to us and so all the banks in Canada will be left under the suspicion of having needed help and having been offered help. I tell the Finance Minister now as I have told him before, that in the near future he will be requiring more help from the banks than the banks require help from him. There are as able men at the head of our banking institutions to-day as the man who holds the portfolio of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that is true.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am glad to hear the minister acknowledge it; an open confession is good for the soul. I do not disparage the Minister of Finance, but I can tell him that at the head of our banking institutions there are able men who have withstood a tremendous strain during the past twelve or fifteen months, and it was only because of their great foresight that we have been able to weather the storm. They began to take in sail long ago; they were preparing for the stress which the financial world knew was coming. But it was not so with the government. The government has been running full blast to the last, spending money by the millions to the end, and at almost the close of this financial year we find them under a full head of sail with a gale at hand which they will find difficulty in weathering. There is no cutting down on the part of the government. They talk glibly of an all-red line that will cost millions, they talk about a Georgian Bay canal, a Hudson Bay railway, and other enormous projects which it will take one thousand million dollars to carry out. They talk of these things and they do not know how they are going to meet the immediate demands of the present hour. The Minister of Finance has not told us that any loans have been negotiated. Every business man knows that before he starts to manufacture or to purchase goods, he must go to his banker and ask him how much his credit is good for and whether he can buy this quantity or manufacture to that extent, so that the bank may finance him if he will require it. A business man does not buy his goods first and then beseech his banker to see him through. But that is what this government is doing. Millions of reckless expendi-

ture has been showered throughout the country for the past ten years for which no value has been received. To-day we are confronted with a position which well nigh amounts to national bankruptcy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but let them wait until the next loans are floated and they will see. I commend the Minister of Finance for his shrewdness in keeping out of the money market for the past twelve months, but he will be forced to go there soon and the longer he waits the worse for him. Had he gone to the money markets twelve months ago as he was advised by some of our friends to do, he would be a great deal better off than he is to-day, and the longer he delays the worse for him. Times are stringent now, but I am much mistaken if in the next speech from the Throne you do not find a more distressing reference to the stringency which will prevail in the country. I venture that opinion based on my knowledge of the financial, commercial, and industrial conditions which prevail. The crops have been bad in the west and those of us who are doing a large business there have been uneasy. We have been worrying for the past year over the outlook, and the Minister of Finance will have his turn at worrying very soon. I think he will probably get some wise advice from his bankers ; I think they will advise him as I have advised him, that he had better bring his exports into line with his imports. Some make very light of that, but they will see more force in it as the days go by, and in that respect the Minister of Finance had better take a line out of the book of our neighbours to the south who have always managed to keep the balance of trade on the right side. It may be asked why there is a stringency in the United States, but that is the result of speculation, and no wise policy of business can guard against reckless speculation in stocks on margin. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will resume my remarks after six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight oclock.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was dealing with the question of immigration. I may say that I do not intend to pursue that subject at any length at the present time, as I have on the Order Paper a proposed motion dealing with it. I only wish to say this much, that in my opinion it is necessary for the government to take immediate action with regard to the immigrants at present en route or likely to come during the remainder of this year. These people are coming to Canada on the representation that there is in the country ample money and ample work, and that they will be looked after on arrival. I want to point out to the Minister of the Interior particularly that it is very unfair to the immigrants and still more unfair to the cities, towns and even country districts to which they are being sent, if they are brought here without some provision being made for their reception and some chance of their getting work when they arrive. This is a very serious question demanding immediate attention. The rigours of a Canadian winter are upon us; many of these people are arriving without a dollar in their pocket, in some cases without enough for the first meal, and they are going to the cities to be placed on charity. That has occurred in the summer in many instances, and it is now the ordinary case. These people do not want to go to the farm or to railway work at this time of the year; they are going to the large centres, where they will be on charity during the winter unless the government is on hand at the port of arrival to take charge of them and to show them where they can get work. Unless this is done great cruelty and hardship will be inflicted on a number of innocent people during the present winter.

The next subject I wish to touch upon is the imperial conference. We have very little reason to expect that anything would be done by this government with reference to imperial trade or imperial defence, and we have not been disappointed—nothing has been done or arrived at, and the great question of imperial unity with reference to trade and defence is still in the same chaotic state that it was in when these gentlemen took power eleven years ago. We never did expect them to do anything along this line. Although the Minister of Finance boasts that they are the authors of the British preference, I wish to tell them that they stole the name, and it is only the jug handle part of the policy that they have given us. They have given a preference. but have received nothing in return. As a result of this misnomer, the true policy has had to change its name and is now known as the mutual preference as opposed to the jug-handle preference which the Minister of Finance and his friends put in force eleven years ago. I am as unalterably opposed to that policy now as I have always been. It has been of no value to this country and is not appreciated at home, because they do not pay anything for it. As I have said before in this House, the proper course would be to collect the same duties on British goods as on goods from any other country, and if necessary hand back a portion of the money so collected as our contribution to the defence of the empire. This great question of imperial unity these gentlemen have not dealt with; we never expected that they would. They have

never shown any disposition to embark on any policy that would unify the empire.

But we have had sprung upon us lately a new theory; we are told that we are to have an All-Red line which is to compass the British empire and is to solve the transportation problem for the whole empire. It promises to be a thin red line rather than an All-Red line. Even the seconder of these resolutions, one of the government's own supporters, distinctly opposed it, so far as I was able to gather from his speech. So that when we upon this side are twitted with want of unity on the tariff question, I would suggest that hon. gentlemen opposite had better unify their own followers on this All-Red line question.

The much-heralded French treaty has been brought down. I regret that I have not yet had an opportunity to look very fully into that treaty; but, so far as I have been able to examine it, I am not hopeful of any great results from it for Canada. There have been some concessions on light wines, which will strike at some Canadian industries, because in Ontario there are several companies that manufacture large quantities of light wines, and I fancy they will not be advantaged by the concessions granted to France in that treaty. In this connection there is one point to which my attention has been called, that is, that unless these goods from France come directly through a Canadian port they are not to receive the full advantage. I would ask the Finance Minister if I am correct in that?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, they must come across the ocean to a Canadian port. They may start from a French port or a British port, Great Britain having the advantage of the minimum French tariff, but they must come across the ocean to a Canadian port.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Well, I think that is in advance of our time. It is unfair to the railways and to many merchants and importers. For instance, I understand that the Grand Trunk Railway will not be able to bring in these goods through Portland, and the lines in western Canada which depend on connections with New York or Philadelphia will be cut out of the carrying trade on these goods. I am opposed to that feature, and I think it is regrettable that the Finance Minister should have gone so far as to adopt a principle with regard to imports from France after refusing to apply the same principle to British goods, as was done last session on a resolution brought in by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan).

I wish to speak for a few moments on the question of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That is a rather interesting question, and I do not know that the reference to it in the speech from the Throne is any more reassuring than the reference to other matters. It says, referring to the Transcontinental Railway——

Progress has been made both on the eastern and western divisions, but the difficulty of obtaining labour and material at a time of great business activity has somewhat retarded the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. Nevertheless some progress has been made.

It is to be regretted that the Grand Trunk Pacific is not in as forward a state as it might reasonably be expected to be. But whose fault is that ? I am rather doubtful that it is due to the lack of labour. We have had an influx of Japanese and Chinese and a large number of Hindoos and Coolies into British Columbia last winter, whose advent was opposed by the British Columbia representatives. I scarcely think that these representatives will re-echo the sentiments expressed by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance in this debate. I doubt whether they will feel satisfied with regard to the position taken on this question by these two gentlemen. But if the construction was hampered at the outset by lack of labour, that is not the case now, because I find that the other day the Grand Trunk Pacific dismissed 8,000 men, on one section at Kenora, most of whom have returned to their native land.

But what I want to call particular attention to is the cost of the road, and I regret that the right hon. the First Minister is not in his place to-night. I am told that he is busily occupied attending to the business of the country in the Russell theatre. Whether that be the case I do not know, but I do not see why I should be restrained by his absence from pointing out a statement made by him which certainly requires some explanation on his part. I have been twitted on many platforms by Liberal speakers and by many Liberal newspapers with not going by the book when I say that the First Minister was guilty of mis-representation when he introduced the Bill in parliament. Although I was not present in the House at the time, I understand that he stated in three different places in his speech on that occasion that this new transcontinental road would cost the country $13,000,000 and not one cent more. Is that correct ? The right hon. gentleman is not here to reply, but the Minister of Finance might reply for him.

Mr. FIELDING. So far as I know, the right hon. gentleman never made such a preposterous statement in any shape or form.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am very glad to be able now to give the hon. minister and the House exactly what the right hon. gentleman did say. In Vol. 4 of 'Hansard' for the session of 1903, will be found the introductory speech of the right hon. gentleman when he submitted the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill to the House. I take it that he was then speaking with the view of making the people believe that his was the right policy and that it was a policy which would be carried out as he explained it. Let me read

his very words. They will be found on page 7691 of 'Hansard' of 1903, third volume :

The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 and not a cent more.

Further on he says :

What is $13,000,000? It is a bagatelle. It is about the surplus of our revenue over the expenditure. The surplus for this year will pay for the construction of the road.

There is the complete statement within itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that a preposterous statement ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether those are or are not the words of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has read them out of their context. Everybody knows it would be ridiculous and preposterous for any body to say that the many hundreds of miles across the mountains and prairies could be built for $13,000,000. If he did, he would be a proper candidate for a lunatic asylum.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is pretty hard on the First Minister.

Mr. FIELDING. He never said anything so ridiculous. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have been delighted, could they have caught him saying it. If the hon. gentleman wishes to be candid, he would know that these figures had reference, not to the cost of the road, based on so much a mile, but to what would be the obligation on the people, which they would have to pay, when the accounts came to be adjusted in the end. For example the construction of the eastern division alone costs a number of millions of dollars, but the Grand Trunk Pacific was to rent that eastern division, and after a period pay interest upon its cost. When they pay the interest, the country is at no expense ; and the calculation of the First Minister had reference to what the road would cost the country when all these considerations were taken into account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman read it again ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Finance Minister has accused me of reading it out of the context. Well, I would like to read the whole speech but it is too long. I have read the speech through myself and I cannot find that the First Minister mentioned anywhere in it any other figures. His statement was very explicit. He said :

The surplus of this year will pay for the construction of this road.

Can any words in the English language more clearly and completely express that idea ? It is all very well for these hon. gentlemen to try and withdraw these figures now. That is the way they always proceed. They make fine promises but give no performance. The figures are there in 'Hansard,' in black and white, in four or five different places, and they are $12,000,000 to $13,000,000. My hon. friend and everybody knows that the road cannot be built for any such sum. And when the right hon. gentleman said it would, he was misrepresenting its cost, as I would be if I made a similar statement. I would like to ask the Finance Minister what amount has already been expended in the construction of the road and when we are going to get the balance expended over the $13,000,000 back. It was just such preposterous statements which caused Mr. Blair to leave the government. When the First Minister said the road would be built for $13,000,000, Mr. Blair replied that it would cost $120,000,000 and he thereupon threw down his party and came out like a man. He said to his leaders : You may be a party to misrepresenting the country but I will not. I do not wish to use any figures on the public platform which I am afraid to repeat in this House, and that is why I have quoted those figures and that statement from the speech of the right hon. gentleman. I only regret he is not here to-night, but I do not think that if he were, he could offer any better justification, than the Finance Minister has given for him. But I will say this that the Finance Minister endeavoured to disentangle the First Minister from that statement before he was through with his speech, but he was too late and the First Minister persisted in that mis-statement. What the First Minister said was that $13,000,000 would be the cost to the country. What is the use of playing on the word 'obligation' ? Let us have a straightforward, manly statement as to what the cost to the country will be. When is the balance of the cost over the $13,000,000 coming back to the country ? I understand that we have voted $41,000,000 for the road already. I may be mistaken but I understand that those are the figures that we have voted. It is preposterous to say that $13,000,000 will build the road when we have already voted $40,000,000 for its construction and have not a mile of it running yet. Then because we criticise the conduct of the government, we are told by the Finance Minister we are opposed to the road. Sir, we never opposed the building of another transcontinental road. The same party which built the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is the backbone of the country to-day and of which our people are so proud, is quite prepared to build another transcontinental road or two more if required.

We are not, and never have been, opposed to the building of another transconti-

nental road. We have always stood for an enlightened development in our transportation methods. It was not a question of having or not having one more road; it was a question whether a profligate bargain was being made or whether it was a wise undertaking on which the government were embarking. And I think the facts will prove, before we get through, that our side was right, and that the counter proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition was the correct policy and would have saved this country millions upon millions. It is well enough for these hon. gentlemen, to seek to evade responsibility for these figures now. But they deceived the people with these figures in the election of 1904. I used them on the platform in the presence of my opponent, Mr. Heyd, who did not deny that they were used in the House. I stated that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had given $13,000,000 as the amount, and I asked my opponent whether he would stand by the statement. He said he would not, but that it would cost as well as he could judge $81,000,000. He made a correct estimate according to his lights at that time, and I give him credit for that; but he never denied that these figures had been used, and that they were used to convince the people that the cost of this road to the country would be $13,000,000. Of course, Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not make the statement that the road was going to be built for that amount, but that was what he said would be the cost to the country. Now, I think I have made myself fairly clear to the Minister of Finance. I would not wish to use these figures on the platform if I were afraid to use them in this House. If I am misrepresenting the Finance Minister in this or any other matter, I hope I am man enough to take it back and apologize, and that is what I am ready to do if the figures are not as I have given them. I would like to know how much of this $13,000,000 has been spent in connection with that road so far. It would be more interesting to have that fact given us than the fact that it is not progressing as fast as was expected.

Then, we have a reference to the Quebec Bridge disaster. That goes to profit and loss account. I do not propose to lay the blame of that disaster upon any body, for we do not yet know who was responsible. The country deeply regrets the loss of life and destruction of property which resulted from this error of some body's making. I understand that the government of this country is on the bonds to the amount of $4,800,000 to pay for the loss on that bridge, and I have heard it rumoured and have seen it stated in the press that the government has been asked to pay up. Sooner or later, there is little doubt, the country will have to pay that bill. The speech from the Throne says that we shall have to devise means for the completion of the bridge. We thought we had already provided for the cost. About as much has been expended as this estimated cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the country, and now the structure has collapsed. And this collapse is but emblematic of the collapse which will take place with this government on many of its policies as well as the Quebec bridge.

The next matter mentioned is the Post Office. There is loud acclaim of the management of the Post Office and the revenue it has brought to this country. I stated last session in this House that I believed the Post Office was the most undermanned and underpaid service in the Dominion of Canada. I showed at that time that there were nearly 10,000 people working in the post office service at $25 per annum, and 11,000 at not more than $150 per annum, and they were furnishing bonds for good behaviour, providing a building in which to keep the post office as well as light, heat, &c. I stated that the service was a starved one throughout. Our leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) has told us of the breakdowns in the post office facilities in many parts of the west. And not only in the west, but in many parts of Ontario and the east the same want of facilities can be found. As to the boasted surplus of the Post Office Department, that might very well be expended in paying a living wage to those individuals who are carrying on the work and in improving the service, not only in the outlying parts of the Dominion, but in the towns and cities, for, even in the towns and cities, the service falls far short of what wise and economical administration would provide. I think that service should not show a surplus. If that surplus could not be spent otherwise, it could be devoted to establishing a system of rural mail delivery and in other improvements.

Now, I come to the proposed enlargement of the Railway Commission. This is taking a leaf out of the book of the leader of the opposition. I think it is a wise step, provided the appointments made are satisfactory, and that the matters adjudicated upon from time to time are settled and not carried over from one month to another and one season to another, as they have been in times past. I hail with delight the announcement that the Railway Commission, which, I think, on the whole a very useful body, is to be enlarged. I hope that the men appointed will be chosen for their fitness and not for their political services.

Now, we are promised an insurance measure. I pointed out to the Minister of Finance before dinner that, in my opinion, he had done an immense injustice to the insurance people of this country, an immense injustice to all concerned, including the policy-holders, of whom I happen to be one. I do not consider that my property in my insurance policies is as valuable as it was before the government made an attack upon the insurance companies. And, further, I

believe that most of the discussion of the subject in this House was not calculated to reassure policy-holders or create that trust in the management of our insurance companies that ought to exist. I think it is to be regretted that a slur should be cast upon many of our old line companies, and that they should have been hampered in their business to the extent that they have been in the last eighteen months by this ill-advised commission with its ill-advised findings. The whole matter has been tied up, the country has been held up, and the insurance people to-day are not doing anything like the usual amount of business, because suspicion has been cast upon their methods and managements, and it has been stated that they are not going to be allowed to do this, that and the other in the future. All this is to be regretted. It goes to show that it is easier to pull a man down than to make him a success ; it is easier to cast a slur upon his work than to give him back his reputation after it has been taken from him by wrong means. The insurance business in this country should be rehabilitated and those with money invested should be given in it a fair chance to go on and do their work.

Now, I must hasten on. The last question I have to deal with is the statement that we are to have an improvement in our electoral methods. I am glad to know that the government is to take hold of that matter. I did not think it looked very promising when I saw the recent additions to the cabinet. So far as Ontario is concerned, I do not look for any great results from these additions. I may be mistaken ; I am not going to speak a disparaging word of our good friend from Brockville (Mr. Graham), but I want to remind this House and the country that that hon. gentleman came to the support of the Ross government in its dying days and made himself responsible for thirty-two years of corrupt work. He was in office in the Ross government just about three months, and I do not know that he is going to be in his present position much longer than that. It has been said that he came in as a pallbearer for the Ross government, and that he is now here to do the same work for the present administration.

But I say that I cannot hail with satisfaction nor delight the idea that we are going to have a change made in that line, because this gentleman has been selected for the very reason that I have stated. Sir, let it be understood that so far as Ontario is concerned we mean business. We have got a government there that are going to see that honest elections are conducted whether this government want them or not. We are already doing it in Ontario, and what is going on in respect to the London election is only a sample. We thank Providence that we have in Ontario at last a government that is going to make all these gentlemen do their duty in that respect. We have got a government in power there that is not going to shield the wrong-doer, the ballot switcher, the ballot stuffer, the man that purchases a vote, or miscounts a vote. That is the kind of government we have in Ontario to-day, and it is a warning to these gentlemen that whether the other provinces in the Dominion run a straight election the next time or not, we are going to have a straight election in Ontario. We are not afraid of a straight election, we are only afraid of rascality. The hon. gentleman has told us to-day that we are 'another,' that we do the same. Well, let him point the finger of scorn to a single act the Whitney government has done now in three years. Has there been any ballot burning, ballot switching, ballot stealing, ballot purchasing, in any of the by-elections that have been held ? Is there one instance ? Is there any under Roblin in Manitoba, or under McBride in British Columbia? Show us wherein we are all alike. We are not in the same swim and we would be sorry to take power by such means as have held these gentlemen in power during the past few years. I say to the Finance Minister we are not all alike.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend need hardly attack me on behalf of the Whitney government. All I said about the Whitney government was to defend them from the attack of the leader of the opposition in the subsidy matter.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. They scarcely need the defence of the hon. gentleman at the present time. He has quite enough of his own to defend just now. For our part, we commend to his attention some of those matters to which he did not find time to address himself in the speech from the Throne. I think he will find that he has not touched the cardinal situation, and he will get some criticism in quarters that will be able to judge of his levity in dealing with the speech from the Throne on this occasion.

Now I say that we invite good men of all parties to unite in seeing that we get honest and straightforward elections, a straight count, an honest ballot, no stealing, no switching, no purchasing. That is the kind of fight we want. I have already stated in my own convention, and I say that here to-day, that I do not want to win an election on any other lines. I would rather stay at home, and I believe there are many men on both sides of the House that will take the same stand. We have heard the stand that Mr. Watts has taken up in British Columbia, who has recently offered to do something in cleaning up election matters. He has offered to subscribe $5,000 towards punishing those who transgress the law. That is practical Christianity, and clean politics besides. I hope we can

all be in accord on that. I hope this government is honest when they say they are going in for election purity. But I have not much confidence in the promise they have made in that connection. I hope I am wrong. But I remember distinctly that some very tricky ballot boxes were used in the eastern part of Ontario during the late election in 1904. They were not manufactured by the Conservatives, nor in their interest. We have been told to-day that we are all the same, but I think he will have to go back a long way to find where and when Conservatives have manufactured trick ballot boxes, with false bottoms in them, so that the ballot could be switched to one side, and another one be put in its place. Where did these boxes originate, and where are they likely to originate again? I think not in Ontario. We have got a law and a government there that will punish that kind of thing, and the revelations that are taking place in London are a warning to them that whether they run clean elections or not in other provinces of this Dominion, so far as Ontario is concerned, men who do wrong will be punished. If I do wrong in that way I am willing to suffer punishment for it, just as I would ask that another man should be punished for doing the same thing. Now let us unite in getting clean, honest, straightforward elections throughout the Dominion of Canada. Anything we can do to purify the election laws and to give us a good, clean, honest, able administration in this country, by men that are elected by the people and for the people, and to serve the people, we will endeavour to do, and will join our friends opposite for that purpose. I have very much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, to move the following amendment in reply to the speech from the Throne :

That the said motion be amended by adding to the proposed address to His Excellency the Governor General the following paragraph at the end thereof:

We desire to express our respectful regret that more adequate reference has not been made to matters of public interest alluded to in Your Excellency's gracious speech, and that other matters of grave public concern have altogether escaped mention therein.

We deeply regret the financial stringency which is alluded to in Your Excellency's gracious speech, and which has already occasioned great inconvenience and loss to the people of this country. We sincerely deplore the lack of ordinary business prudence and foresight on the part of Your Excellency's advisers, especially their reckless and wasteful extravagance and the immoderate taxation exacted from the people in recent years, all of which have materially contributed to this financial stringency. We humbly beg to call Your Excellency's attention to the fact that the Customs and Inland Revenue taxation for the nine months ending March 31, 1907, was at the rate of $68,754,120 for a period of twelve months, and that during the past five years the average taxation of the people has amounted to the sum of $57,105,177 annually;

that the adverse balance of trade against Canada has enormously increased during recent years, and for the twelve months ending August 31, 1907, it amounted to no less than the sum of $121,467,844; that the expenditure for the nine months ending March 31, 1907, was at the rate of $87,000,000 per annum, and that the total expenditure during the past five years has thus reached the alarming figure of more than $383,000,000, and exceeds by $170,000,000 the expenditure during the corresponding period ending June 30, 1906.

We respectfully and humbly submit to Your Excellency that having regard to these considerations, the business of the country has not been carried on with that reasonable foresight, care and prudence which have characterized the management of successful business institutions throughout Canada, and which we are entitled to demand from Your Excellency's advisers.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that after the excellence of the speeches to which we have listened in this debate it would be a matter of considerable difficulty for me to say anything more that would be of added interest and I will not detain the House at any great length. Referring to the address of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) —and I regret that he is not here this evening—the first item to which he referred was in connection with the service afforded by the Post Office Department. He said in his speech:

Under these circumstances it does not seem to me that there is very great cause of congratulation to the country that the Post Office Department, year after year, is piling up a surplus when the postal service throughout the country, out of the mouths of business men and others, is denounced in terms which I would hardly care to repeat in this House to-day.

The hon. gentleman has lately made a tour of the west. In that country it would be strange to me if it were not possible for him to find some complaints regarding the post office service. We all know that in the Canadian Northwest, a very large country that has been peopled in recent years by the coming in of many hundred of thousands of immigrants, many men have selected their homesteads a long distance from the railway lines. They have sought these places because of the better soil that they have found there or for some other consideration, and they are patiently waiting the advent of the railway. It would be a matter—I was going to say—of impossibility to give all these men, isolated as they are, a mail service as frequently as they would desire to have. The figures given by the hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon have clearly proven that there is nothing in the complaint, yet I would point out that in our own province of Ontario the mail service in recent years has been very, very considerably improved and that we have, in many of the principal towns and smaller cities of Ontario, to-day a street delivery of

mail that we have only had in recent years, while in the country in many places we have daily mails where tri-weekly mails were formerly the rule and tri-weekly mails where we had mails twice a week. Then we find that the government have not only improved our mail service, but they have given us a two cent postage rate, and that twice since this government have come into power the salaries of the country postmasters have been materially increased. I do not think that any one will criticise or censure the Postmaster General if the postmasters of the smaller country offices should receive an even further increase in their salaries.

The hon. leader of the opposition spoke of the financial stringency, but as the last speaker has spoken of that at greater length I shall refer to it later on. The hon. leader of the opposition made use of a paragraph from a Conservative paper, published, I think, in Halifax, and by a quotation from that paper endeavoured to attack the government. The quotation was in part as follows, referring to this government:

> Its buildings fall down. Its dredges sink. Its steamers run aground. Its calculations fail.

That is a rather dreary picture, but it is bright in comparison with the picture that might have been drawn at the time that this government came into power, succeeding the late Conservative administration. Then it might have been said with truth not that their buildings fell down after they had been erected by the government, but that business houses and enterprises everywhere were falling down. Business houses, banks and enterprises of a business character all over this country were running aground. It is said that the calculations of this government failed. Sir, in that day business men made no calculations save the calculation that to have any betterment in the conditions they would have to put out of power the Conservative government that then held the reins of power and put in their places men of greater business capacity. That determination the people of that day carried into effect and because of the change that was made by the voters in the general elections of 1896 we have had the comparatively prosperous times which have prevailed from that day to this.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the Quebec bridge and endeavoured to cast the blame upon the government because of it. Sir, because a little tower out here in the yard fell down, it must not be assumed that that this is a thing which never happened before. Public buildings have fallen down before because of faulty material or design, and since that day as well as before it structures erected by private individuals and companies have fallen. We remember that not long ago a great disaster occurred in Great Britain when the Tay bridge fell, a great many lives, not those of workmen, but passengers upon the bridge, were lost. We must not forget that the Quebec bridge had the longest span not only of any bridge that has ever been erected, but a longer span than any other bridge that is now under construction. The hon. leader of the opposition quoted from the 'Scientific American,' a very proper paper from which to quote, devoted as it is to scientific matters, and I will quote again from another number of the 'Scientific American' with reference to the Quebec bridge. that of the issue of September 14, 1907. That article is headed 'A portentous bridge disaster,' and it says:

> Quite apart from the lamentable loss of life which it involved, the fall of the great Quebec cantilever bridge is the most disastrous calamity that could possibly have overtaken the profession of bridge engineering in this country. If we were to select out of the many fields of activity which are covered by modern civil engineering some particular one in which the American engineer has displayed most signally his originality and freedom from tradition, we would choose that of bridge engineering; and if we had been called upon to name some one particular structure which stood as the highest exemplification of his skill in this particular branch of his profession, we would have selected the great cantilever bridge across the St. Lawrence river at Quebec.

Again, I find a paragraph in the same article and this particular paragraph is printed in italics:

> The tremendous significance of this disaster lies in the suspicion, which to-day is staring every engineer coldly in the face, that there is something wrong with our theories of bridge design, at least as applied to a structure of the size of the Quebec bridge.

Again I turn to the 'Scientific American' of date October 12 last and I read this paragraph:

> The conclusion at which practically every engineer who has examined the fallen bridge and made a careful study of the strain sheets, &c., has arrived is, that there was something radically wrong with the design of the large compression members, and particularly the bottom chords. In this opinion we entirely concur, and for the reasons which are given below.

An article that I had previously read published in the same paper said that it would be some relief to the bridge designers of the United States if they could attribute the accident to any fault in the material or any neglect on the part of its engineers, but that could not be done and they have concluded, as the men who have since inspected the work have concluded, that the accident was due to the fault of the original design of the bridge. Surely this is not a fault that could be attributed to or laid at the door of this government. I remember hearing the story of an old man whose pro-

perty had been injured by an earthquake; when some one was consoling with him because of the loss he had sustained he said that the only consolation he had in the matter was that although he had been married for forty years this was the first time that any accident had happened that his wife had not blamed him for. It seems that there are members of this House who will blame this government even for loss caused by an earthquake.

Passing from the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition to that of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for North Toronto, speaking of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), said that he had given the whole force of his address to an endeavour to break the strength of the manifesto of the Liberal Conservative party. I did not notice that the Prime Minister devoted a moment of his time to breaking the strength of the manifesto of the Liberal Conservative party, but he did devote a few minutes to showing the House and the people of Canada that there was no strength in the manifesto of the Liberal Conservative party. The hon. member for North Toronto—I am sorry that he is not in his place to-night and if he were in his place I would speak more boldly perhaps than I will speak in his absence—went on and laboured strenuously to prove that there were some planks in the platform laid down by his leader that did not contain a loophole, or, as he put it, an 'if' or a 'but.' One of the planks in which he thought there was no loophole, was : Honest appropriation and expenditure of public money in the public interest. Well, Sir, any leader who places that plank in his platform pays the greatest possible compliment to the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Let me read it again : Honest appropriation and expenditure of public money in the public interest. That is the principle that has been acted upon for eleven years by the Laurier government and the Reform administration. I think it was the leader of the opposition who said that no reference had been made to the moneys that had been paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company, or to supplying the steamer 'Arctic' for her voyage to the northern seas. Well, I know of no reason why any speaker upon the Reform side should not mention the money spent on the North Atlantic Trading Company. If there is any one charge that the Conservatives of this House ought to be sick and tired of it is their charge with reference to the North Atlantic Trading Company, for they signally failed in proving the truth of their charges in connection with the government's transactions with the company.

Mr. AVERY. Who were they ?

Mr. MILLER. If your leader had taken the information that was twice or thrice offered him he would have known who they are. I say that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) ought to be ashamed of his record in this House with respect to the North Atlantic Trading Company and the gentlemen connected with that company.

Mr. AVERY. Do you know who they are to-day ?

Mr. MILLER. I do not care a button who they are so long as I know the work they have done and the terms upon which they have done it. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) when he knew an inquiry was to be proceeded with, and before he heard the evidence, rendered his verdict and he accused men who were not in this House and who had no opportunity of defending themselves, of rascality and dishonesty. I say, Sir, that when the evidence was given and when the witnesses proved that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was wrong in the charges he had made, had he been the kind of man that ought to represent a constituency in this House he would have apologized for the charges he made and the words he used, but so far no apology has come. Men may honestly differ as to the wisdom of the contract made with the North Atlantic Trading Company, but there has not been one iota of proof that there was anything dishonest in the dealings between this government and the company. And as to the voyage of the steamship 'Arctic,' why should any Reformer be ashamed of anything in connection with that incident. We find that in the year 1904-5, the year in which great complaint was made as to the expenditures for the supplies for that steamer, $112,050 had been expended, but I point out that in the year 1905-6 the expenditure for the supplies for that steamer was only $12,813 and in the year 1906-7 the expenses were only $11,558. The supplies laid in 1904-5 have been largely sufficient for the steamer's use in subsequent years, and about $25,000 worth of supplies have been removed from the boat and placed in store at Quebec for future use. In addition about 12,000 pounds of provision, rope, tobacco, &c., were left in the Hudson Bay district, in caches for emergencies, in case vessels should be wrecked or require provisions. And those of us who are as well informed as we ought to be, know of the splendid work the Arctic' and her officers have done for Canada since that investigation took place. We know that the 'Arctic' has gone to the northern seas, has taken possession for Britain and for Canada of islands that might otherwise have remained disputed territory; we know that the Union Jack was planted on islands over which it never waved before ; we know that the Hudson bay has been marked without any uncertainty as a closed Canadian sea, a matter which will probably prevent very great friction between this country and the

United States, and has secured for us undisputed rights in territory that will be of very great value. Another plank in the Conservative platform which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) mentioned with a great deal of gusto was this : Appointment of public officials upon consideration of capacity and personal character and not for party services alone.

Is there any loophole in that; do you not find a loophole in the last word,—appointment of public officials upon consideration of capacity and personal character and not for party service—it does not end there, but it continues: and not for party service alone. You see, that if a man had been a worker for the Reform party, these Conservatives would dub him a party heeler, but if he had been a worker for the Conservative party and they could call him a respectable man it would be perfectly fair, even under the wording of this manifesto, to appoint him for his political service. But, did the leader of the opposition in this House ever hear of a gentleman named Whitney in the province of Ontario? Has he ever heard of any man who has been the head of any government in any province in Canada, and who has adopted the American spoils system to the extent it has been adopted by the Hon. Mr. Whitney? Does the leader of the opposition know that a little while ago Mr. R. R. Gamey, one of the champions of the Conservative party in Ontario, announced that he had only one complaint against his party in Ontario and that complaint was that there were still some appointees of the Ross government left in office whose heads had not been cut off in the guillotine which Mr. Whitney has erected and has kept so well oiled. It may be said that the Conservative party in this House are not responsible for the work of the Conservative party in any of the provinces, but I tell them that the Conservative party in Ontario is a large factor in controlling the affairs of the Conservative party in this Dominion, and I say to the leader of the opposition that if he were in power and did not satisfy the hunger of his party throughout the country as Mr. Whitney has done, he would not long continue to be leader of the Conservative party in Canada. The member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made a bold statement when he said; the right hon. gentleman knows that he has thieves and embezzlers in the public service to-day. That may strike the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) as a brave charge to make and a brave thing to say. It is a thing that might be said by any loafer in any bar room; it might be said by any fish-wife; it might be said by anybody, but it has little significance if there is no proof to back it up. Another plank to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) referred was as to clean elections; and I will not read the wording because it is too long. As has been said by speakers on both sides of the House, it is a very proper thing for anybody to desire but they make this a meaningless thing when they get up, with hypocrisy and cant, and endeavour to make the public of Canada believe that the only wrong doing in connection with elections has been on the side of one political party alone. The leader of the opposition has said that political corruption has been rampant since 1898. Sir, I claim that political corruption was more rampant before 1898 than it has ever been since, and I say that public men who make political speeches are doing an injustice to the Canadian people when they magnify the political corruption which exists in Canada at the present time. If there is any political corruption at all there is too much political corruption; if there were political corruption to-day in only one Canadian constituency it would be that much too much ; but I do say—and perhaps it is not due to the effort of one party more than another but probably on account of the change in public opinion—there is less political corruption in Canada to-day than there was ten years ago and there was less political corruption in Canada ten years ago than there was twenty years ago. There has been a constant improvement in this respect. It was as morally wrong fifteen years ago to hire a man's team to carry voters to the poll in order to obtain his vote and his political support as it is morally wrong to do it to-day; but it was not legally wrong then and it is legally wrong now, and because our law has been made stricter, while there may be less political corruption there may be perhaps more offences against the law. The hon. member for North Toronto and the hon. leader of the opposition may come into my own riding of South Grey and may talk about political corruption; and when they do, the minds of the voters in that riding will go back to a little incident which took place in 1891, seven years before the date mentioned by the leader of the opposition, when after an election in which the late Dr. Landerkin was the candidate on one side and a man named Blythe on the other, eight or nine ballot boxes were broken open and the ballots marked for the Reform candidate taken out and ballots marked for the Conservative candidate put in their place.

The hon. member for Carleton has referred to the election in Colchester. I think, to twist an old quotation, that my hon. friend protested too soon. When he was so ready to say to the House at this early day that at least the Conservative party in Colchester had fought a clean election, it seems to me that his action was very like that of a man who wanted to ward off an investigation for fear that dishonesty and corruption would be discovered.

The hon. member for North Toronto spoke of the record of this government in disposing of public lands. If there is any sub-

ject on which the action of this government will bear favourable comparison with the action of the government which preceded it, it is the disposal of public lands. Reference has been made to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company and the Robbins Irrigation Company; but, as was well pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture in a recent speech, when the leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) were on their tour of the west, in the neighbourhood of the Saskatchewan valley lands and in southern Alberta where the Robbins Irrigation Company operated, not a word was said of the dishonesty or rascality of those enterprises. The hon. member for North Toronto spoke of 'a more or less wholesale alienation of the lands to political favourites who to-day sit behind and beside, affluent in the result of these favours they have got from my right hon. friend and from the members of his cabinet.' The hon. member for North Toronto is altogether too prone to make insinuations against people whom he does not name, and charges which he does not define. I challenge him to point to a man sitting beside or behind the Prime Minister who has received favours that he should not have received or that would not be extended to any other Canadian citizen. I challenge him to point to any man sitting on the Reform side of the House who has made himself affluent as a result of receiving grants of Canadian lands. I happened myself to own two quarter-sections of land in the province of Saskatchewan, both of which I purchased from men in my county who were ardent Conservatives. Looking over the title papers, I find that each of these quarter-sections was patented twenty years ago to a supporter of the Conservative government from whom I purchased it. Nothing of the kind has ever occurred under the Laurier administration.

The hon. member for North Toronto endeavoured to make capital against the Prime Minister on the Japanese and Chinese immigration question. He said that it was immoral and wrong to endeavour to keep out the Chinese because they were poor, while letting in the Japanese because they had a big stick or because we could make a profit by trading with them. Sir, this transaction was based on the maxim of 'quid pro quo.' As every negotiation between one nation and another, between one business house and another or between one business man and another, is based on the same principle of getting something for something, so is this arrangement between our government and the Japanese government, and so was the tax placed by this government on Chinese immigrants coming into Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said: 'I look for a better and more remunerative trade with the great population of China.' The hon. member may be right in anticipating that after the lapse of a number of years Chinese trade may be worth more to this country than the trade of Japan. The Chinese people are making rapid progress and quickly adopting western civilization, a new energy is spreading over China, and her people are fast becoming a people with whom we may have considerable trade. When that time arrives, I have no doubt that this government, if still in power, as no doubt it will be, will make new regulations suitable to the new conditions and circumstances.

With regard to the criticism of the Prime Minister in the selection of his cabinet ministers, it has been well said that the hon. member for North Toronto was not chosen to fill the very important position which was for some time vacant in the Conservative party. The hon. member for North Toronto reflected on the newly appointed Minister of Public works, saying that he was of the flotsam and jetsam of the Conservative party—of the cargo that was got rid of in stress of bad weather. I would like to point out to the hon. member for North Toronto that according to present indications there is great danger that he will very shortly himself be of the flotsam and jetsam of the Conservative party. The leader of the opposition took a trip through the west during recent months, and whom did he take with him as his lieutenant? The eloquent, experienced, clever member for North Toronto? No, that hon. gentleman was left quietly at home, and he took the smiling genial jollier, the hon. member for Beauharnois, who is capable of making fun and amusing a crowd, and the hon. member for Brantford. The hon. member for North Toronto was not permitted to participate in the glories of the trip—why? Was it not that Conservative newspapers and Conservative friends advised the leader of the opposition that he had better leave the hon. member for North Toronto at home, if he desired to make any political capital or to create a good impression or to prevent his party suffering great harm? I point this out in the most friendly spirit to the hon. member for North Toronto, reminding him that the time may soon come when he will be glad to receive, if it be possible, kindly treatment from the shepherd of another fold.

I pass to the speech of the hon. member for Brantford to which we have just listened. He has told us to-night that he talks to-day as he did two years ago, and we can readily believe that his speech of to-night is a repetition of speeches he made in this House twenty-four months ago. We were treated to seventy-three or seventy-four dismal prophecies and seven toboggan slides, all in the imagination of the hon. gentleman. He spoke of soup kitchens. The hon. gentleman and his party have been closely associated with soup for many years, and it seemed for a short time to-night as if he

were not able to talk of any thing but soup. He reminded me of a gentleman from the other side of the line partaking of a meal at a Canadian restaurant, who, after partaking of many courses of soup, was surprised to find that there were many other things on the bill of fare, and regretted having partaken of so much soup that he could not partake of anything else.

It may be true that in the city of Toronto there are to-day a number of men whom it is a charity to help in some degree and for a short period of time. It may be that there are to-day in Toronto some recent arrivals who have not yet succeeded in obtaining employment. These are probably men not well able to adapt themselves to the conditions they find in this country—men who are not capable of making a living on Canadian farms. If they were, they would soon find employment. If there are in Toronto and some other Canadian cities some men from the old land who are not able to do anything but the work of a labourer or artisan, they will find difficulty in obtaining employment. But if that be the case, the blame cannot be laid at the door of the government, because it has never been the policy of the government to assist immigration of that class or character. Its policy has been to assist men who can make their living upon Canadian soil, who are able to till and cultivate the rich lands we have in our country. But while the Canadian government since 1896 has never adopted the policy of helping any other class, it has been in recent years the policy at least of the manufacturers' association to assist just that class to come to Canada. We heard a great deal during the investigation of the North Atlantic Trading Company of Louis Leopold. We heard him denounced as a bad man, because having an unpronounceable name, he had anglified it, as many other foreigners do, and adopted a new name when he came to live in an English speaking country. Well, we find the Manufacturers' Association assisting the immigration of the labour they required and employing Leopold to send to this country men whom the manufacturers might utilize in carrying on their business, which, of course, they had a perfect right to do if they thought it necessary or wise.

A great deal of stress was laid by the last speaker (Mr. Cockshutt) on the fact that Canadian imports have vastly exceeded Canadian exports in recent years. That however is not due to any fault of the government nor is it any evidence that the country is going to the dogs or even that we are moving in a wrong direction. Let me point out that the balance of trade has been against Great Britain for many years. In, perhaps, no time in the memory of man has the balance of trade been in favour of Great Britain. Yet the United States, during their recent stringency, appealed to the British people for a supply of gold. That highly protected country of the United States, whose tariff wall is as high as Haman's gallows, was compelled to obtain its supply of gold from a country against which the balance of trade has existed for many years. We have had in this country a tremendous development during the past eleven or twelve years. Our manufacturers have been everywhere expanding their operations. Both our manufacturers and miners have had to purchase new machinery. Take one item, that of electrical machinery we find that it has been bought very largely in Sweden. No doubt it is because our manufacturers prefer at times the machinery manufactured in Sweden or possibly at other times they buy from Sweden because our own establishments are too busy to fill their orders.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Have they ever refused orders in Canada ?

Mr. MILLER. If not in that line, in many other lines.

Mr. J. D. REID. I was asking about that particular item.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know, but in many other lines they have. But if in our young and rapidly developing country, our manufacturers find themselves compelled to purchase machinery from other countries to build up their enterprises, those purchases will produce wealth in years to come and therefore no loss is caused to the country.

Much has been said of the financial stringency. Well, our people may congratulate themselves that the financial stringency in Canada is not greater than it is. I find that while Sir George Drummond, the president of the Bank of Montreal, has alluded to the great stringency in the United States to-day as a conflagration, he says that in Canada we have no such evidence of stringency as exists in the neighbouring republic. True some of our stocks have depreciated in value, but take, for instance, our loan companies, if the stocks in these companies have dropped in one or two cases in the Canadian stock markets a few points during the past six months, in other cases they are quoted higher to-day than they were two months ago. Our bank stocks have decreased a few points, but only a few points ; and it is a matter for congratulation and an evidence of the solidity of our institutions that American citizens, all along our border line, have been bringing their savings and hoardings across the line to deposit in Canadian banks, for the simple reason that they have much more confidence in our monetary institutions than in their own. I was reading to-night in the 'Candian Manufacturer and Industrial World,' a magazine published in the city of Toronto, in the interests of industrial enterprises, and I find in its issue of Novem-

ber 15, 1907, notices of some fifty new factories and manufacturing industries being established in Canada or enlarging their output by the erection of large additions. And in counting the number, I left out of the reckoning the large number of mining companies which have been installing mining machinery.

The Bank of Montreal held its annual meeting in Montreal yesterday, and I would like to read to the pessimistic gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt), who has favoured us with his views to-night, some of the statements made at that meeting. Mr. Clouston, the general manager and vice president of the Bank of Montreal, said :

The stringency is largely the result of universal prosperity, and as a natural consequence the world has been spending more and saving less. This state of affairs will cure itself by retrenchment. When it comes suddenly, as it usually does, it brings many hardships, but we will eventually reach a much better and sounder basis, though the process may be, in the meantime, somewhat unpleasant. Still, in Canada, where we have been exceptionally prosperous for several years, we can stand a temporary reverse without serious consequences, and I do not look for a reaction on anything like the scale which we experienced in previous epochs.

Again, at the same meeting, Mr. Clouston said :

Owing to the lateness of the crop in the Northwest, the approaching closing of lake navigation, and the fact that a considerable portion of the wheat was low grade, a fear was expressed in some quarters that sufficient funds would not be forthcoming to satisfy the abnormal pressure to move the crop promptly.

The hon. member for Brantford attached a good deal of blame to the Minister of Finance because he had offered to assist the banks in supplying money to carry on the business of the country, and particularly to move the grain. But Mr. Clouston does not make such criticism nor do we observe from his lips such censure. He says :

To meet this, the government asked the banks to co-operate with them in assisting the export of wheat as rapidly as possible. The joint action has had the desired effect; the crop is now being forwarded in a normal way, and there are buyers for all grades of wheat in the market. There is one factor in the condition of affairs in the Northwest which must not be lost sight of, and that is the large amount of low grade wheat in this year's crop, making it a much more risky one for exporters to handle.

So, while the hon. member for Brantford criticises the Minister of Finance for offering to assist the banks as he did, the manager of the greatest bank in Canada, and our largest monetary institution, gives praise where the hon. gentleman casts blame. And Sir George Drummond, president of the bank, says :

Here in Canada we have escaped most, if not all, of the troubles of our neighbours. The collapse in stocks has, no doubt, affected many investors, but beyond a certain tightening of the money market and advancing interest, I see no evidence of serious ill effects. The banks have been acting with caution and reserve, which is eminently proper with a conflagration raging next door; but, as the detailed review which follows will show, consumptive demand has been good, and the excellent business of the early part of the year has shown little abatement up to the present time.

And again, he says :

The general state of trade I believe to be sound, and if we have reached a period of pause, if the pendulum is to swing back somewhat, there is no reason to believe that the recoil will be severe or protracted. The large emigration we are now receiving, the opening of new territory by railway construction, give reasonable assurance of continued commercial progress, while our financial and banking methods are so sound and conservative as to mitigate, when they cannot altogether prevent, the severities of the natural law of reaction.

And Sir Wm. Van Horne, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, has recently stated, that, in his opinion, the present stringency was but a temporary thing, and would be of short duration. So, in the face of the gloomy outlook of the hon. member for Brantford, it is cheering to know that our monetary institutions, our financiers, our writers of financial articles and editors of financial papers, attach no blame whatever to the Canadian government because of the temporary stringency that exists. And it seems to me that a man can scarcely be deemed a patriot, a man can scarcely be said to be rendering good service to his country, in magnifying the financial stringency and making out that times are worse than others find them to be. It would almost appear—I do not make the accusation, but I do say that if the hon. member for Brantford is not more careful than he has been to-night, he will lead us to believe that he would hail with joy and delight an era of soup kitchens, a period of hard times and depression. The hon. gentleman made another statement to which I take exception and it is this : He says that Canada has not much land left. I see sitting opposite to me the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), and I am sure that that hon. gentleman could assure us, and could convince the hon. member for Brantford, that we have yet millions of acres of land, fertile and attractive land, which we can give as homesteads to good settlers from any part of the world. And again I say that a man is not a patriot, he is not a true friend of his country, he is doing bad advertising for Canada, when he tells the world, as the hon. member for Brantford has done, that we have but little land left with which to provide homes for the settlers who come from those countries from which we invite immigration.

The hon. member for Brantford has told us that he was with his leader (Mr. R.

L. Borden) in the west ; and he also told us that he is not a high protectionist. It is true, no doubt, that the hon. member was with his leader in the west ; it is equally true that we did not find him talking high protection or increase of duties when he was on that western tour. If the hon. member is not a high protectionist, I would like to know when he was converted, and under what influence that conversion was brought about. I remember that he took part in the debate on the Budget in the last session of parliament, and I made hasty, but correct, extracts from his speech on that occasion, and I will inflict them upon the House. He said :

I look upon a 20 per cent tariff as a very moderate tariff. I think that should have been increased on the bulk of agricultural implements and not diminished.

I would like to know whether the hon. member for Brantford on that western tour when he talked to the farmers of Saskatchewan and Alberta told them as he told this House last session that he though a 20 per cent tariff was a very moderate tariff and that it should have been increased on the bulk of agricultural implements and not diminished. Again he said :

Then why should we jeopardize the $500,000,000 of capital embarked in these manufacturing industries in order to give a very slight advantage to the agriculturist?

Did he tell the farmers of Alberta and Saskatchewan that it was a shame and a disgrace to jeopardize the $500,000,000 of capital embarked in the business of manufacturing, that the agriculturists might be benefited ? Who is this agriculturist whom he holds in such light esteem and for whom he has so little consideration ? The man who came into the forest of these older provinces, hewed down the trees, drained the swamps, gathered the stones from the fields, and tilled the soil and made the highways ; the farmer who went into the Northwest when that country was but a buffalo pasture and made for himself a home—this is the man for whom the hon. gentleman has so little sympathy that he thinks nothing should be done to give him even a slight advantage. And yet I will say for the hon. member for Brantford that he has been more honest in his speeches than some of his colleagues in this House. I remember when last session the duty on agricultural implements was reduced from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent some speakers on the Conservative side said tnere would be no resulting advantage to the farmer. But the hon. member for Brantford admitted that there would be a benefit for the farmer, even though he thought that benefit should not have been given. He said :

I doubt whether it will give him an advantage of more than $2.50 on a mower or a reaper, and for that you jeopardize an important Canadian industry. It is a retrograde step. This country has gone too far in the direction of adequate protection to home industries to take such a retrograde step towards free trade.

Nice language for a man who is not a high protectionist. And again, from the same speech :

I may say that I think most of the reductions are not well advised in a general way. I think that any reductions that have been made would have been better not made, and that in some instances there should have been an increase where the reduction has been made.

Again I ask, is that the speech with which the hon. member favoured his audiences in Alberta and Saskatchewan ? I point out that it has been said of the leader of the opposition that in framing his platform, every plank was left with a loop-hole, every declaration with a way of escape, that he was prepared to sail with any breeze that blew. And I say the same of the rank and file of the Conservative party that follow him in this House.

When the hon. gentleman who just preceded me, the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), spoke in this House last session on the budget debate, and when he stood up as a man in favour of a higher tariff, as a man who did not believe that any consideration ought to be given to the poor agriculturists that would jeopardize the Canadian manufacturer, every man behind him on the opposition benches applauded to the echo and cheered him loudly. A little while afterwards, in the same session, another member of the same party occupying the same benches, got up and moved that the duty upon agricultural implements be reduced ten per cent. Is that not hypocrisy? The same gentlemen who cheered the hon. member for Brantford who said that no reduction ought to be made but rather an increase, cheered with equal vigour members from agricultural constituencies in the western provinces who moved for a reduction of the duty to ten per cent. I have no doubt but that those Conservative members from the rural constituencies who moved for a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements will go into the next general election and tell their constituents how they moved for a reduction in the duty, but the wicked Grits helped to vote it down.

Again, I was amazed as well as surprised when I heard the hon. gentleman from Brantford speaking with a great deal of sympathy and consideration for the United States ports; he said there was a danger that the United States ports would suffer a loss of revenue because of the provisions of the French treaty, inasmuch as the Grand Trunk Railway, under that treaty, would not be able to bring the goods in by way of Portland and the American lines would not be able to bring in goods from

France. And because American ports might lose something to Canadian ports, and the Canadian ports might be built up at the expense of American ports, this gentleman was full of sorrow and regret. I had thought he was a better Canadian than that; I had thought that it would be for him a subject of pride that Canadian ports should be built up, and I was astonished to see his sympathy go out to Portland and other ports in the United States.

But of all the dishonest utterances of the hon. member to-night, I refer to his attempted deception, let me say, to his foolish and silly attempt to deceive this House as to what the Prime Minister said about the cost of building the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I am pleased and glad when hon. members of the opposition get up and make such absurd statements, and when they adduce such absurd arguments in an endeavour to convince the people of the truth of such foolish statements as the hon. gentleman was unwise enough to make to-night. He said, and he was applauded and cheered when he repeated, that the Prime Minister had stated emphatically and without any qualification that the whole cost of building the Grand Trunk Pacific would be $13,000,000. I was astonished when he made the statement, and I was astonished when the leader of the opposition and others on the Conservative side of the House applauded him as he made the statement; a statement which he and they knew to be not only absurd, but to be altogether aside from facts. The hon. gentleman was guilty to-night of separating from their context a few words of a speech in an endeavour to make us believe that he was quoting fairly from that speech. Surely it is not an honest thing; surely it is not a right thing; surely it is a think unworthy of any member of this House to garble an extract that he is reading from a speech. He was reading from the 'Hansard' and endeavouring to prove that the Prime Minister had said that the total cost of the construction of that road would be $13,000,000. I sent for the 'Hansard' and obtained it a few minutes later. I have not had an opportunity of reading the whole of the Prime Minister's speech, but turning to the page from which the hon. member from Brantford read, I find these words:

> Now what is the disposition for the prairie section? The disposition with regard to the prairie section is that the company shall pay interest from the issue of the bonds; the government will pay no interest at all upon the prairie section. Now, sir, what is the liability incurred by the government for the construction of this road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean? Assuming that the road across the mountains——

That is the mountain section, and the Prime Minister said:

> Assuming that the road across the mountains is 600 miles long, the cost of construction will be $18,000,000.

That is the mountain section alone. And yet the member for Brantford endeavours to make us believe that the Prime Minister said that the cost of construction of the whole road would be $13,000,000. Again upon the same page, and in the very same paragraph from which the hon. gentleman made his quotation, I read these words:

> When completed, the company will lease the road and will pay to us a rental at the rate of three per cent per annum upon the cost of construction, whatever that may be.

Yet the hon. member makes this attempt to deceive the House. Further:

> The sum total of the money to be paid by the government——
>
> By the government.:
>
> —for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, and not a cent more.

A plain statement of the liability of this country. The cost to this government will be $12,000,000 or $13,000,000. After the Prime Minister had read the agreement and defined the bargain every person who listened to him knew that only for the interest upon certain sections of the road for a certain period of years would this country be liable. The Prime Minister said that this interest for this period of years would amount to $12.000,000 or $13,000,000. Sir, it is hard for us to conceive how any man with sufficient intelligence and honesty to represent a Canadian constituency should endeavour to deceive us to-night as the hon. member for Brantford endeavoured to do. I say that after that it will be difficult for the hon. member to influence the minds, the thoughts or the convictions of people in the House or out of it.

The hon. member went on to say: The party to which I belong never opposed the construction of that road. It would not have objected to build another line or two other lines; it was simply a difference in the method of construction. Aye, you can readily believe that there would have been a difference in the method of construction. When he uses these words and says there would have been a difference in the method of construction, our minds go back to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway upon which they pride themselves. The Prime Minister yesterday gave credit to the Conservative party for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but he was careful to say that if the Reform government had constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway they would have constructed it more economically than it was constructed by the people who built it. Yes, there would have been a difference in the method

of construction, I should think so. We go back and we remember that while, as the Prime Minister said, the total cost to this country of the Grand Trunk Pacific would be $13,000,000, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, a Conservative government gave to that company $25,000,000 in cash, a completed part of the railway valued at $33,000,000, and 25,000,000 acres of land worth $75,000,000; and an iniquitous provision of the contract was that no part of the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be subject to taxation at any time while the world stands, and that they also permitted material for the construction and building of the Canadian Pacific Railway to come into this country free of duty.

In conclusion, we have before us the amendment of the hon. gentleman that he seeks to present to this House in connection with the speech from the Throne. He has spoken of the bad business practices, he has spoken of financial stringency and the management of many matters that had escaped the attention of the person by whom the speech from the Throne was constructed. In this whole debate it seems to me that all that any one being friendly to the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier could have desired would have been that the Canadian people could have been accommodated in these galleries, that they could have seen and beheld the difference in the character, talents and abilities of the leaders of the two parties and could have listened to-day to the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. I trust that the time will never come when soup kitchens will prevail in Canada. I am not, unlike the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), going to undertake to prophesy, but there is one prophecy that I do feel like making and that is that unless we have more statesmanship and business ability than we have had displayed in this debate by our friends on the Conservative side of the House there will be a party in the soup after the next general election and it will not be the party following the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

On motion of Mr. Clements the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 4, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. How many miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway are under construction between Winnipeg and Edmonton, and west of Edmonton, respectively?

2. How many miles east of Winnipeg?

3. What is the estimated cost of grading, tracklaying and ballasting, including cost of ties and rails, on the portions let between Winnipeg and Edmonton, Edmonton and the coast, and Winnipeg and Moncton, respectively?

4. What is the ascertained mileage from Moncton to Winnipeg, Winnipeg to Edmonton, and Edmonton to the coast, respectively?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. 800 miles between Winnipeg and Edmonton. None west of Edmonton.

2. 860 miles.

3. $18,400,000 between Winnipeg and Edmonton, $60,700,000 between Edmonton and the coast, $41,946,258 between Winnipeg and Moncton (this amount includes engineering and contingencies).

4. 1807·4 miles from Moncton to Winnipeg, 800 miles from Winnipeg to Edmonton, 940 miles from Edmonton to the coast.

The mileage from Edmonton to the coast has not been submitted to the department by the Grand Trunk Pacific, so that the mileage on that section is approximate, being merely taken from the preliminary surveys.

RESIGNATION OF HON. CHARLES S. HYMAN.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. When did the Honourable Chas. Hyman leave active control of the Public Works Department?

2. What is the date of his first resignation of the office of Minister of Public Works?

3. To what period after his first resignation has he been paid as Minister of Public Works, and what amount has been paid him in salary and expenses, respectively?

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

1. December 4, 1906.

2. 19th November, 1906.

3. The answer is as follows:—I informed the House last year that Hon. Chas. S. Hyman, on the 19th of November, had offered his resignation, but that I had declined to accept it, advising him to try to recuperate his health. Whilst I was in Europe, I received the following letter from Mr. Hyman forwarded from Ottawa:—

Oakland, Cal., May 22, 1907.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—When at your kindly expressed request I wired a withdrawal of my resignation as Minister of Public Works, I had confident hope that the improvement in my health would have permitted an early return to the duties of my department. In the interval which has passed, though at times much improved, at no time has it been possible for me to take up any serious work, and in the past few weeks I regret to say complications resulting from my continued ill-health have become manifest and, though now incipient, threaten to become chronic, with most serious results, in an endeavour to pre-

vent which I am compelled to immediately leave on an extended ocean voyage.

Under these circumstances, conscious of the disability under which my colleagues have laboured owing to my long absence from departmental work, the indefinite time of my possible return, and the necessity of permitting my successor to assume the duties of the department at an early date in preparation for the next session of parliament, deeply as I regret the decision, I must perforce again respectfully request your acceptance of my resignation of the portfolio of Public Works.

May I once more reiterate my great appreciation of your own and my colleagues' kindness during the time that I have been a member of your government, and again express my sincere good wishes for your personal and political welfare.

I remain, my dear Sir Wilfrid,
Faithfully yours,
(Sgd.) C. S. HYMAN.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Ottawa.

To this letter I replied as follows :—

Grand Hotel Royal, Milan, June 12, 1907.

My dear Hyman,—I am at this moment in receipt of your letter of May 22, tendering me again your resignation as Minister of Public Works.

I feel that under the circumstances detailed in your letter that there is nothing for me to do now but to comply with your request. The reasons which you set forth admit of no other course.

Immediately on my return to Ottawa, about July 20, I will see that the matter be made official.

With the sincere hope that you will be able, at no distant date, to recover your usual state of health, believe me as ever, my dear Hyman,
Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

The Honourable Chas. S. Hyman,
Oakland, California, U.S.A.

When I returned to Ottawa on the 22nd of July, His Excellency the Governor General was in the maritime provinces. Immediately on his return I communicated to him the fact of Hon. Mr. Hyman's resignation. His Excellency was pleased to accept it, and Mr. Hyman's successor was appointed and sworn in on August 29. On that date, Mr. Hyman's connection with the department ceased, and he was paid up to that date at the rate of $7,000 per annum ; no expenses.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company from the beginning of its service up to June 30, 1906?

2. What amount, if any, has been paid since?

3. Are there any claims still outstanding? If so, to what amount?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. $306,011.02.

2. $61,234.83.

3. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What are dates of the orders given for the manufacture of Ross rifles for the government, the number ordered, and the number delivered in each case; and the dates of delivery?

2. What payments have been made on each order, and the dates of the same?

3. What is the total number delivered to date and the total payments made?

4. What number is yet to be delivered on each order?

5. On what certification, and by whom given, were the several payments made?

6. Has any interest been charged by the government on advances made to the Ross Rifle Company?

7. Do the advances cover anything except money actually expended by the contractor upon the rifles or parts or fixtures thereof? If so, what?

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

1. (a) Dates of orders, number ordered, and number delivered, as follows :

Order.		No. delivered on order.
Mar. 27, 1902, for delivery calendar year, 1903,..	12,000	12,000
Nov. 22, 1904, for delivery before July 1, 1905.....	12,000	12,000
Nov. 22, 1904, for delivery before Jan. 1, 1906.....	8,000	8,000
For delivery calendar year 1906.....	10,000	500*
Sept. 24, 1906, for delivery calendar year 1907.....	10,000	*
	52,000	32,000
Balance to be delivered.....		19,500

* Time for delivery of balance extended by order in council of July 27, 1907, to January 1, 1908.

* Time for delivery of whole order extended by order in council of July 27, 1907, to June 1, 1908.

(b) The dates of the deliveries as follows :

August,	1905.....	1,000
October,	"	3,000
December,	"	2,000
February,	1906.....	1,000
March,	"	1,000
April,	"	2,000
May,	"	1,000
June,	"	2,000
July,	"	2,000
August,	"	1,000
September,	"	1,000
October,	"	2,000
November,	"	1,000
December,	"	2,000
January,	1907.....	2,000
February,	"	1,000
April,	"	2,000
June,	"	1,000
August,	"	500
September,	"	1,300
October,	"	2,100
November,	"	600
		32,500

This does not give whole of November ; it was impossible to get delivery.

(c) In addition to the above the undermentioned orders were given :

Marine Department, 500 carbines, delivered in 1904.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 1,000 carbines, delivered 1905.

Justice Department, 12.

2. Payments made on each order given by Department of Militia and Defence.

Advances.			Final Payments.	
	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.
		$ cts.		$ cts.
Order, March 27, 1902.	March 26, 1903	25,000 00	August 26, 1905	6,250 00
			October 2, 1905	6,250 00
	August, 5, 1903	37,971 92	" 17, 1905	6,250 00
			" 30, 1905	6,250 00
	February, 24, 1904	25,000 00	December 12, 1905	6,250 00
			January 4, 1906	6,250 00
	March 5, 1904	33,703 88	February 27, 1906	6,250 00
			March 27, 1906	6,250 00
	March 12, 1904	40,558 60	April 16, 1906	6,250 00
			June 20, 1906	6,250 00
	July 26, 1904	60,000 00	July 13, 1906	6,250 00
			August 2, 1906	6,250 00
	"	2,568 11		
Order, Nov. 22, 1904.	February 24, 1905	77,020 90	May 8, 1906	6,250 00
			" 22, 1906	6,250 00
	April 20, 1905	64,422 66	August 14, 1906	6,250 00
			September 18, 1906	6,250 00
	June 17, 1905	59,929 74	October 12, 1906	6,250 00
			" 24, 1906	6,250 00
	August 26, 1905	75,839 19	November 14, 1906	6,250 00
			" 29, 1906	6,250 00
	October 28, 1905	73,140 18	December 14, 1906	6,250 00
			" 24, 1906	6,250 00
	December 7, 1905	24,647 33	January 15, 1907	6,250 00
			" 31, 1907	6,250 00
			February 21, 1907	6,250 00
			April 6, 1907	6,250 00
			March 28, 1907	6,250 00
			July 10, 1907	6,250 00
			August 31, 1907	3,125 00
			September 14, 1907	625 00
			" 14, 1907	625 00
			" 18, 1907	2,500 00
			" 19, 1907	625 00
			" 23, 1907	1,250 00
			" 26, 1907	1,250 00
			October 3, 1907	1,250 00
			" 4, 1907	1,250 00
			" 9, 1907	625 00
			" 12, 1907	1,875 00
			" 16, 1907	1,875 00
			" 24, 1907	1,250 00
			" 25, 1907	1,250 00
			" 30, 1907	3,750 00
			November 6, 1907	1,250 00
1906 Order.	February 27, 1906	31,016 53	" 15, 1907	1,875 00
	April 27, 1906	49,748 36	" 18, 1907	1,875 00
	July 17, 1906	70,562 49		
	August 22, 1907	36,172 62		
Order, Sept. 24, 1906.	November 3, 1906	53,362 37		
	December 20, 1906	32,578 67		
	September 19, 1907	52,377 06		
	October 1, 1907	45,906 21		
		970,526 82		203,125 00

3. The total number delivered as follows :

To the Militia Department.. ..		32,500
" Marine "		500
" Justice "		12
" N. W. M. P..		1,000
		34,012

The total payment made, $1,173,651.82 (advances $970,526.82, final payments $203,-125). This total only represents payments made on rifles ordered by the Department of Militia and Defence.

4. On the order for 1906, 9,500 rifles are yet to be delivered. On the order for 1907, 10,000 rifles are yet to be delivered.

5. 'Advances' on certificate of chartered accountant approved by the minister in accordance with the terms of the contract.

Final payments on certificate of the inspector of small arms approved by the deputy minister.

6. No.

7. No.

*The progress estimate upon which the last advance was paid was on October 1, was supported by an inventory by the government accountant, giving in detail the quantities of each component part of the rifle, then in the company's factory and whether finished, partly finished or raw material. This inventory shows that practically all the parts required to complete the rifles remaining undelivered under the contract were on hand and the greater portion of them finished.

The progress estimate of the government accountant also shows the amounts paid for superintendence and labour, material and other expenses.

THE SUB-TARGET COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What orders have been given for machines to the Sub-target Company, what were the dates of the orders, what number of machines have been delivered, and what amounts paid therefor ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). A contract was made with the Sub-Target Gun Company on June 30, 1904, for two hundred sub-target guns, and on July 21, 1906, an order was given for 250 more.

The whole 450 have been delivered and the total amount paid therefor is $112,349.50.

GOVERNMENT AID FOR THE MOVING OF WHEAT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What arrangements, if any, were made by the Minister of Finance in conjunction with or through banks, to provide funds for the moving of wheat from the west?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The arrangements referred to are to a considerable degree confidential, and could not at present be made public. I am satisfied it would not be in the public interest that they should be disclosed at present, but at an early day full information will be furnished to the House.

CLASSIFICATION OF LIGHTHOUSES IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked (Translation) :

1. Is it the intention of the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries: to have a classification made of the different lighthouses in the province of Quebec ?

2. To increase the salaries of the lighthouse keepers ?

3. To increase the allowances of the captains of the floating lighthouses?

4. If so, does he intend to have such classification and increases done this session, with retroactive effect for the season just closed?

L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation). The answer to the first question of the member is yes. As to questions 2, 3 and 4, I must say that they are actually under consideration.

INSPECTORS FOR MEATS AND CANNED GOODS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. How many inspectors have been appointed up to the present time to carry out the regulations in connection with the Meats and Canned Goods Bill ?

2. What are the names of the inspectors and their respective salaries per annum ?

3. How many inspectors will be required to carry out the regulations when thoroughly established over the whole Dominion ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. 46 veterinary inspectors and 17 lay inspectors. In addition, 5 of our former veterinary employees and 5 new men have been appointed for special temporary service.

2. I will have to lay the information on the table, as I cannot read so long a return.

3. It is impossible to tell at the present time. Necessary appointments will be made as the work develops.

STEAMER STANLEY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Is the steamer 'Stanley' ready for the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?

2. Is it the intention of the government to place the steamer 'Stanley' on the western route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine? If so, are preparations being made for that purpose with the view of taking up that service immediately on withdrawal of summer boats?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The steamer 'Stanley' has just arrived from Great Britain. It is necessary to

empty and refill boilers and slightly overhaul her on account of rough passage from Scotland; the 'Stanley' will be ready in a few days.

2. Owing to the accumulation of farm products at Charlottetown it is not possible in the public interest to place the steamer 'Stanley' on the western route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR REMOVAL OF CROPS.

Mr. PRINGLE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government arranged to assist the banks in financing for the removal of the crops in the west?
2. If so, what banks are receiving assistance and in what way?
3. Was this done at the request of the banks? If so, what banks?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would ask the House to accept the answer which I have already given to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in reply to question No. 11, as it covers precisely the same subject.

SALARY AND DUTIES OF MR. PERDUE, CHATHAM, ONTARIO.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

What salary was paid Dr. Perdue, veterinary, who is stationed at Chatham, Ontario, for the last twelve months, including all expenses, and what are his duties?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

M. B. Perdue, V.S., salary, 12 months to October 31, 1907	$1,400 00
Travelling Expenses	392 99
Total	$1,792 99

Dr. Perdue is an inspector under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, and his duties are to carry out the provisions of that Act and the regulations made thereunder.

In addition he has recently been appointed an inspector under the Meat and Canned Foods Act.

PAYMENT OF INCREASED PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

Have the increased subsidies, or any part thereof, provided for by the Imperial Act passed during the present year, been paid to the provinces of Canada entitled thereto under the said Act or to any of them? If so, to which of them?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). There is a question of the proper interpretation of the Act with respect to the province of Alberta and I am not quite sure at this moment—the matter has been engaging attention for the last day or two—what the conclusion is, but in respect to all the other provinces the subsidies have been paid. I anticipate that the matter with respect to Alberta, if it has not already been settled in the last few hours, will be without delay.

INVESTMENT OF TRUST FUNDS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What steps, if any, has the government taken for the purpose of authorizing investments of trust funds in the United Kingdom under the Imperial Colonial Stock Act of 1900 in inscribed stock of the provinces of Canada?
2. Was any action in that regard taken by the government at the Colonial Conference, or otherwise during the present year?
3. Has there been any correspondence between the government of Canada and the imperial government on that subject during the present year, and will such correspondence be brought down?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In regard to the first and third questions I beg to say that there has been no recent correspondence on the subject. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that there was no resolution of the Colonial Conference on the subject. I may say, however, that while in England, regarding the matter as one of very considerable importance, I discussed it very fully with the proper officer of the Imperial Treasury and presented the reasons which I thought should be presented in favour of the inclusion of that class of stocks in those available for the investment of trustee funds, but I was not able to obtain any definite answer.

MARCONI SYSTEM OF WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN—by Mr. Lennox—asked:

1. Is the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy across the Atlantic doing a regular commercial business?
2. Since what date has any such service been working?
3. What are the rates for such service?
4. Has the government exercised any regulation of such rates?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The department is informed by the Marconi Company that they are doing a regular commercial transatlantic press business for certain newspapers. Ordinary public messages will be taken shortly when all arrangements are completed.
2. Since the seventeenth October, 1907.
3. Government messages, ten cents; press messages, five cents per word.
4. Present rates are in accordance with the government contract with the company.

WATER RENTALS ON WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. LALOR asked:

1. Did the government appoint a commissioner to inquire into the water rents on the Welland canal and Welland canal feeder?

2. Who was the commissioner appointed?
3. Did the commissioner so appointed make a report?
4. Has any settlement been offered to those in arrears of water rents?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1 and 2. Yes ; Honourable Justice James Henry Madden, was appointed by order in council, May 15, 1907, to investigate and report upon the matter of arrears for rentals on certain leases at Dunnville—Welland canal.

3. Yes.

4. No, the report has not yet been dealt with, and is now under consideration.

SQUATTERS WITHIN RIDING MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. What action, if any, has been taken by the government in reference to the squatters within the Riding mountain timber reserve?
2. Have the half-breeds located at Clearwater lake, township 19, range 19, west meridian, been notified to vacate their present holdings? If so, what disposition is to be made of them?
3. When are the lands that were taken out of the Riding mountain timber reserve by the new Forestry Bill, to be thrown open for homesteading?
4. Have any of these lands been entered for already?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. On the 30th of April last the forest ranger in charge of the Riding mountain reserve was given instructions to serve notice on all persons located in the reserve that unless they could establish title to the lands upon which they were located they would be required to remove from the reserve. Those who held legal title to the lands, those who were located prior to the reserve having been first set apart on the 13th of July, 1895, and those whose occupation was given some recognition by their being granted the right to purchase or enter for land were to be negotiated with for removal, their rights being given full recognition. Persons who had squatted without any right or authority were to be removed but might be allowed homesteads elsewhere if they had been any length of time in residence. The report of the forest ranger has not yet been received, but is expected shortly.

2. Yes. It is proposed to remove them from the reserve, but to provide them with homesteads elsewhere.

3. They will not be opened for homestead entry until an investigation into the rights of squatters upon such lands has been completed.

4. Entries have been granted to persons who have established squatters' rights.

Mr. LALOR.

NUMBER OF FRENCH IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many French immigrants came into Canada during the fiscal year 1906-7?
2. What was the amount of expenditure for French immigration during the season of 1906-7?

Hon. FRANK **OLIVER** (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 1,314 3rd class. Account not kept of 1st and 2nd.

2. It is impossible to absolutely separate the cost of promoting French immigration from the expenses incurred because of other immigration, but on a fair apportionment about $10,000 might reasonably be charged against French immigration.

NUMBER OF BELGIAN IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many Belgian immigrants came into Canada during the fiscal year of 1906-7?
2. What amount of expenditure for Belgian immigration has been made during the fiscal year of 1906-7?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 650 3rd class. Account not kept of 1st and 2nd.

2. It is impossible to absolutely separate the costs of promoting Belgian immigration from the expenses incurred because of other immigration, but on a fair apportionment, about $4,500 might reasonably be charged against Belgian immigration.

IMPROVEMENTS AT PORT OF QUEBEC.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What sums have been expended by the government, since confederation, for improvements in the port of Quebec, such as elevators, dredgings, basins, wharfs, sheds, &c.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). My hon. friend will see that this inquiry involves an examination of the accounts of all the expenditure at the port of Quebec for forty years, and I would suggest as to whether it would not be better to put the matter in the shape of a motion for a return.

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

INCREASE OF FRENCH IMMIGRATION.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Since January 1, 1906, has the government come to any arrangements with the French agencies to facilitate the increase of French immigration?
2. What are those arrangements?
3. Has the government, since January 1, 1907, appointed any new immigration agents in France?
4. What are the names of such agents? Since when have they entered upon their duties? What is the amount of their salaries?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. Three additional agents have been sent to assist Mr. Wiallard, who is directing the work from Paris; arrangements have been made for a large distribution of literature and an active personal canvas, and the interest and services of the following shipping firms and their agents throughout France have been enlisted: Messrs. Currie & Co., 2, rue Pleuvry, Havre and Paris; Pitt & Scott, Paris; and Hernu, Perron & Co., Paris. These firms and their numerous country agents work on commission, receiving bonuses of ten shillings and five shillings per capita respectively on their bookings to Canada of adults and minors under 18, provided the persons booked are bona fide immigrants belonging to the following classes: Farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway surfacemen, navvies, or miners, who signify their intention of following farming or railway construction work in Canada, and female domestic servants.

3. Yes.

4. (a) R. Brutinel, (b) Charles Vauriot.

(c) Arthur Geoffrion.

(a) 24th May, 1907. (b) 1st January, 1907.

(c) 26th October, 1907.

(a) $75 per month (temporary engagement).

(b) $100 per month (temporary engagement).

(c) $2,000 a year.

IMMIGRANTS DEPORTED, &c.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What is the number of immigrants deported during the fiscal years of 1905-6 and 1906-7?

2. What is the number of immigrants who reached and settled in Canada during the fiscal years of 1905-6 and 1906-7, and from what countries did they come?

3. How many children under twelve years of age came into Canada during the said years?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Fiscal year 1905-6—524 rejected at the ports and 137 deported after admission. Fractional fiscal year (nine months) 1906-7—440 rejected at the ports and 201 deported after admission.

2. Fiscal year 1905-6—189,064. Fractional fiscal year 1906-7 (nine months) ending March 31, 1907—Lists of nationalities attached.

3. Fiscal year 1905-6—37,503. Fractional fiscal year 1906-7—24,173.

DRILL HALLS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. How many drill halls have been constructed or are under construction by the government since 1896?

2. In what localities have these buildings been constructed, and what is the cost of construction in each case?

3. What military organizations exist in the respective localities in which these drill halls have been erected, and what is the numerical strength of each such military organization?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Worthington) that this should be put in the shape of a motion for a return as well as it involves considerable work and the answer could not be ready within a day or two at all events.

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

THE ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Are any negotiations now pending, or have any negotiations been under consideration, between the government or any member thereof, with the Vickers Maxim Company, or any representative thereof, or any other company or firm, regarding the sale, transfer, or other disposition of the contract of the Ross Rifle Company to the Vickers Maxim Company, or other company?

2. Has there been any change in the composition or personnel of the Ross Rifle Company since its contract with the government was made? If so, what is the nature of the changes?

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

1. No negotiations are pending nor under consideration between the government or any member thereof and the Vickers Maxim Company, or any representative thereof, or any other company or firm, regarding the sale, transfer, or other disposition of the contract of the Ross Rifle Company to the Vickers Maxim Company or other companies.

2. The composition of the personnel of the Ross Rifle Company is not under the control of the Militia Department, and the department has never been notified that any changes have taken place.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. E. D. SMITH asked:

What is the maximum and what the minimum rate of duty on each of the articles admitted into France from Canada at the minimum rate under the proposed treaty?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It would be hardly convenient to give the information in the form of an answer to a question, but a paper is being prepared on the subject and will be brought down at an early day.

CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. DUBEAU asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to amend the Inland Revenue Act, so as to still

more encourage the use of Canadian tobacco in our manufacturing industry?

2. If so, when does it purpose introducing such amendments ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). This matter is at present under consideration.

TIMBER PERMITS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. What was the object of passing the order in council of the 16th May, 1906, permitting permits to be granted to sawmill owners for cutting timber?

2. When was this order in council rescinded in whole or in part, and why ?

3. How many permits were granted under this order in council, and to whom?

4. How much timber was cut under these permits?

5. How many applications were refused ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. It was intended to provide a supply of lumber where it was available and was immediately and locally required. Permits are not to be granted to holders of license berths and only to owners of small mills which are to be located in each case on the tract covered by the permit and must be in operation within three months of the date of the granting of the permit. The lumber must be sold to settlers and not put in general trade.

2. It was rescinded by order in council of February 19, 1907. but this order re-enacted it in practically the same terms. This order in council was passed in order to cover by a general order all permits granted in a similar way including those for mining timber, cordwood, &c., and provide similar procedure in dealing with the permits.

3. Under the orders in council of May 16, 1906, and February 19, 1907, thirty-two permits have issued as follows:

R. J. Ferguson, Isaac Gagnon, W. W. Channell, Thomas Quigley, H. Meyer & Co., J. A. L. McDougall, John Marchanski, D. Black, J. H. Wood, Dr. H. L. McInnes, F. C. Papineau, Wm. J. McIntyre, Thomas Fulton, A. D. McDiarmid, J. H. Thompson, James Alcorn, R. A. McDonald, Joseph Fisher, C. R. Kuinee, Felix Bordeleau, Alex. Hodgins, D. C. Tyler, Canadian Society of Equity, R. J. Schell, J. E. Guilbeault, B. M. Pratt, R. T. Telford, Chas. Stubbs, Arthur G. Spooner, J. F. Meier, Samuel J. Templeton, B. B. Thompson.

4. Returns so far received show 2,042,316 feet board measure.

5. It will be necessary to examine a number of files in this connection and it has been found impossible to furnish the information to-day. I would ask my hon. friend to move for a return.

ROYAL GRAIN COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. Has the Royal Grain Commission made any report? If not, when is it expected that the report will be made ?

2. When will said report be laid before parliament ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Only a portion of the report has as yet been received. It will be laid before the House as soon as received in complete form.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. How many special immigration agents did the Dominion government send to Great Britain, also the Continent of Europe, for immigration purposes, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907, and how long was each agent employed ?

2. What were their names and post office addresses ?

3. What were the salaries and expenses of each ?

4. Were reports received by the government from each of the aforesaid agents, and will the government lay these reports upon the table of the House?

5. How many immigrants have come to Canada at the instance of the aforesaid agents, and what were the respective numbers for each agent ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1, 2 and 3. Thirty-five as per list below.

4. Yes. Yes, if moved for.

5. In the large number of immigrants coming it is not possible to say how many come at one instance or another.

Name.	Address.	Length of Employment.	Salary.	Expenses.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
P. M. Robinson	Pilot Mound, Man	3 months	300 00	449 48
A. D. Campbell	Austin, Man	3 months and 19 days	361 75	442 32
J. H. Gunn	Inkster, Man	2 months	200 00	238 09
T. Embleton	Gilbert Plains, Man	3 months	300 00	315 23
R. Beatty	Melfort, Sask	3 months and 9 days	331 18	465 12
W. D. Goulden	Yorkton, Sask	2 months and 4 days	312 90	257 50
Dr. M. Clark	Olds, Alta	3 months	300 00	475 01
Rice Sheppard	Strathcona, Alta	3¼ months	325 00	490 10

Name.	Address.	Length of Employment.	Salary.	Expenses.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
J. Y. Young	Alameda	2 months and 25 days	280 64	338 55
Chas. Vouriot	St. Norbert, Man	3 months	300 00	321 22
Hugh McIntosh	Macleod, Alta	3 months and 6 days	325 05	380 06
A. Aylesworth	Newburg, Ont	3½ months	350 00	297 81
W. J. McNaughton	Lancaster, Ont	3 months and 4 days	317 52	304 51
E. W. Brewster	Compton, P.Q	3 months	300 00	304 62
A. C. McPhail	Brandon, Man	3 months	300 00	371 51
T. P. Spannier	Battleford, Sask	2 months	200 00	336 52
F. Furber	New Hillside, Sask	3 months	300 00	427 76
J. Kennedy	Edmonton, Alta	3 months and 11 days	341 07	410 98
W. R. Abbott	Maple Creek, Sask	2 months	200 00	189 11
G. L. Stewart	King, Ont	3 months	300 65	358 85
W. M. Baker	Woodstock, Ont	1 month	100 00	221 58
Jno. Fluker	Ft. Saskatchewan	3 months and 11 days	333 41	400 55
J. Fletcher	Ellerslie, Alta	3 months	300 00	308 65
A. E. Wilson	Indian Head	2 months	200 00	160 49
Mrs. Simpson Hayes	Winnipeg, Man		Allowance.	300 00
T. B. Willans	Neepawa	3 1-4 months	325 00	766 42
J. B. Flack	Oxbow			59 20
Rev. T. E. Burke	South Mountain	3 months and 6 days	319 37	338 49
Wm. Allen	Yorkton	1 month	100 00	56 30
Peter Rousay	Yorkton, Sask	2 months	100 00	
D. H. McColl	Elmwood, Man			85 20
J. J. McHugh	Calgary, Alta	1 month	100 00	237 87
Father Woodcutter	Winnipeg	4 months	333 32	712 12
J. B. Oakes	Wolfville, N. S.	3 months	300 00	379 72
A. Allen	Aubrey, P. Q.	3 months	300 00	330 17

TIMBER LICENSES CANCELLED.

Mr. LAKE asked:

What timber licenses have been cancelled by the government between May 1, 1905 and November 1, 1907, exclusive of such as have been voluntarily relinquished by the licensees, and what is the number of berth and name of former license holder?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

No. of Berth.	Licensee.
390	P. D. Tyerman
825	G. B. Housser
1,029	Armstrong & Rowland.
1,143	James & Otterbine
1,346	R. A. Westbrook

TIMBER LICENSES AND RENEWALS.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. How many timber licenses, including renewals affecting lands in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Keewatin have been issued by the Department of the Interior for the year commencing May 1, 1907?

2. What area in square miles do these licenses cover?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. To date there have been 316 renewals and 49 new licenses.

2. Renewals, 6,172·72 square miles; new licenses 229·76 square miles.

DREDGE 'MONTAGUE.'

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens) asked:

1. What amount of money has been paid on account of the dredge 'Montague' for purchase alterations and repairs, respectively, for the years 1905, 1906 and 1907, to date?

2. What was the contract price for construction of the dredge?

3. What amount was paid for supplies and wages in 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Payments in connection with dredge 'Montague' for the undermentioned fiscal years:

	1904-5	1905-6	1906-7	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Purchase (construction under contract)	37,510 00	6,905 00	4,935 00	49,350 00
Equipment, &c		4,755 77	3,565 76	8,321 53
Towing (Toronto to P. E. Island)			3,926 00	3,926 00
Alterations and repairs			3,423 42	3,423 42
	37,510 00	11,660 77	15,850 18	65,020 95
2 Contract price: $49,350.00.				
3 Working Expenses—				
Supplies			2,097 61	2,097 61
Wages of crew			3,449 02	3,449 02
Tug in attendance			2,689 59	2,689 59
			8,236 22	8,236 22

GOVERNMENT BOOM ON SAGUENAY.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. What companies or individuals made use of the government boom on the Saguenay river above Chicoutimi during the year 1906 ?
2. What amount did they each pay for the use of the boom ?
3. Did the Chicoutimi Pulp Company in accordance with its agreement, recoup to the government the excess of expenses over receipts in connection with this boom for the year 1906?
4. If not, why not ?
5. What companies or individuals made use of this boom during the season 1907 ?
6. Did the Chicoutimi Pulp Company use it in 1907 for all its logs on the Saguenay river?
7. If not what use did that company make of it ?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. La Compagnie de Pulpe de Chicoutimi and Jos. Vachon.
2. No payment made.
3. No.
4. The company claim that, as the boom was not fully completed till the month of September, they should not be held liable for the dues and the matter is still under discussion.
5. La Compagnie de Pulpe de Chicoutimi only.
6. and 7. Yes, for all logs coming by and below the Grande Décharge.

RURAL POSTMASTERS SALARIES.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

What increase in salaries has been given to the rural postmasters since last session ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister. There has been a change in the scale of payments under four headings, namely, salary, forward allowance, night allowance, rent, light and fuel.

Old scale.—Under the old scale, 40 per cent was allowed on the first $800 of revenue, 25 per cent on all over that amount up to $10,000, and 15 per cent on all over $10,000, with an additional 10 per cent increase. The minimum salary was $25.

New scale.—Under the new scale, 50 per cent is allowed on the first $1,000 of revenue, 30 per cent on all over $1,000 and up to $10,000, and 20 per cent on all over $10,000 of revenue, with a minimum salary of $35.

Forward Allowance.

Old scale.—Under the old scale, 10 per cent was allowed on the revenue of the offices for which direct forward duty was performed, and 5 per cent on the revenue of the offices for which indirect forward duty was performed, that is, where the forwarding was done through a second office, with an additional 10 per cent increase.

New scale.—Under the new scale, 12½ per cent is allowed on the revenue of the offices for which both direct and indirect forward duty is performed.

Night allowance.

Old scale.—When a postmaster was required to keep his office open after ten p.m. or before six a.m., he was granted an allowance under that head, according to the time employed and the amount of work done. The minimum allowance was $6, and the maximum, $60.

New scale.—Under the new scale, an allowance is paid for night duty when a postmaster is required to be on duty after nine p.m., or before seven a.m., the minimum allowance being $10 and the maximum, $100, according to the time employed and the work done.

Rent, light and fuel.—The allowance under this head has been increased by about 25 per cent.

GUELPH-GODERICH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. F. MACLAREN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General arranged with the Canadian Pacific Railway to establish a mail service on the Toronto, Guelph, Elmira and Goderich branch of their railway?
2. If so, when does it go into operation?
3. Will contracts be let by tender for carrying mail to and from the trains?

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

1. Yes. The Postmaster General has decided to inaugurate a postal car service on the Guelph and Goderich branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway.
2. The officials of the Post Office Department have been instructed to arrange the details as quickly as possible and the service will go into operation immediately such details have been arranged.
3. The contracts for carrying the mails to and from the trains will be let by tender.

THE STEAMER 'ARCTIC.'

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid on account of the steamer 'Arctic' for purchase, repairs, supplies and wages, respectively, for the following periods: Up to June 30, 1904; June 30, 1904, to June 30, 1905, to June 30 1906; June 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907; June 30, 1907, to date?
2. Who was the historian of the expedition, when was he appointed, at what salary, and how much has been paid him to date?
3. Was an inventory of all supplies on board ship taken on the return of the 'Arctic' in the autumn of 1905?
4. What was the value of fresh supplies put on board for the trip northward in 1906, and has the department an inventory thereof?
5. Was an inventory of all supplies on board taken on the return of the 'Arctic' in 1907?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. 1903-4—Purchase.	$70,000	00
Repairs	14,256	83
Supplies..	4,367	00
Wages....	2,986	49
Miscellaneous ...	1,502	00
	$93,112	42
1904-5—Repairs....	$ 31,055	46
Supplies....	112,050	50
Wages..	16,928	58
Miscellaneous.. ...	1,678	57
	$161,713	11
1905-6—Bal. purchase.. ..	$ 5,000	00
Repairs....	4,456	70
Supplies	12,813	06
Wages..	12,908	08
Miscellaneous.. ..	3,136	17
	$ 38,314	01
1906-7—Repairs..	$ 4,748	26
Supplies..	11,588	68
Wages..	13,357	07
Miscellaneous.. ..	3,003	70
	$32,697	70
1907-8—Supplies..	48	73
Wages..	22,350	48
Miscellaneous	223	25
	$ 22,622	46
	$348,459	70

2. Fabien Vanasse. Appointed Sept. 7, 1904, at $1,500 per annum. $4,808.33 has been paid him to date.

3. Yes.

4. $12,813.06. Yes.

5. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. When may we expect the history ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is being prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. Illustrated ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Minister of Justice to penitentiaries for the nine months ended March 31, 1907.—Mr. Jacques Bureau (Solicitor General).

DESTITUTE IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior a question. The following telegram has been sent to me by the mayor of the city of Toronto :

Three hundred Bulgarian immigrants just arrived and stranded in Toronto. Good class of labouring men, but destitute. City now feeding and housing them pro tem. Have wired Minister of Interior for instructions what to do with them. Please see him and urge immediate action.

I would like to ask the minister if he has received such a telegram, and what action if any he has taken or contemplates taking in the mattetr ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I have received no notice of what my hon. friend has read : but if he will hand me the telegram I shall be very glad to take action immediately.

BROCKVILLE-OTTAWA RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I rise to move that the House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. It is the question of improving the railway connection at Brockville, so that both passengers and mails from the west can reach Ottawa without delay.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has the hon. member leave to make the motion ?

The requisite number of members having arisen, leave to make the motion was granted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and the acting Postmaster General to the fact that to-day the mails arriving at Brockville by the day train leaving Toronto in the morning are pitched off on the platform and are allowed to remain there until the next morning, so that we cannot get any mail from any point east of Toronto on the same day that it leaves. Passengers can get through if the Grand Trunk Limited is on time. Last session we had first class railway connection at Brockville. The mail train leaving Toronto in the morning, on reaching Brockville, remained there until the Limited passed. It arrived at Brockville fifteen or twenty minutes before the time of the Canadian Pacific Railway leaving for Ottawa. Immediately after the session that araringement was broken up.

I wrote to the Railway Commission telling them that I thought it was their duty to see to it that proper railway connection was made at Brockville. I received a reply from the secretary, Mr. Cartwright, saying that the matter would be attended to. But I have heard nothing since, though it is some time since the complaint was filed. Shortly after the session closed I was on the platform at Brockville one day talking with the Ministetr of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), who I am sorry to say is not in the House at present. He had come in from Ottawa, intending to take the train going west. The Canadian Pacific Railway pulled out from Brockville a few minutes before the trains from the east and from the west came in. The Minister of Justice remarked to me: 'Is that not abominable?

That train leaves passengers and mails coming from both east and west and with no chance of getting them to Ottawa today. I asked him, when he returned to Ottawa, to call the attention of the Railway Commissioners to the matter. I had a conversation also with the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) at Brockville one day, and he told me that when he returned to Ottawa he would see Mr. Killam, the chairman of the Railway Commission, and have some arrangement made whereby passengers could make the connection at Brockville for Ottawa. The present Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) lives at Brockville and knows that what I am stating is a fact, and I hope that he or the government or the Railway Commission will see to it that proper connection is made. Lately, on the Tuesday before the opening of the present session, the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn), whom I do not see in his place at the moment, arrived in Brockville with his daughter by the train timed to reach Brockville at 2.30 p.m. The train was a few minutes late and as they came in they saw the train pulling out for Ottawa. The hon. gentleman and his daughter had to remain over night at Brockville. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and his wife came down the day before yesterday, reaching Brockville by the fast train. The train was a few moments late and the Canadian Pacific Railway train for Ottawa had left. The hon. gentleman and his wife went on, hoping to reach Ottawa by way of Cornwall or Coteau. When they got as far as Prescott station, they heard of an accident at Cardinal, so they had to take the bus to Prescott and remain there over night, coming to Ottawa in the morning. At present the Canadian Pacific Railway is timed to leave Brockville for Ottawa at 2.20 p.m. The Grand Trunk limited express from the west is timed to arrive at 2.30. The Canadian Pacific Railway, I understand, are willing to hold the train until 2.30 if there are passengers for Ottawa to arrive by the Grand Trunk, but if the limited is two or three minutes late—

Mr. HARTY. Yes, or one.

Mr. TAYLOR. —even one, perhaps—the Canadian Pacific Railway train pulls out. I do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway, as they have to make their connection with their through train from Chicago. But the Grand Trunk might just as well bring the passengers and mails to Brockville before 2.20 in order to make the connection for Ottawa. I think it is the duty of the government to see to it that passengers and mails are transferred. I cannot get my mail from home by the day train, and others who come from other points east of Toronto are in the same position. It comes to Brockville and remains over until next morning, when the local train brings it here. It seems to me that it is the duty of the government, the Railway Commission, or somebody, to take the railways by the throat and compel them to make proper connections for the delivery of passengers and mails at Ottawa. The train leaving Toronto at 7.45 is a merely local train, but carries passengers, mail and express. It might as well arrive at Brockville in plenty of time to make the present connection. They put the train back. It comes to Kingston and lays there for forty or fifty minutes. It might as well run to Brockville and make the connection for Ottawa. It appears to be a mere matter of ugliness on the part of the Grand Trunk. If necessary to make the connection they might as well leave Toronto fifteen or twenty minutes earlier.

Mr. BRODER. How about the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is practically the same time as last year.

Mr. BRODER. It was 2.45.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Canadian Pacific Railway may have changed its time to make the connection for Montreal, that being a through train. But what I contend for is that it should be possible for letters from points east of Toronto to reach Ottawa on the day of mailing, and it should be possible for members of parliament and others coming to Ottawa from these points to reach here by way of Brockville, arriving at five o'clock instead of being compelled to go around by Coteau, arriving here at midnight, or to remain over and come on next day. We should have the train connection that we had last year.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). There is no man who knows the situation in this matter better than the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham). He lives in Brockville and he knows the complaints that are made there almost every day. The matter is in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway to rectify. They have a monopoly of the train service between the Grand Trunk line and Ottawa, whether you come by way of Prescott or via Brockville. The answer to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will be that it is impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to leave Brockville at a later time and make connection with its through train at Smith's Falls. But there is a train leaving Prescott for Ottawa, and it is timed to pull out a little ahead of the train that comes east. That train does not make connection with any train, and only runs from Prescott to Ottawa. For many years that train did connect with the Grand Trunk and was run up to the station for that purpose. Now, there is no reason why that train should not leave Prescott station, run up to the Grand Trunk and remain there until the train comes from the west. If this were done, mails and passengers that failed to catch the train at Brockville could make the connection at Prescott, and,

if necessary, the train for Prescott could be held for a few minutes for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I ask the hon. gentleman at what time does the train leave Prescott?

Mr. REID. It is timed to leave at 2.10 and reaches Ottawa at four o'clock. It passes Kemptville junction at three o'clock, an hour and fifteen minutes before the train coming east. If they were to hold that train for a sufficient length of time at Prescott for passengers who happened to miss the Brockville connection, the public would be well served. I have tried to get the Canadian Pacific Railway to run their train up and make the connection there at Prescott, but I have found it impossible to get either the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk to make any connection for the convenience of the public. I do not know which company is to blame. But here is a case where they have a monopoly of the train service east of Toronto, and as the hon. member for Leeds has just stated, passengers leaving points along the Grand Trunk and letters posted at those points have to wait over until next day in order to reach Ottawa. It would be no trouble for the Canadian Pacific to make that Prescott train a little later and bring in these passengers and mails; nor is there any reason why that train should not run up to the Grand Trunk and make the connection with the train from the west as it did for many years. The Minister of Railways and Canals I suppose will remember when the connection used to be made at Prescott junction, but this was before the Canadian Pacific got control of the railroad between Prescott and Ottawa, but the moment they got control of it they did away with the connection. I hope the minister will see to it that this connection is re-established and that, if necessary, the train is held for the convenience of the public and the mail service east of Toronto. It will not affect connections between Brockville and Smith's Falls, because the train now leaving Prescott is not supposed to leave there for the purpose of making any connections at Kemptville or any other place.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). I would like to lay a matter before the Minister of Railways which we have been complaining about for some time in relation to the connection between the Intercolonial and the Quebec Central. I will explain to the minister what the situation is. The train coming from Halifax to Lévis is due at Harlaka junction, four miles from Lévis, at the same time that the train on the Quebec Central is due there, namely, 12.55 p.m. If the train for Lévis is half an hour late then the train on the Quebec Central keeps right on to Lévis; but if the train for Lévis is on time, the train on the Quebec Central has to wait at Harlaka junction until the Halifax train passes by, and the Halifax train does not stop at Harlaka junction. The result is that on the Quebec Central train you go to Harlaka junction and wait there 15 or 20 minutes until the train from Halifax passes by, and then you cannot leave that junction until the Halifax train has left Lévis for Montreal. The result is that when you arrive at Lévis you have to wait there until 4.10 in the afternoon before you can go on. If the minister would allow the Halifax train to stop at Harlaka junction, then the difficulty would be avoided, and, by taking the 4.10 at Levis for Montreal, although it is quite a slow train, we arrive at Montreal at any time between 10 and 12 o'clock at night. If we could take the 12.45 at Harlaka we could reach Ottawa the same day.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The question the hon. member has introduced will, I think, attract a good deal of attention throughout the country, particularly on the part of commercial travellers and others, whose calling necessitates their travelling a good deal. I do not profess to be conversant with all parts of the province of Ontario, but I know there are some cases where it is really an outrage for railway companies to act the way they do. Let me call the attention of the minister to one case, which I trust he will bring before the Railway Commission and before the two railways that are concerned. Assuming that a person wishes to leave the town of Southampton, or any intermediate station between there and Harriston, and go to Orangeville—and this matter particularly concerns the people of the counties of Bruce and Wellington—he will find to his disgust that on his arrival from the north coming down on the Grand Trunk to Harriston the Canadian Pacific Railway has passed by just a few minutes before. The stations almost adjoin each other, and were some regulations made by the department compelling the railways to act in a reasonable way, a person coming from Southampton would be able to get to Orangeville that evening. But now he has to remain all night at Harriston, or else go down by Toronto and go by a roundabout course back on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the morning. I assume that that state of things exists there to day, as it has existed to my knowledge for several years past, and if I am incorrect, the hon. gentlemen from North Bruce or North Wellington can correct me.

I desire to call the attention of the minister to another case. Assuming you leave the town of Midland, or any point on the Grand Trunk, or from North Bay, and you wish to go to the town of Perth, or any town to the east of Peterborough, what is the result? You go down on the Grand Trunk as far as Peterborough and there you find that the Canadian Pacific

Railway has just pulled out, and all you see is the tail end of the smoke. What is the result? The passenger who is obliged probably by a business engagement to be in Perth that evening has to remain in the town of Peterborough until about 12 o'clock that night and be pitched off at Perth the next morning, I assume, about 5 o'clock. Now, why should this state of affairs be permitted to exist in this country? It is palpably in the selfish interest of the railway companies to do this, for the reason that the Grand Trunk has to carry the passenger who wishes to go to Perth by a circuitous route instead of giving him an opportunity to go direct by a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Peterborough; and they carry him on to Port Hope, and then he may go on to Kingston and take the Kingston and Pembroke road to arrive at his destination. I say that the travelling public, more particularly in parts of the province of Ontario, are incommoded, and it would look as if they were incommoded by an antagonistic custom that is fostered and cultivated by the railways, so that they may carry people to further points on the railways and obtain an advantage therefrom. There are many other instances that can be found throughout the province of Ontario. But these two, the non-connection at Harriston and the one at Peterborough, have struck my attention at the moment, and I hope the minister will bring these cases that concern the general public to the attention of the Railway Board, that this state of affairs may be ameliorated. I may say that the remarks that have been made here to-day, and the agitation which my hon. friend from Leeds has produced, will be appreciated by the travelling public, more particularly in the province of Ontario.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE (South Bruce): I also desire to say to the Minister of Railways and Canals that we are complaining of similar conditions between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway at Wingham, Ontario, and have been complaining for years. There is just a few minutes difference between the departure of the trains, and although representations have been made year after year, the railway companies have made no change. I hope that in taking up this matter the hon. minister will see that close connection is made at the town of Wingham.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). The question to which attention has been drawn by the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), if I remember right, has been brought to the attention of this House on several previous occasions. Personally, I did not take much interest in it in former years, because I had never felt the inconvenience, travelling, as I do, almost invariably on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Toronto. On the unfortunate occasion to which the hon. member for Leeds referred, the Chicago train for Toronto was upwards of an hour and three-quarters late, which left me in Toronto, and I preferred to go on by the Grand Trunk. We left twenty-five minutes late and made up twenty minutes between that and Brockville. There were about eight passengers for Ottawa, and the conductor of the Grand Trunk train was good enough to wire to Brockville to ask them to hold the train, at least he told me that he did so, although he said they were not bound to do it, and I presume he was correct. We reached Brockville, according to my watch, about five minutes late by schedule time, and on alighting we discovered the Canadian Pacific Railway had pulled out ten minutes previous to our arrival. Had they remained for ten minutes it would have been a convenience and an accommodation to the eight passengers who were travelling in that way to the city of Ottawa. Of course, I admit that railways have a perfect right to run their own roads so long as they do it in the public interest. But they are the creatures of parliament, and they should run their roads for the convenience of the people as well as for the benefit of the companies. I do think, in the instances to which reference has been made, that the public is ignored. It may be to the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, although I fail to see where it is to their advantage. I do think that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will lose nothing if they make an effort to meet the wishes of the travelling public, and make an arrangement by which that train could be held back for ten or fifteen minutes, particularly when there are a number of passengers on board who are desirous of travelling over it. I heartily endorse a great deal of what the hon. gentleman has said as to the existing inconvenience, and the advantage that would accrue to the travelling public if some better arrangements were made. Perhaps there may be good reasons for the present arrangement, but there is certainly room for improvement.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM, (Minister of Railways and Canals). I sympathize fully with what hon. gentlemen have said in regard to this matter, and particularly as to the train connections at Brockville. I am told by my predecessor in office that about eighteen months ago he brought this matter to the attention of the Railway Commission, and I imagine, that the fact that nothing has been done is only one more proof that the Commission is greatly overworked, a condition which I hope will be remedied this session. Candidly speaking I am free to admit that when railway companies come to make connections between each other I think their chief thought is not the accommodation of the public. I may be wrong about that, but having travelled all over Ontario and through some of

the other provinces I have come to the conclusion that they are not really anxious to make connections with each other, even to accommodate the travelling public. It must be remembered that while we complain about branch line connections, possibly the chief attention of the companies, and perhaps properly so, is paid to their through service on the main lines. The fast trains from Toronto must of necessity wait for the Chicago trains or otherwise the through passenger traffic of the Grand Trunk would be seriously injured, and so it is a rather difficult task to undertake to regulate the running time of through trains. However, it has struck me as very peculiar that the Grand Trunk mail train must of necessity arrive at Brockville just after the time set for the departure for the other train. The answer to that has been given me, that it makes the trains in the eastern portion of the province run too closely together, and that it does not give the passengers east of Kingston an opportunity of coming that far on the fast train and going east on the slower local trains. However I do not consider that a good reason. The fast train makes very few stops between Toronto and Montreal, and that is the reason they want to let the passengers off at Kingston who wish to take the slower train. The Canadian Pacific Railway train which leaves Brockville at 2.20 has more than sufficient time to make connections at Smith's Falls. Those of us who have travelled by that train know that it invariably stops at Smith's Falls quite a length of time waiting for the connections from the west ; and even if it did not, the Canadian Pacific Railway train from Brockville to Smith's Falls can make much better time than it does between these stations. Personally I can see no reason why that connection cannot be made without any loss to the company ; it certainly would be a great convenience to the travelling public. Then as to the mails, it is a fact that at the present time the mails for the district north of Brockville, which originate between Toronto and Brockville, have to lie over at Brockville all night. Of course the mails direct from Toronto come straight to Ottawa by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the mails originating east of Toronto very often have to lie over all night at Brockville. The reason I have not taken this matter up sooner with the Railway Commission is that I have been endeavouring to get detailed information, as I want to make a strong case before the Commission myself, and I shall certainly take an early opportunity to bring this matter to their attention. I believe that possibly the complaint about Wingham is along the same line, and as to the connection at Harriston between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. I have been through there and have had personal experience of the difficulty to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If hon. gentlemen who have these complaints to make would kindly put them in writing I will gladly place the details before the Railway Commission. The same would apply to the hon. gentleman who has complained about the connections at Harlaka junction in the east. I will exercise my privilege, as indeed it is the privilege of any hon. gentleman, to place these matters before the Railway Commission. I trust something may be done to bring about a better state of affairs so that one great purpose for which railways are built, that of accommodating the public may be achieved:

Motion (Mr. Taylor) to adjourn, negatived.

DISTRIBUTION OF BLUE BOOKS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to know what change has been made in the matter of distributing the public documents. I find they are not in the post office, and the post office officials refer me to some where else. Has a change been made ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot inform my hon. friend, but I will inquire.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). Mr. Speaker, permit me to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address, and permit me also to congratulate the members of this house who have been spared to meet this session in friendly combat I hope, in the interest of this Dominion and in the interest of their various constituencies. I am sure the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) in moving the address realized that he had a most arduous task, and I congratulate him on making the best out of a bad case. I shall not attempt to follow the argument of the gentleman who last addressed the House (Mr. Miller). I have heard his rhyme so often that it is not necessary for me to deal with it. When the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) pictured that flourishing town of Peterborough which every Canadian is proud of, and pictured the tall chimneys which adorn that thriving city, he was honest enough to give credit to Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party who by adopting the national policy in 1878 made it possible for Peterborough to be to-day a thriving com-

mercial centre. I regret that I cannot also congratulate the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller). He has always evinced in this House a spirit of intense partyism rather than a spirit of fairness. I have never taken enough interest in the hon. gentleman to know what his ordinary avocation in life is, but judging from his face I would take him for a local preacher out in some rural district who would be ready at all times to discard his religion or party politics. I want to say and I say it honestly, that I believe that if the devil himself were running as a Grit candidate and if he had a hundred votes to give him he would give them all to him. As far as that hon. member is concerned I believe, speaking for the welfare of this Dominion and in the interest of Canadians generally, that that type of public man who deals up these bitter attacks is a curse to Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, I think the hon. member (Mr. Clements) should withdraw that remark.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but what I have to say is that the hon. member for South Grey will stand up in this House and defend such deals as the North Atlantic Trading Company contract, the 'Arctic,' the 'Montcalm,' and other nefarious transactions which have been exposed in this House, which, I am sure, are well known to every individual in this country regardless of his politics, and I am convinced that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would not attempt to defend these deals as the hon. member for South Grey has. That is all I have to say of that hon. gentleman. Personally I have nothing but utter contempt for such a man.

With respect to the appointments which have been recently made from this chamber to the Senate I want personally to congratulate my friend Mr. Campbell. I think he is deserving of some promotion. I do not desire to say anything prejudicial to the hon. gentleman who has been appointed to the position of Minister of Public Works in this country, but I believe the right hon. Prime Minister could have done worse than give Mr. Campbell that appointment which he was living in the hope of getting. Mr. Campbell has had the honour of representing the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and while he has been moved to the upper chamber, I am sure it would have been his pleasure to have received some other position in life. I have to say of Mr. Campbell that I wish him all prosperity. I have heard that gentleman upon the hustings in my riding in my young days denouncing the Senate and advocating free trade, and it cannot give very much pleasure to Mr. Campbell to be obliged to forsake his party allegiance and be shuffled off with the old gray haired chaps over in the Senate. I have just been reading a statement in the Montreal 'Herald' in the column headed 'Political Gossip.' If I understand the proper functions of a senator it is supposed that when he is removed from this chamber he enters upon a higher plane in so far as politics are concerned, but I see by this article that this is not going to be the last that will be heard from Mr. Campbell upon the hustings and at the political meetings of this country. I hope that Mr. Campbell will have more regard for the honour of the position to which he has been appointed, and I hope we will not find him as we found Senator McMullen stumping the country in the last by-elections. It is rather painful to see senators of our fair Dominion taking that stand, and I believe that there would be no more popular movement or one that the electors of this country would take up more keenly than a movement for real genuine reform in the Senate. If that sort of game is played by the senators who are appointed, and if they are going to display partisanship of that character I believe, personally speaking and not speaking for the Conservative party, that when these senators are elected by the voice of the people it will be to the advantage of this country.

Now, I want to congratulate many of the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate so far, but I am bound to say that I believe the electors of this country expected something different. I listened intently to the remarks of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and when we realize that a great deal of the time was taken up with accusing the party on this side of being as bad as they were it seems to me that the time of this House could have been much better occupied in speaking of some other questions which have an important bearing upon the welfare of the Dominion at the present time. We have not heard so much of the growing times and prosperity as we have in the past. That wave seems to have been checked for a time. I will be the last one to attempt to cry blue ruin in this country. I am a Canadian, first, last and always, and I shall always have the interest of this glorious country of ours at heart. The Finance Minister saw fit to take up half an hour in pointing out how much cabinet material there was on this side of the House when we come into power, which I am sure, will be at a very early date. The right hon. Prime Minister took up a great deal of time in wondering how our esteemed leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) was chosen for that honourable position. I want to say with all due regard to the leader of the opposition that I believe the people of the country are prepared to accept Mr. Borden as the leader of this House, and I also believe they will do so very shortly.

Now, Sir, I see that nice little man, that 'pretonious' little fellow who has always

reminded me of a feminine character rather than of a masculine character—I refer to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who paid a very memorable visit to the city of Chatham on the 23rd of November last. I congratulate that hon. minister upon his safe return from the city of Chatham where he was forced to meet the farmers who were up in arms against the legislation which he is solely and entirely responsible for and which has been placed upon the statute-books of this country. It seems to me that he was placed in rather a deplorable position when he had to go up there and defend his legislation. There is one thing, lest I should forget it, that I want to take occasion to censure the Minister of Agriculture for. I may be wrong, but it seemed to me that an attempt was made by the hon. gentleman to further party ends at that meeting. The hon. gentleman made the statement that he was not there for political purposes, that he was not there at all to assist Mr. Clements or Mr. McCoig, the Liberal candidate for the Commons, but he would undertake to tell that magnificent gathering of farmers who were there, 95 per cent of whom were protesting against the minister's action in bringing down the regulations which he attached to the Meat Inspection Bill, which he and his department were responsible for and which no member of this House was responsible, that Mr. Clements and every other member was present when that Bill and those regulations were passed. He did not say that in just those words, but I am sure that is the idea that the minister intended to convey.

When these regulations were made public the local candidate stated in different parts of the constituency that I sat silent in the House when the regulations went through and that I was to blame for them. I want to say that this Meat and Canned Goods Inspection Act which was assented to on the 27th day of April last, is on the face of it a very innocent looking measure, but I would point out that the Conservative members in this House took exception to it and interrogated the Minister of Agriculture as to why such legislation was required. As I remember, his reply was that the result of the exposures in connection with the meat packing concerns in Chicago would have such effect in the old country, that he felt it his duty to adopt in Canada such a law as he then proposed. We on this side of the House pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture that in Canada the conditions were different, that the meat packing business in Chicago was controlled by mammoth concerns, while in Canada the business was in the hands of individual enterprises with small capital and that the Canadian concerns depended on the good reputation of their product for their success in business. I assert without fear of contradiction that the Canadian packing concerns have been most careful in the selection and preparation of their meats and canned goods in the past, and I have no doubt that they would be just as careful in the future without any such legislation as this. I can see no reason for this legislation at all. Now, as to the regulations which the minister has made under that law, as soon as I saw them I came to the conclusion that they were the most ridiculous and iniquitous regulations that could be devised. I saw that they were detrimental to the pork raisers of the Dominion and especially to the farmers in that section of the country which I have the honour to represent. When I first had the honour to address this House, I discussed certain questions which I had advocated long before I entered public life, and I am independent enough to say that any legislation, along the lines I have advocated, whether it be introduced by one party or the other shall have my cordial support. But Sir, I objected strenuously to these regulations, and six or eight weeks ago when they were published I came to the city of Ottawa to protest. I did not see the Minister of Agriculture himself, but I saw Doctor Ward, an officer of his department for whom I have the greatest regard, and who I believe is a very capable official. I pointed out to Doctor Ward that these regulations were a great disadvantage to this country, and I felt that in doing so I was only doing my duty to my constituents. I continued the agitation against these regulations through the local press, and I openly stated that I was ready to meet the Minister of Agriculture at any public meeting that might be called either by him or by me to discuss these regulations and to leave it to the farmers to say if they were not detrimental to their interests. I repeat that challenge to the Minister of Agriculture. If these regulations are to be continued in force I am ready to meet him on one platform or ten platforms or twenty platforms in my constituency, and I am ready to take my chances that the farmers will pronounce that I am right. The Minister of Agriculture dare not meet me; I defy him to accept the challenge. At the meeting which was held in Kent some time ago, it was announced after the meeting was called that it was to be non-political and the Liberal press in the county spoke of the Minister of Agriculture as a well known farmer and they professed their belief that he would not sanction any regulations which would injure the agricultural industry. Well, Sir, in a very short time the Liberals in the constituency appeared in hundreds to denounce the Minister of Agriculture for these regulations, and to denounce the government candidate in the riding, and I have no doubt there were telegrams by the dozen asking him: For Heaven's sake come up and explain the regulations. When I first took up the fight against the regulations I was practically alone in the district. I have a very great regard for the gentlemen who repre-

sent the adjoining constituencies, but I had not heard from them. When the Prime Minister explained the other day the accession of his new colleagues to the cabinet, he declared that his followers had faith enough in him that no matter what he did they would follow him if necessary into the ditch. I hope that the representatives of the farming community in this House will not take that same view; I trust that if the Minister of Agriculture does not revise these regulations, that regardless of politics, the representatives of agricultural constituencies in this House will not be slow to show the Minister of Agriculture that his regulations are calculated to ruin one of the greatest industries in this country. Now, the Montreal 'Herald' is supposed to be the official organ of the Minister of Agriculture. I think that last year he announced he had no stock in this sheet, but I presume the stock is held by his brother or some of his associates. However, that may be, there was an article in the Montreal 'Herald' recently which looks very like the language of the Hon. Sydney Fisher, and in that editorial he flaunts the farmers of Essex and Kent, saying that they do not produce a hog suitable for bacon purposes, and that if they do not change their tactics the industry must go out of existence. I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture that in that district we grow the very best hog that is grown in Canada for the purposes of our trade. I can tell him that ninety-five per cent of the hogs grown in that district do not average over 200 pounds. The Montreal 'Herald' also says that professional politicians who are not farmers are endeavouring to make political capital out of these regulations which have been promulgated by the minister. If the minister refers to me as a politician and not a farmer, well, while I don't want to brag, I can tell him that I know more about farming in twenty-four hours than he will ever know in his life.

The farmers of my district know me as a farmer and know my family as a family of farmers, and I am prepared to be judged by them whenever the hon. member sees fit. When the hon. minister came to that meeting in the city of Chatham he was placed in that ridiculous position. If he takes up the 'Daily News' of that city, which is one of the most ardent supporters of the government—the editor of the paper, I am quite certain, is tinged with insanity—he will find there a report of that meeting which I am sure would not be very reassuring to himself. In the Toronto 'Globe' there was a very glowing report of that meeting. The minister on his way back to Ottawa must have stopped off at Toronto and fixed up the report with the editor of that paper. If he did not do that, then the ministerial editor of the 'Globe' was responsible for that report, and I can only put him in the same category with my hon. friend from South Grey. When a man does wrong and then rights himself as quickly as possible, he deserves some credit, and I hope the hon. minister will be able to secure for himself the credit of correcting the injustice he has done to the farmers of Canada in establishing these regulations. If he will do that, and do it immediately, I shall be the first to give him credit. Under these regulations, for which, as I say, the hon. minister was solely responsible, and no member of this House, there are four interested parties. The regulations protect the foreign consumer. They do not protect the Canadian consumer or the Canadian producer. They throw the whole trade into the hands of the packers, thereby creating one of the greatest combines that have ever existed in the Dominion of Canada, to the detriment of every pork producer, at any rate in the section which I have the honour to represent. They have the effect of putting the farmers of my district entirely out of the dressed pork trade. In the past we in that district have had the privilege of dressing our hogs and shipping them wherever we could get the best price for them. When in the past a farmer has had, say fifty hogs, perhaps twenty-five lean of from 160 to 170 pounds weight, and twenty-five fat hogs averaging 200 pounds each, it has always paid him to dress his fat hogs and sell them dressed instead of on foot. In addition to that, the farmer's wife was able to put up 100 or 200 pounds of lard, instead of being compelled, as she will be under these regulations, to go to the grocery store and buy lard at the packers' prices. At the same time, the poor mechanic or labouring man formerly was able to get his pork at first cost, whereas in the future he will be compelled to pay two prices for it. Therefore, I say that the hon. minister's regulations have resulted in forming one of the greatest combines that have ever existed in this country. I am sure that the hon. minister, after having listened to the suggestions which were made at that Chatham meeting on the 23rd of September, will not have the gall or audacity enough to argue that the dressed pork trade of the Dominion had been almost wiped out of existence. Fancy the Minister of Agriculture bringing in regulations compelling the farmer, when selling hogs to the shipper, to leave in heart, liver, lights and lung. The hon. minister at that meeting asked for suggestions. He was at a loss what to do. There were ex-wardens of counties, reeves of townships and other prominent men, most ardent supporters of this government, who said that they had followed this government through thick and thin, but that they would follow it no longer if these regulations were put in force. I ask the hon. minister if that statement was not made? When the hon. minister attempted to tell the farmers of West Kent, who know something about farming, that they should be able to grow

pork at five cents a pound with grain at its present price, and that if they could not do that they did not know how to farm, the howl went up, not from one, but from dozens, that he was practically an ass to talk in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must know that language of that kind is not permitted to be used.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to use the language which was used at that meeting, if I may be permitted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot use language of that sort with reference to any member of the House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not using it myself.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member will see that the language should be withdrawn.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will withdraw the statement. However, that was the remark that was made at that meeting. The hon. minister was placed in such a position that he had to humbly apologize to those farmers for making the statement that he did, and invited them to his farm in the province of Quebec where he would show them how to grow pork at five cents a pound. I think the sentiment of that meeting was expressed very well by a remark made by a worthy French Canadian, a pork raiser of that district, whom I know very well, when he practically shook his fist at the hon. minister and said: 'You are not there for the farmers; you are there for the money you get.' I thought that expressed the real sentiment of that meeting in regard to the hon. minister's remarks on the dressed hog trade. Now, I find that the minister said that seventy-three inspectors have been appointed under this Act. I should judge that the salaries and expenses of these inspectors would amount to $1,500 or $2,000 apiece; so that the cost of these regulations already is possibly $150,000 a year. When he gets his whole equipment, which means several hundred more of these inspectors, I venture to say that a million dollars will not pay the whole expense. When that Bill was before this House, we on this side accused the hon. minister of bringing it in for the purpose of providing political hacks with salaries and jobs at the expense of the farmers of the country; and, Sir, it seems to me that if that measure is carried out to the letter it is not to the advantage of this country to have it in force.

Personally I would not object to the proper inspection of any food products put up in this country at the seaport town, but there is no occasion for this inspection in the factory. The utmost precaution has always been taken in the factories of this country. We have no mammoth concerns here which go astray as did the mammoth concerns in Chicago, and there is no reason for this iniquitous legislation. What the farmers asked at that meeting, to which the hon. minister came to get suggestions, was to put the matter back to where it was. But if the government are determined to give these jobs to their political friends, then have the inspection in the farmer's yard and not 400 or 500 miles away from it. Fancy a buyer purchasing hogs from a farmer, who knows that they are of good quality and then having an inspector—and 75 per cent of your inspectors do not know a hog from a wheelbarrow—passing upon those hogs when they reach the factory. The minister has told us that there was a plague of hog cholera in the Chatham district. I venture to say that he cannot get a responsible veterinary surgeon in this country who will say there was one genuine case of hog cholera in that district. There was a hog plague, we admit, and there was a wholesale slaughter of hogs, which was just as detrimental to the farmers then as I believe this inspection will be now. The live hogs are shipped to the factories. Then an inspector, to show the government that he is on his job, feels bound to do some culling, and he culls out a number of them which the factory must not use. I am about to make a statement to show the operation of this law, and I want the minister to correct me if he thinks I am wrong. I put this case to Dr. Ward. Suppose, I, as a buyer, buy a carload from a farmer and ship to the factory, and suppose the inspector at the factory culls out twenty from the carload, will the government pay me for those hogs that were rejected ? He said no. The factory, he said, allows you one cent a pound. I asked him where I came in. He said that the inspector furnished a veterinary certificate, and I could collect my loss from the farmer. That is absolutely unfair to the farmer. If a buyer comes into my yard to buy hogs, he should know his business sufficiently to be a judge; and if he wants to cull out any, that is the time for him to do so. But after he has bought the hogs and paid the money, I ought not to be responsible for any further inspection, and any loss on account of that inspection should be settled between the buyer and the pork packer. The minister says that these very able inspectors have not been appointed for political purposes. Well, let us see whether they are doing their duty. I put these two cases before the minister, and if he wants to trace them up I shall be glad to give him every assistance. In the first case, the buyer, who was a very good supporter of the government, shipped a carload to London. He knew nothing about the new regulations. He shipped a carload and followed it up. When he went around for his cheque, the foreman of the factory told him that there was trouble. He told him

that one of these government inspectors was around and had culled out thirty-two of the hogs. Why did he do that, asked the shipper ? The foreman said : Go around and see for yourself—I do not know. All I know is that the inspector has pronounced them unfit for food. There is a spot or pimple on their lungs or liver. Thus the hogs are culled out for some spot on their liver or lungs just as they were killed by the thousand in the west as being infected with hog cholera when such was not the case. When in Chatham, the minister said he was an expert farmer and an expert butcher. I have no doubt that he deserves the latter title because I believe he has butchered legislation more than it is possible for any other human being to do it. The shipper persisted that he should not be docked on those thirty-two hogs, which the inspector had culled out, and be only paid the one cent a pound the inspector would allow. He found that he was going to be held up and he would not stand it. He said: Before I will submit to the inspection of this government inspector, whoever he may be, I will appeal from it, and I think there are other veterinary surgeons who are just as capable of judging whether those hogs are diseased or not. I propose, he said, to call in if necessary a dozen inspectors. There was a short consultation then between the factory manager and the inspector and in fifteen minutes the shipper was called in and told that the thirty-two hogs had passed inspection. There was another shipment from the city of Chatham by a very reliable dealer there. This man shipped a carload of hogs to Hamilton and was careful in shipping them, and he had previously shipped hundreds of carloads from that district. On this occasion he got his first dose of this legislation. He was amazed the next day to receive a telegram telling him that twenty-three were culled out and that he had the privilege of having them shipped back to Chatham. He knew what he was up against. He was in Chatham and the hogs were in Hamilton. They were shipped back to Chatham. I want the minister to know what was wrong with those hogs. I will show why they were culled out. As is usual in a good many farm pens, there is vermin, and in this case the farmer who owned the hogs poured some kerosene oil upon their backs which smothered out the vermin but which resulted in causing a little bit of scab on the backs.

And they went down to the factory, and this very efficient inspector whom the minister has appointed evidently thought that these scabs indicated smallpox, and ordered them back to Chatham. The result was that the owner had these twenty-three hogs on his hands. He decided to try another factory. This he did, and the hogs have not been heard from since. I suppose that they are on their way to the British market duly labelled by this time. This is the kind of inspection we are getting, to the detriment of the farmer. If you must have inspection, I say have it at the farmer's door, so that he may not be compelled to take the results of an inspection made three or four hundred miles away. I have stated my opinion that this packing business was one of the greatest combines ever known in the Dominion. I warned the minister that this Bill would have the effect of giving them control of the pork situation, and enable them to buy pork at their own prices. I stated that if they had to take a loss of 25 per cent on the factory end, they would rob the farmer of 75 per cent at the other end; and I want to tell the minister that that is just what they are doing. Six weeks ago I sold hogs off my own farm at $6.75 and $7, and to-day the price offered for the same class of hogs is $4.50. The minister may think that he can grow pork at 5 cents per pound, but I want to tell him that at the present prices of grain he cannot grow pork for less than 6½ cents or, at the very least, 6 cents. The effect of these regulations is to rob the farmers of the counties I have the honour to represent of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I believe it will run up to a million dollars. I inquired in the Department of Agriculture if any official notice has been given of a change in the regulations, but was told that it had not. But the minister, at the meeting in Chatham, told the farmers there that he would endeavour to rectify the wrong he had done. I say he will be only acting as a man if he does that, so as to restore this industry, of which our farmers are proud, and upon which the average farmer depended to pay his taxes and running expenses. If you annihilate that industry, as you certainly will do if these regulations are maintained, you are doing the Canadian farmer a grievous wrong. I hope the minister will give his earnest attention to this matter, and if there is an advantage to be given on one side or the other, let it be given to the farmers and not to the corporations. I have always felt, and have stated since I became a member of this House, that the manufacturers and corporations were fairly well looked after; but the farmers, the mechanics and the labourers, who form the bulk of the taxpayers, are the classes who need our attention. I have repeatedly called attention to the returns laid before this House showing the imports and exports of farm products as between Canada and the United States. Every member of this House must know the disadvantage under which the Canadian farmer labours by reason of the fiscal conditions existing. Every reasonable man must admit that the Canadian farmer is not receiving justice. This is proven by the broad fact that the American duties on farm products are about two and one-quarter times the duties which we charge upon Amercan farm products coming into

Canada. If we are going to give protection, let us give the farmer equal protection with the manufacturer. That is not given at the present time. While I am not a free trader —far from it—I would be ready to favour reciprocity as between the United States and Canada on some natural products. On goods, the exchange of which would benefit both nations, I would give one hundred per cent for one hundred per cent, but I would not give one hundred per cent for forty per cent return, which is about what we have been given as Canadian farmers.

When he spoke in the city of Chatham a week ago, the hon. Minister of Agriculture told his hearers how the farmers had prospered lately through the pork industry. I want to tell the hon. minister that even before I entered public life I protested, as a farmer, against the bonding privilege given on pork entering this country from the United States. It was only after a great deal of persuasion that the minister saw fit to annul that bonding privilege, and so to give the Canadian farmer the Canadian market to himself, a market to which he is entitled and which he ought to have had years ago. I do not know that the minister deserves great credit for having taken so long a time to realize the benefit it would be to the farmers of this country to bring about that change. But now that he has seen how well it works in one case, I would like to tell him that it would work just as well in relation to all the other products of our Canadian farms. Give the Canadian farmer every dollar of the Canadian market —it belongs to him, just as the Canadian market for manufactured goods belongs to our manufacturers. And when we find hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of United States farm products dumped in this country, while we send so little in return, it is plain that an injustice is done to the Canadian farmer. Last session the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated, in reply to an hon. member who had pointed out the large imports of American butter into Canada, that the total would butter only three slices of bread for every individual in the Dominion. I have to say in reply that this means that a market for butter for eighteen million slices of bread has been given to foreigners which should have been kept for the Canadian farmer. And what I would say concerning butter would equally apply to every article produced on our Canadian farms. If we are given the home market to ourselves we shall be all the better able to hold our own in competitive markets abroad. I hope the government will give the Canadian farmer more consideration in the future than they have given him in the past. It would seem that the members of this government think that the farmers do not require any legislation.

I have listened to hon. members on the other side stating that the farmer was the best-off man in this Dominion. Now, I wish to make one statement as a farmer, and as one who knows farming. I make this statement with relation to the farming conditions of my own district, though I believe it could be applied also to farming in the west if you leave out of consideration the advantage the ordinary farmer in the west has in the increase of the value of his land and returns on other investments. I believe that in my district we have the best class of farmers to be found in this Dominion. My statement is this ; Let a farmer on an average hundred acre farm take an inventory of his farm and implements, just as a business man would do with his stock ; let him take account of his earnings ; let him allow himself a salary of $300, and there is not a farmer with a hundred acres of land within my district who makes more than three per cent on his investment. I say that is not a condition that the farmers of this country ought to be in. The pork packers of this country, as has been shown by statements of the Davis pork factory, make 30 per cent profit, and in one case 100 per cent. I say that if the merchants of this country make, as I believe they do in many cases, 10 to 25 per cent, it is only fair that the farmers should be placed in a position where they can make at least 10 per cent on their investment. But now they are driven off from their farms there is no encouragement to the farmer's son to remain upon the farm, they are driven hither and thither to better their position, either to the States or to foreign countries. I think more consideration should be given to the farmers in the future, and I hope that this government will give them more consideration. When the tariff came down last year I advanced arguments to show that the farmers should be placed in a better position, and I hoped from the remarks of the Finance Minister that he would do something for them. Unfortunately owing, I presume, to laxity on his part, he has failed so far to look after the farmers of this Dominion.

Now if we examine the whole tariff in the agricultural list as it came down, we find that only two changes were made in the interest of the farmers, I refer to beans and potatoes. I have the honour of representing a section which produces the bulk of the beans of this country, and I contend that the bean growers should have the Canadian market for their product, whether it is in British Columbia, the Northwest, or any other section. I said they were entitled to it, and I said they should be protected from American competition. The American duty against our beans was 45 cents a bushel against our duty of 15 cents a bushel. I pointed out the difference in the freight rate by the all-rail route, and I contended that in order to place the Canadian farmer in the same position in

which the American farmer was placed, our duty, instead of being 15 cents per bushel as against their 45, should be 60 cents a bushel. That would compensate for the difference in freight by the all-rail route, when we had to ship to British Columbia and the Northwest. The Minister of Finance did partially acquiesce in my request and raised our tariff from 15 to 25 cents, thereby improving the condition of the Canadian farmer to the extent of 10 cents a bushel, when the minister should have raised the duty at least by 30 cents. Now in regard to potatoes. The American tariff was 25 cents against our potatoes, and our duty was raised from 15 to 25 cents. As I say, those are the only two items in the whole agricultural list where the farmer was given any advantage. Now the Finance Minister in order to please the farmer, when he brought down his tariff on agricultural implements, says he effected a saving of about $2.50 on his implements. In answer to a question which I asked him what the saving would be to the farmer on a binder, he said it ought to be $2.50. Now any one acquainted with agricultural implements knows that the life of a binder is about ten years; therefore the farmer saves about $2.50 in ten years, which I say is a ridiculous concession to make. They then turn round and give practically free iron and steel to the manufacturer, placing them in a much better position than they were before. I firmly believe the farmers are not going to stand that sort of legislation, I believe they will rise very shortly and protest against that sort of legislation. They will also protest against the nefarious deals which have been proven against the present government, and will resent the lavish expenditure of public money. I am sure that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will have no fear in appealing to the electorate of this Dominion at any time the government choose to make the appeal. This may be a familiar question to some members of this House, but coming as I do from the southern portion of western Ontario where we grow products which cannot be grown in many other sections of the Dominion, I have felt it my duty, both last session and this session to place the facts before the government. When the tariff arrangement was made in regard to the excise duties, we were promised that changes would be made in the interest of Canadian tobacco growers: but when the Prime Minister went to the Colonial Conference, it was announced to the House that there would be no time last session to make the change, but that it would be made same time later. I see the Minister of Inland Revenue in his seat, and I sincerely hope that he will take this question into his serious consideration. It is one that especially interests my district, because we grow a splendid quality of

raw leaf tobacco. I ask the minister to give the Canadian farmer the home market in this article, instead of compelling the Canadian consumer to buy from the American farmer every year of the same class of tobacco, fifteen or twenty million pounds, thus paying him a million dollars or a million and a half a year, which money should go to the Canadian farmer. Now let me show you the position the Canadian farmer is in, at least in the riding I have the honour to represent. If he had the market of this country to himself, every farmer in the district I have the honour to represent could grow ten to twenty acres of tobacco each year, and could supply the home market, and avoid the necessity of bringing in millions of dollars worth of American raw leaf tobacco, excepting what would be required for cigar purposes, a quality which we do not produce. This is the position in which the farmers were placed this season. Now I want to read a circular which was mailed to every farmer in my district by the Empire Tobacco Company, with which my hon. friend the minister is doubtless well acquainted. That is a large concern which purchases practically the whole crop of tobacco in that section of the country, the circular is dated April 6, 1907.

Dear sir,—We feel that from our long and intimate business relations with you, it is our duty to remind you at the most opportune time that the past three crops have all been excessively large ones, and as usual we have bought a large proportion of each crop.

We think it advisable to impress upon you the fact that we have a large quantity of leaf tobacco on hand and, in our opinion, it will be necessary for you to reduce your acreage to the minimum this year, as the demand as far as we are concerned will naturally be limited.

We trust that you will give this matter the consideration which it deserves.

We beg to remain,
Most faithfully yours,
THE EMPIRE TOBACCO COMPANY,
Limited,
William T. Gregory, Leaf Dept. Manager.

That is the position in which the Canadian farmer is placed by the regulations enacted under the excise and tariff laws of this country which allow 15,000,000 pounds of American leaf tobacco to come in and usurp the market that belongs to the Canadian farmer. I do not care how you arrange it, but what I say is: keep the market solely for the Canadian farmer and you will be doing your duty as Minister of Inland Revenue. I am going to read a little short catechism on the tobacco question that I hope will apply to the case and that I hope will be of some benefit to the minister:

Q. Why is leaf tobacco higher in the States than in Ontario?—A. They keep their home market for home products and shut out foreign leaf by a prohibitive tariff.

Q. What is the duty on American leaf entering Canada?—A. Ten cents a pound.

Q. What is the duty on Canadian tobacco entering the United States?—A. From fifty cents to one and one-half dollars per pound.

Q. Under the present regulations how are tobaccos in Canada stamped?—A. Foreign tobacco manufactured in Canada; with a black stamp. Imported and Canadian mixed, with a pink stamp. Foreign shipped in already manufactured, with a blue stamp. All Canadian with a green stamp.

Q. How is tobacco stamped in the States?—A. There is a uniform stamp for home grown and imported tobaccos. People there must judge by the quality of the article and not by prejudice and colour of the stamp.

Q. How much is Ontario leaf taxed when manufactured?—A. Five cents per pound.

Q. How much on Quebec leaf?—A. Quebec leaf is stemmed, then twisted, pressed into boxes and sold without tax of any kind.

Q. Is there any country on earth that does not tax the retailing of leaf?—A. None except Canada.

Q. Is there any country or nation under the broad canopy of Heaven that places the stamp of inferiority on the product of the brain and brawn of their own citizens?

I would like to see other regulations adopted than those which are in force at the present time. I maintain that our Canadian tobacco should not be branded with the stamp of inferiority. Let the smokers or the chewers be the judge of their own tobacco and do not let them be prejudiced before buying it. I received yesterday a petition from some of my friends in the province of Quebec, and I will take the liberty of reading it:

At a meeting of the board of directors of Tobacco Growers' Association of the district of Joliette, held at St. Jacques on November 17, 1907.

It was proposed by Lucien Martin, Adhemar Leblanc and Denis Aumond, seconded by Damase Eugene Forest and Prosper Granger:

Whereas the growers have still on hand a large quantity of tobacco of the preceding years and the crop of this year is abundant and ready to be placed on the market and it is urgent that the changes to the Revenue Act, which have been promised to us, be made at the opening of next session and be put into effect immediately in order to create new openings which are absolutely necessary and which those changes alone can procure;

Whereas, if those changes were delayed any longer serious prejudice would result to all the growers of the country;

It is unanimously resolved that this association humbly prays the federal government to take this question into consideration and acquiesce to the unanimous wishes of the tobacco growers of this district by modifying the law as soon as possible so as to promote the use of Canadian tobacco in the industry.

J. BLAISE DUGAS,
President.
J. O. E. FOREST,
Secretary.

This is an important question. It is especially an important question in the district from which I come, and I am sure that my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke) and the hon. the Speaker of this House (Mr. Sutherland) will endeavour to use their best efforts—and if they do they will be doing their duty—to persuade the department to adopt regulations which will build up that industry and make it one of the most important industries of this country, such an industry as every Canadian will be proud of. I am sure that the smokers of tobacco will not regret any change that may be made which will promote the use of Canadian tobacco in the tobacco industry.

I believe that other things can be done in the interest of the farmers. You know how the Minister of Agriculture was attached for so many years to his antiquated idea with respect to cold storage. You could not get him to adopt the idea of giving the country an up to date mechanical system of cold storage. He brought down, last session, a Bill setting aside a million dollars for building cold storage plants in the Dominion and he attached certain regulations to that measure. I have never yet had the privilege of asking the question, but I would like to hear from the minister to-day what advantage has been taken of that Bill which he brought down and of the regulations which were attached to it. In my humble opinion the regulation with respect to a contribution by the government of 30 per cent and prescribing the manner in which this payment was to be applied was so ridiculous on the face of it that no individual would put up the balance of 70 per cent and have his establishment under government control, as required by this regulation. Instead of spending money so extravagantly and, as has been proven in so many cases, of allowing middlemen to be so grasping in their efforts to obtain possession of the money which belongs to the people of this country, I believe that this government could well afford to adopt the principle of government ownership and provide an up to date system of mechanical cold storage in the different sections of the country where they are required. If they would do that they would only be doing their duty and I believe they would be doing something for the farmer which would be a benefit to this whole Dominion.

Now, I want to refer to rural mail delivery. I have been an advocate of the adoption of the system of rural mail delivery in the thickly settled portions of this Dominion and especially in the section which I have the honour to come from. From the slight knowledge I have of the question and because of the advantages which I see the American farmers obtaining from that system throughout the different states, I believe that rural mail delivery could be established in this Dominion at a very reasonable cost much to the advantage of the farmer. He deserves some of these advantages in return for the share of the taxation which he puts up and

to compensate him for the disadvantages under which he labours by reason of the iniquitous regulations which our Minister of Agriculture imposes on him occasionally, and furthermore I believe that even if this were to be considered as something in the nature of a luxury the farmer should be placed in this respect in the same position as those who live in cities.

I believe that the question of the fisheries of the province of Ontario and of the other provinces of the Dominion is a question of the utmost importance. Our fisheries constitute an important asset to this Dominion, and I want to say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that in so far as the province of Ontario is concerned he has neglected his duty with respect to the fisheries. When we remember that there was only about $13,000 spent in the province of Ontario in propagating fish for replenishing the fisheries of the great lakes as against about $80,000 for the province of British Columbia, the House will realize the small amount of attention which has been bestowed by the department upon the fisheries of Ontario. I am not objecting to that amount of money being spent in the province of British Columbia, but I am objecting to the small amount which has been spent for the benefit of the fishing industry of the province of Ontario. When you take into consideration that the fish from the great lakes of Ontario bring, in the New York market, from $40 to $50 a ton more than British Columbia fish, you must admit, with all due regard for the province of British Columbia and for the members who represent that province, that greater consideration should be given by the department to the fish industry of Ontario. I would advocate the establishment of fish hatcheries in suitable places, and the expenditure of more money in the propagation of fish in our great lakes so that the natural asset which the Dominion has in the fisheries should not be lost.

Let me say a word about the fiscal policy of the government and especially in relation to what is called the intermediate tariff. I believe that tariff will prove a curse to the Dominion. I believe it will prevent the investment of millions and millions of dollars of capital which otherwise would flow into this country. We talk about the Dominion being prosperous, but considering the great natural advantages which we have, Canada should be fifty times more prosperous than she is. Give us a true national policy ; cut out your bonuses and your intermediate tariffs, frame your fiscal policy in the interests of Canadians and Canada will become a country of which every Canadian, be he Liberal or Conservative, may be proud. A period of depression is upon us and the government is to blame for the hard times. They have been wilfully extravagant, and they have never looked forward to a rainy day. They have lavishly expended the money of the people and now they are forced to call a halt. Let me refer for a moment to the telegram in respect to immigration which was read to the House this afternoon by my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell), I have always contended that the immigration policy of this country is a wrong policy. I say that instead of paying thousands upon thousands of dollars for immigrants to come to Canada we should be deriving a revenue from these immigrants. What we want in our immigrants is quality and not quantity. I have myself seen, in the city of Chatham, at least 100 immigrants dumped off one Saturday night, mothers with babies in their arms, who had to remain at the station all day Sunday and until Monday night without a dollar in their pockets to purchase food, and depending on the charity of the citizens to provide for them. That sort of thing should not exist. Then as to the English immigrants whom I have seen and with whom I heartily sympathize, I blame the government for encouraging them to come here to suffer the great hardships which they have to experience. You may talk about soup kitchens, but I can tell the Department of the Interior that soup kitchens will be necessary if that class of immigration is to be encouraged. I had the pleasure of visiting the Northwest this past summer and as a public man I felt it my duty to pay some attention to the immigration question. I say that it is a curse to this country to bring in the class of immigrants that I saw there. I do not care what may be the nationality of the immigrants, but I do say that none should be encouraged to come here except such as are willing to abide by our laws, and my experience is that the Doukhobors in the vicinity of Yorkton are not willing to submit themselves to Canadian laws or to become British subjects. I hope the government will call a halt and reform their immigration policy at once. My object in rising, Sir, was to plead with the Minister of Agriculture to abolish or to amend the meat inspection regulations which are condemned by ninety-five per cent of the farmers of the district of West Kent. I ask the Minister of Agriculture to annul these regulations altogether because I can see no good reason for their existence. If the Minister of Agriculture persists in enforcing these regulations which will ruin the great pork industry of the country, I hope the Prime Minister will ask for his resignation ; that he will pension him off if necessary, and that he will allow him to pursue his first hobby of stuffing and cramming chickens, which probably he may develop into a science by the adopting of the compressed air process. An hon. gentleman asked me why the Minister of Agriculture does not get married. Well, if the hon. gentleman ventured on that step I believe his time would be more profitably occupied than in framing regulations which are a great detriment to the agricultural community. I

might refer to the inspection of fruits, but I will leave that matter to be dealt with by gentlemen who are more conversant with the subject than I am, and in conclusion I thank the House for its attention to my remarks.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, and I would not probably have done so but for the kindly, chivalrous, personal allusions of the hon. member (Mr. Clements) who has just sat down. I am not able, Sir, in such personalities to compete with the hon. member; therefore I leave them all out. It is, however, perhaps as well that the misconceptions and misunderstandings with regard to what has been the chief subject matter of the hon. member's address should be removed, and that what has evidently occurred in the counties of Kent and Essex should be put right. It seemed to me, when I visited Chatham a little while ago, that a good deal of excitement had been aroused amongst the farmers of that neighbourhood in regard to the regulations under review, excitement which I do not think was at all necessary, the cause of which I am not going to inquire into, but the result of which I deplore, because it has prevented a number of those farmers from taking advantage of the opportunities that offered in their business. Had the necessary steps been taken earlier, probably my visit to Chatham would have been earlier, and the difficulties would have disappeared earlier. I found an entire misconception as to the scope of regulations. I found also a disposition to ask me to do certain things which I was quite prepared to do, in so far as the law allowed me to do them, and as I might be able to do them, consistently with the spirit and letter of the law passed by the parliament of Canada last session. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down says that he came to Ottawa for information. He did not see me, but saw some of my officers from whom he got some information. I do not know why he did not see me; possibly I was out of town at the moment; but it is a pity that he did not communicate with me and lay before me the difficulties his people were labouring under in such a way that I might have taken steps to remove those difficulties if it were possible to do so. Mr. McCoig, the representative of the county of Kent in the provincial legislature, communicated with me, representing certain things which I appreciated to be facts of a serious character, and invited me as soon as I possibly could to visit the county of Kent, so that I might find out for myself the exact condition of affairs, and if possible remove the difficulties that existed. Just as soon as I was able, after fulfilling certain engagements of a public character which had been made before I received that communication, I did go to the county of Kent at Mr. McCoigs' invitation. I found there a state of excitement of which I tried to ascertain the cause by examining the public press. I found in the press supporting the hon. gentleman opposite very exaggerated statements and very exciting paragraphs which created unrest and excitement in the meeting which I addressed. That meeting was a public meeting, called at my instance by Mr. McCoig, who had invited me to go to Chatham—called by public advertisement, and everybody was invited to come. I am glad to say that a large number of people came; I am sure that it was a representative gathering of the farmers of Kent and Essex. When I arrived at the meeting I found that a chairman had been chosen, and immediately afterwards the hon. member opposite (Mr. Clements) entered the room and was invited to the platform to take part in the discussion. He declined to do so.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Might I just correct the hon. minister? I was not invited to the platform to address the meeting. I was asked to the platform, but not to address the meeting; and when the hon. minister says that it was called as a public meeting, I may say that I have here a copy of the advertisement calling it, and if he will allow me the privilege of reading the names of those who were announced to address the meeting, I am sure he will not say that it was a farmers' meeting, but a purely Liberal meeting.

Mr. FISHER. Read it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The names of the gentlemen advertised to address that meeting were: the Minister of Agriculture, Hon. Mr. Fisher; Dr. Rutherford, veterinary director general of the Dominion; D. A. Gordon, M.P. for East Kent; Geo. Stevens, ex-M.P. for West Kent; T. L. Pardo, ex-M.P. for West Kent; R. L. Goswell, Liberal candidate in East Kent; Fred. Stone, Liberal candidate in East Kent; Mr. A. B. McCoig, M.P.P. for West Kent; and others.

Mr. FISHER. And others; and the hon. member was asked by the chairman to the platform—

Mr. CLEMENTS. I was not asked to speak.

Mr. FISHER. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman was invited to the platform with the full intention and expectation that he would speak if he had any thing to say.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say right here that when I was asked to the platform, I rose in my place in the building and said that that was the first invitation or intention I had to attend that meeting. As the hon. minister had come to back up his regulations and to refute the arguments which I had put up against them, I said I was there to listen to the explanations he had

to make, that I would remain in the hall during the afternoon, and that I was there to back up the arguments that I had made against his regulations.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman took his own course, and he can abide by it; I have no objection at all. I say the hon. gentleman was invited to the platform with the intention and object of giving him an opportunity to speak. I now find the hon. gentleman saying that he has been arguing against my regulations. I can only conclude that the hon. gentleman is the cause of the excitement and difficulties that have arisen in the county of Kent. However that may be, I found a condition of excitement there and a misapprehension in regard to the regulations. The regulation which was complained of by the speakers at that meeting and by the people who spoke from the audience is a regulation with regard to the sending of dressed hogs to establishments or packing houses under the operation of the Meat Inspection Act. The farmers there seemed to think that all dressed hogs sent to market anywhere had to be inspected and submitted to the regulations. That first misconception was removed immediately that I had an opportunity to speak, by my pointing out that the paragraph in the regulations which was complained of only applied to dressed carcasses of hogs being sent to an establishment which was under the operation and inspection of this Act.

I have been informed since—I do not know whether my information is absolutely correct or not—that the number of the carcasses which would be sent to those establishments will not be over 60 per cent or 40 per cent of all the dressed hog trade of the counties of Kent and Essex. Some of my hon. friends have gone so far as to say that they find, on looking up the returns, that last year not even 20 per cent of the dressed hog carcass trade will come under the operation of this regulation. I went there for the express purpose of finding out the facts. I thought it better to ascertain the facts myself than take the wild statements of men who had not examined the condition of affairs and who did not know what they were talking about. I gave to the meeting the information, which I need not repeat here, because all the members know the reasons on which this Act was based. They know that last session on several occasions we discussed for hours the principles and the reason for passing this legislation, and those reasons were so convincing that the House adopted the Bill without division. The House adopted it without any formal protest of any kind and it became law by our unanimous decision. I quite understand that, as regards certain details of the measure, there was considerable discussion in this House. I do not remember whether the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Clements) took part in that discussion or not. I do not know whether he helped to frame the legislation, but, seeing the great interest he now takes in the matter, he must have taken some part in the discussions last session on the principles and details of the Act. I would like him and his friends to look up 'Hansard' and find just how much part the hon. gentleman took in the framing of that legislation. I said then that I invited the co-operation of hon. gentlemen opposite just as much as the co-operation of hon. gentlemen on this side. Why? Because the question was in no sense a political or a party one. The legislation was a new departure. It was legislation required to meet a new condition of affairs, and I wanted the co-operation of members on both sides in order to make it as perfect as possible. I do not charge my memory with the part which the hon. gentleman took in the debate, if he took any, but judging from the interest he now shows in the matter he must have taken a very active and prominent part. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I forget what part I took in that debate, but I was in the House throughout the discussion on the Bill. If any of my friends made an argument which I wanted to adduce myself, I of course would not take up time by repeating it, but I watched the debate closely, and I repeat that I can see no reason for this legislation.

Mr. FISHER. Did my hon. friend say that? I pause for a reply. I would like to know, as I have not looked up 'Hansard.' He, however, does not seem to remember himself what he did last session, and I shall not undertake to press the question further. He says that the Bill is unnecessary. Well, it was a Bill which the House approved of and passed; and I was charged, as Minister of Agriculture, with the carrying out of the law. The Bill empowered me to make regulations, and I made regulations to carry out the purpose of the measure, namely, to have our meat products and canned goods above reproach. I confess that in making the regulations, I took advantage of those framed in the United States for a similar purpose, and which were formulated and prepared after the scandals in the Chicago packing houses had been made public. The regulation complained of has now been in force about three months. It applies to the whole of Canada as well as to the counties of Essex and Kent. And with the exception of one letter, I have not received any objection to that regulation from any other part of Canada. The only objection I have had is from the county where the hon. gentleman himself has been stirring up a commotion. I do not say that the regulation may not bear on some other people in Canada as it has borne on the farmers of Kent and Essex. But it is a regulation which applies to all Canada and which applies also, by reason of the American regulations, to the people of the United States who kill

hogs and dress and ship them just as our farmers do. These are subject to the same regulations without any recourse or relaxation of any kind and they have been so subject for over a year. Our farmers in the other parts of the country have apparently acquiesced in these regulations. At any rate I have only received one letter to the contrary. How are we to account for that? No doubt in Essex and Kent there is this year, and perhaps there was in other years, a rather unusual condition of affairs. But the farmers of Canada generally have taken of late years to the shipments of live hogs to the packing houses, and let me remind you that it is only shipments of hogs to the packing houses to which these regulations refer in any shape or form. They have of late years taken to ship their hogs to the packing houses alive; and without having examined the question, I venture to say that over 90 per cent of all the hogs that come to the packing houses go there alive. In Essex and Kent, however, there is a trade in the dressed carcasses, and the conditions there are interfered with to a certain extent by this regulation. What is the object of the regulation? Its object is to protect the public against fraud, against disease, against diseased meat being put up in our packing houses. I need not say why that is necessary because that was all explained last session, and no one objected then to the principle of the measure. Veterinary surgeons tell me that they cannot tell whether the carcass of a hog is that of a diseased hog unless certain vital organs are left in the dressed carcass,

These organs, in general terms, are the gullet, the lungs, the liver and the heart. Veterinary surgeons inform me that without these organs attached it would be practically impossible to detect disease. Now, I am not a veterinary surgeon or a doctor, so I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I take the opinion and advice of my experts—and the opinion of my experts in this matter is the opinion of the experts of the United States government as well. I explained this to the meeting at Chatham, and I am glad to say that those present, almost unanimously, agreed that everything ought to be done that was necessary to protect our meat trade. I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Clements) himself will dispute that. I do not think he will say that we ought to run any risks of our meat trade in the foreign markets to which we send our goods. I know that farmers generally have suffered in the past because their interests in this respect have not been guarded, and I know that to-day our farmers are regretful that their live cattle are shut out of the British market, by the embargo, and that they would do anything to prevent their meat from being shut out of that market in the same way. Therefore, we must take the necessary precautions, and one of these precautions, the veterinaries tell me, is that these organs should be in the carcass when it is inspected. It comes, then, to a practical detail of administration. The regulations contemplated the inspection of these carcasses when they arrived at the packing house that being the easiest and cheapest way of doing it. It seems, however, that the conditions of the trade in Essex and Kent are such that this way of doing it was not satisfactory to the shippers there. Notwithstanding the jibes of the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements) I venture to think I have been a little solicitous of the interest of the farmers, and that I have tried in the administration of my department to meet their convenience, to arrange the work of my officers so as to interfere just as little as possible with the work our farmers are carrying on. But I am not prepared to do away with necessary safeguards. I do not believe that the farmers of Canada want me to do away with those safeguards. I am certain that the people of Canada generally want those safeguards maintained. And I may say that I did not find that those present at the meeting in Chatham wanted any of these safeguards removed, but only wanted them to be so arranged that they could carry on their business without interruption or obstruction. That I was prepared to do, if possible, and I went to Chatham to find out by inquiry on the spot how best it could be done. Am I to be blamed or criticised for that?

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. By the hon. gentlemen opposite I am to be blamed for everything. But that was what I did.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is what I ask.

Mr. FISHER. Then I have done all the hon. gentleman asks, so let him be satisfied. At that meeting I asked for suggestions. I received a suggestion from a gentleman in the audience. I have forgotten his name, and I did not know—and did not care—whether he was a supporter of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) or not. I was there to consider a business proposition, and to find out how I could best carry on the affairs of my department and not to talk politics. When I go to Chatham to talk politics I will talk politics—as I did before. And I may say that on the last occasion when I talked politics in Chatham the Liberal candidate was elected. It is not impossible that I may go to Chatham and talk politics again. I know that there were some men in the audience who wanted to talk politics and act politics, but that did not interfere with me, I am accustomed to that kind of thing. I went there to hear business suggestions, and I got them. Two or three suggestions were made that were objected to by the members of the audience as unsatisfactory or insufficient. One gentleman suggested that inspection

should take place at the station from which the hog carcasses are shipped to Toronto. Montreal and other markets. It seemed to me that I might be able to arrange that, and I told them that I would arrange it if I could. I said: I cannot tell you offhand that I will do it, because I must find out first how it will work out; I must consult my officers and see whether they can manage it. I consulted my officers, and we decided they could manage it. Notices to that effect were sent within three days of the time when I was in Chatham and, within eight days of the time I was there, the new arrangements went into operation. The hon. member (Mr. Clements) takes exception to the regulations. I have not changed the regulations, but I found that the way in which the regulations were carried out did not suit the trade of the people of Essex and Kent, so I set to work to carry them out in a slightly different way, and have done it. And, from what I hear, the people of the neighbourhod are satisfied. The hon. member for West Kent shakes his head. Of course, he will not be satisfied whatever I do, or whatever I leave undone. But I have been informed that a number of carloads of hog carcasses were to be shipped to-day and to-morrow and my inspectors are on the spot to make the necessary inspection. The shipping will be done with as little inconvenience as possible to the farmers of the district.

Now, the hon. member told us that the effect of these regulations would be to throw the whole business into the hands of the packers and that the farmers would be at the mercy of the packers. I cannot see how that can be when the farmers are selling dead carcasses any more than when they are selling live hogs. It is a business transaction between the man who buys and the man who sells. Of course, in a general way, under the business arrangements of this country, the man in the big establishment is apt to get a little the best of the bargain in dealing with the individual farmer. But I believe that it is no more the case in these transactions than in any other. The farmer can sell or not sell, as he likes. He can sell to one buyer or to another buyer. It may be that the buyers will make agreements among themselves as to the prices to be given, but if they enter into a combination or agreement in restraint of trade, there is a statute placed on the books by this government under which they are liable to prosecution—a new thing in Canada since this government came into power. It is true that generally the farmers of Canada are not organized and are at the mercy, to a considerable extent, of the businesses that are organized . I have been preaching, year in and year out, constantly and insistently, that the farmers should get together and organize for the protection of their own interest.

The hon. member said one or two things more. First, he said he knew there never had been any hog cholera in Essex and Kent. Well, he sets up his judgment, which one would suppose from that statement, was the judgment of one of the most experienced and renowned veterinary practitioners on the continent of America. I do not know that the hon. member is a veterinary practitioner. I do not know that he is a biologist. I do not know that he is a medical practitioner of any kind whatever, But the most eminent veterinary practitioners, the most eminent bacteriologists, not only of Canada, but of the United States, have declared that there was a large amount of hog cholera in Essex and Kent. I say advisedly that there was a large amount, because six, seven and eight, aye, nine or ten years ago, the people of Essex and Kent were losing, year in and year out, thousands and thousands of dollars by reason of the hog cholera with which these two counties were permeated. But to-day there is practically no hog cholera in Essex and Kent, and the reason is the administration of my veterinary department, who have stamped it out. The head of that department is a man who is acknowledged, not only in Canada, but in the old country, in Scotland, whence he came originally, in England, where he is well known, and in the United States, as one of the highest authorities upon veterinary subjects in the English-speaking world. I allude to Dr. Rutherford, who is known to members of this House who were here when he was a member, and whose professional attainments and reputation are known all over the English-speaking world. He said there was hog cholera in Kent and Essex; Dr. McEachran, his predecessor in that position, said there was hog cholera in Essex and Kent. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that because Dr. Rutherford was a Liberal he is not to be believed. But Dr. McEachran is a Conservative, and perhaps they will take his word for it. I know there are hide-bound partisans on that side of the House who do not think a Liberal can say anything that is right, and perhaps they will take the evidence of a Conservative.

Next, the hon. member made some allusions to certain events in London and in Hamilton. All I have to say is that if the hon. member will send me—he said he would not do it publicly—but if he will send me privately the names of those inspectors whom he accuses of having acted improperly in the performance of their duties I will investigate the matter, and if they are guilty they will be inspectors no longer.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I cannot give the names of the inspectors, but I can give the names of the shippers.

Mr. FISHER. That will not do. I must have the names of the inspectors. I am not going to accept the statement of shippers

in a matter of that kind. But perhaps he can get from the shippers the names of the inspectors or, at all events, the name of the factory. If he will give me the names of the factories that will do; I will know who the inspector is.

The hon. member also spoke of the bonding law. Now, the hog industry is one in which I have taken a great deal of interest. I believe it is one of the most satisfactory branches of agriculture in Canada. I have always advised farmers to go into that industry, because I was satisfied they could make money in it. Three or four years ago the packers of Canada had an interview with me. The hon. member seems to think they are my particular pets, because he says that I wish to throw the whole of this trade into the hands of the packers. They wanted to import hogs from the United States and make them into Canadian bacon, and they asked me to rescind a regulation which prevented them from doing it. I did not, though I was subjected to the greatest pressure. Instead of dealing with the packers alone, I went to the farmers, and had a gathering of the farmers at Guelph on the occasion of the fat stock show there. I asked them what they thought of the business and what the condition of affairs was. I pointed out to the farmers, as I had done before to the packers, that in the interest of the health of our live stock in Canada, and of the hog industry especially, and in the interest of the packers themselves, it was absolutely necessary that no danger should be incurred by the introduction into Canada of live American hogs, which would be taken into our packing houses and thence distributed over Canada, as some of the animals would be sold alive and taken away from the yards. I showed that this would degrade the quality, the character and the reputation of our Canadian bacon in the motherland. I did not yield to the packers' request, I did not allow them to do what they insisted upon doing and said they must do in their own interest. I told them that I knew their business better, and that they would not be injured, and that they could not be injured, because they were then doing a business very profitable to themselves, and that they must be careful not to endanger that business nor to endanger the hog-raising industry in Canada. And so I prevented them from bringing American hogs into the Canadian market to be made up as Canadian bacon, and I protected the interests of the Canadian hog-raiser and feeder, and saw that he had a chance to raise animals which were to be made into Canadian bacon and that alone, and that nobody else should be allowed to raise animals which afterwards were going to be put into a product that was to be sold as Canadian bacon. That was a part of the bonding law that they wanted to be relaxed. The result was a stimulus to the Canadian hog-raising and an advantage to the farmers here, though the packers thought it was not in their interest. I think my action was in the interest of the packers, and told them so frankly. I told them that I thought they would ruin their own trade if they did what they wanted to do. But they insisted they did want it; I would not allow them to do it, and the result is that their trade was saved, and their purchases were saved to the Canadian farmers, and to the Canadian farmers alone.

The hon. gentleman referred to some other matters upon which I will touch lightly, though I would not have spoken at all in this debate had it not been for the personal allusions of the hon. member for Kent. He and one or two others have spoken about rural mail delivery and the extension of post office facilities in Canada. I want to say a word or two about that. In the first place, let me say that I think this question of rural mail delivery can only be properly considered and understood after a clear statement of the facts. The reason that some people in Canada are calling for rural mail delivery is because the United States have undertaken it. I know that in my own county, in the Eastern Townships, the farmers on our side of that invisible line of 45 think they ought to have the same postal facilities as the farmers in the neighbouring states of Vermont, New Hampshire and New York. Now, Sir, the United States introduced rural mail delivery in 1897. They then appropriated $40,000 for that purpose and only spent $14,000. They only began in places where it seemed most likely that the system would succeed. The next year they appropriated $50,000, and spent it all. The next year they appropriated $150,000 or three times as much, and they spent it. In 1900, the fourth year, they appropriated $450,000, or three times what they had in 1899, and they spent nearly all. Then came the jump. Up to that time the people of the United States generally, the farmers and dwellers in rural parts, had not understood or appreciated what was being done, but they began, to use a slang phrase, to catch on, and the result was that in 1901, the government, which, in 1900, had asked for $450,000 for this purpose, asked for $1,750,000 and spent it all. In 1902 the demand for extension of this convenience was so great that they had to ask for $4,000,000, and they spent it all. In 1903 they had to double again and ask for $8,580,000, and they spent it nearly all. In 1904 they had to increase again and they asked for $12,900,000, and spent it all. In 1905 they had to nearly double again and ask for $21,000,000, and spent nearly all. In 1906 they had to increase again by $6,000,000 ; they asked for $25,800,000 and spent $24,700,000. In 1907, the present year, they had to ask for $28,350,000. We do not know how much they will have spent but I am informed that they will not be able to do the work for that amount and the estimate which

they have made for next year is no less a sum than $35,000,000 for rural mail delivery in the United States. Just glance over these figures and take them in in their proper relations. For the first three or four years they were doing it experimentally in a few places only, the amount was not very great but just as soon as the other people in the United States who had not the advantage of rural mail delivery began to understand what some of the people of the United States were getting the increase was enormous, and in eight years it went up from $1,750,000 to $35,000,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I put these figures before the House for thought and consideration. The United States have an area no larger than our own. The United States have tried to begin by only doing it where it was likely to be feasible and they have not ended it yet, but they have got to a point where they have to do it nearly all over their Union at a cost of nearly $35,000,000.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Is that cost in excess of the previous cost of mail delivery or is that the entire cost ?

Mr. FISHER. Practically it is the whole cost. It is true that by reason of the adoption of rural mail delivery they have been able to cut off a few country post offices. I am informed however that the amount thus saved is trifling in comparison with the amount spent. I have not the exact figures but my information leads me to believe that out of $35,000,000 which they have appropriated for next year for rural mail delivery the other expenditure, may be reduced in consequence of that, is less than $5,000,000 ; in other words the increase of the expenditure of the Post Office Department of the United States because of rural mail delivery next year will come to over $30,000,000.

I am not prepared to say that never, at no time, should Canada undertake this work. This is a matter which we have to consider. We have to count the cost, we have to look the facts in the face and we have to see what the advantages are to compensate for this cost, but I do venture to think that without any material increase in the cost of our post office administration, without, at all events, making to disappear the splendid surplus which our Post Office Department has shown for the last few years, we can practically accomplish as much for the rural population of Canada as the United States has accomplished by means of this vast expenditure for rural mail delivery. What we can do in that respect I will just outline, and I am not speaking after having consulted my colleagues but from my own knowledge of the affairs of the country parts of Canada and from what I believe can be done. I believe that we can increase the number of local post offices in the country parts. I believe we can increase the number of local mail routes and the number of mails per week that these rural post offices will have to such an extent and in such a manner that the rural population will be fairly and adequately supplied with the mail delivery and facility which they deserve, which they have a right to demand from the government of the country and which are a necessity in the isolation of country life. I am aware that during the last few years the department at Ottawa here has worked in this direction. I have a few figures, and I will only weary the House with a very few, but they are sufficient to indicate the truth of what I have said. I have understood—I do not remember exactly where or when, but I think it was my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) who said it—that the people of the Northwest were almost up in arms, I am not using his exact words, I know—because of the bad mail service they were getting. I made inquiry of the Post Office Department on this point and I have to say that in the last two years there has not been a complaint from the Northwest or from any part of Canada where there was a reasonable excuse for establishing a new post office or increasing the number of mail services that the complaint has not been met and the demand granted. I will just show what has been done in the Northwest. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), last night, gave the figures of the increase in the number of post offices. I will not go over that, but he did not show what I am now going to show, that in the Northwest there are four additional inspectorates and three additional railway mail service districts being organized, and that the letter carrier delivery system has been extended to all towns having a population of 12,000 people and a revenue of $20,000 per year. Now, what else has been done in the Northwest ? The number of post offices in operation in the Northwest on the 30th of June, 1906, was 1907. There was an increase during the year of 186, giving 1907 at the end of 1906. Since that time there were added to the number of post offices opened in the Northwest and British Columbia, 267, and there were in the whole of Canada 436 new post offices opened during the year, of which 267 were west of Lake Superior. In 1896, there were only 1,060 offices in British Columbia, Manitoba and the Northwest. Now, there are 2,174, or an increase of 1,114, or they have been considerably more than doubled in the course of the last ten years.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Will the minister tell us how many post offices have been closed during that time.

Mr. FISHER. The number of post offices closed was deducted before the figures I have given to the House were prepared. I feel strongly that the rural population of Canada deserves all possible consideration in postal service; I feel strongly that we

should do our best to supply the postal needs of that population; I feel satisfied that by such work as I have alluded to—carried on if necessary until the whole surplus of the post office shall disappear, the needs of the people in the postal service will be supplied. I am satisfied that can be done in the way I have outlined without the adoption of a system of rural mail delivery. When I see the result of that system in the United States, and when we know that while our population is smaller and our revenue less, yet the area over which rural mail delivery would extend is not much smaller in Canada than in the United States, I confess that the United States statistics have staggered me and made me feel that we must not plunge lightly even into a discussion of the question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the difference between the cost of the rural free delivery as established in the States and a system of postal expansion such as he refers to?

Mr. FISHER. I have no doubt that the figures could be given approximately but I have not them at hand. The expansion which I have alluded to will take place gradually as the needs of the people in each locality will arise. I have no hesitation in saying that people who live in isolated districts have more need for such postal facilities than those who live in thickly populated parts of the country, because with the good roads in these settled localities the people go frequently to the local centres and they can call at the post office to get their mail with very little trouble.

There is another subject on which I wish to say a few words, and it is a subject which has been dwelt on by the leader of the opposition and the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). I refer to the old bugaboo of the balance of trade, and I use the word 'bugaboo' advisedly. Hon. gentlemen opposite are now trying to make out that because in Canada we have a larger value of imports than of exports the country is being ruined. Let me point out in a few words—for it is nearly six o'clock and I want to finish before adjournment—that the best political economists have for years and years declared emphatically that the theory that a country which imports more than it exports is doing a bad business, is not in consonance with the facts as shown in the history of Canada, of the United States, and of most European countries. I have here the figures of our trade for four five year periods, starting with 1905 and going back. Between 1901 and 1905 our excess of imports was very large and in these five years it amounted to $96,000,000, or an average of $19,000,000 a year of imports over exports. In the five years from 1896 to 1900 we had an excess of exports to the amount of $24,000,000, and that is the only one of these five years periods during which there was an excess of exports. Between 1891 and 1895 we had an excess of imports of $49,000,000, and between 1886 and 1890 we had an excess of imports amounting to $116,000,000. I point hon. gentlemen to the fact that from 1886 to 1890 when the national policy so called by them was in its full vigour; the national policy to which they still—no, they don't still pin their faith to it but they used to—when the national policy was in its full growth and force there was an excess of imports in these five years of $116,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Minister of Agriculture read the speeches made by Sir Richard Cartwright, who declared then that that condition was the ruin of the country.

Mr. FISHER. I am making my own speech and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) can make his afterwards.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read Sir Richard's speech.

Mr. FISHER. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) make an original speech of his own and show us what he can do himself. From 1891 to 1895, when every one will admit that the national policy was in its decline, when these gentlemen opposite know that the country was not doing as well as it was during the five previous years, the excess of imports was $49,000,000, or a great deal less than one half what it was in the previous five years. There was change of government in 1896 and the full effect of that change was not felt in the country for some few years. It did not take five years of Liberal rule to make the country prosperous, but still during the first five years of our regime there was an excess of exports, because the development of production in Canada came quickly and effectively under our policy. During the first few years after we put our policy in force the farmers of Canada began to produce more; the farmers of Canada began to be better off, and the result was an excess of agricultural exports, and only during these five years out of the last twenty years in Canada was there an excess of exports over imports.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question——

Mr. FISHER. I have only a few minutes and I want to finish ; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) can make his speech afterwards whenever he likes. Then the full effect of our policy came into force; then the country began to feel the full tide of prosperity ; then began enormous railroad building in Canada to meet the demands of a prosperous people; then began the investment of United States capital, British capital, Belgian capital and French capital to take advantage of the prosperity which had arisen under our policy and administration. What was the result? That in the last five years there was an excess of imports of $96,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite say

that is all wrong; that it is bad for the country, and that the country must be going to the dogs because of it. How was it under the glorious regime when Sir John Macdonald was at the head of the government of this country and the national policy was in full force? That in five years there was an excess of imports of $116,000,000. What is the meaning of these excesses of imports? I have not the exact figures, but everybody knows that the large balance of trade between Canada and the United States is against us, and that these imports are largely from the United States and they are largely the raw material of our manufacturing industries, which to-day, under an enlightened fiscal policy, are prospering in a way which they never did before under any protective policy with the hon. gentlemen opposite in power. The hon. gentlemen know that American capitalists have invested in Canada thousands and hundreds of thousands—ay, millions of dollars—why ? Not only to get the home market of Canada, but to export from Canada to the foreign markets of the world. What is the reason of the International Harvester Company establishing a factory in Hamilton? Are they going to manufacture only for Canada? No, but for the European, Australian and South African markets, and in the French market, especially, under the new treaty just negotiated, the Canadian implement manufacturers are going to have a decided advantage over the American manufacturers. Why has the Singer Sewing Machine Company come into Canada and established a factory at St. Johns in the province of Quebec, employing several hundred hands, and likely to employ a thousand hands in a few months? Not only to sell the Singer sewing machine in Canada, but, as the manager told me himself, to manufacture in Canada for the export trade. I asked him: 'Why don't you do that in your old factory in the United States?' His reply was: 'Because we can manufacture for the open markets of the world better and cheaper in Canada than we can in our own country.' The balance of trade is against us, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, because the people of Canada are wanting more good things than they can get at home and have to go abroad to get them. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: If that is the case, you do not give a high enough protective duty to get these things produced in Canada. The hon. gentlemen need only to turn to the census reports of manufacturers to find that our manufacturers in Canada have been producing more and more to an enormous extent, and yet the industrial development of Canada has not reached the point of meeting the consumptive demands of the people of Canada. What are the actual facts with regard to that? We took a census of manufacturers in 1905 and there was a general census in 1900, and what is the comparison? In 1900 the industrial productions of Canada, manufactured articles, amounted to $481,000,000; in 1905 they amounted to $706,000,000, an increase of $225,000,000 in those five years, an increase under the Liberal policy which was never dreamed of under the national policy. But notwithstanding that enormous increase, the consumptive demand of the prosperous people of Canada is more than the manufacturers can meet, and the result is that we have to import goods from abroad, and, besides, these same manufacturers have to obtain a large quantity of raw materials from abroad or they would not be able to make that magnificent showing.

I have a word or two to say in regard to another matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have to send out coin and bullion to pay for the difference in the balance of trade and that is a bad thing for the country. Now, I happen to have some figures here which tell a different tale. I have the figures of the exports and imports of Canada for forty years. In those forty years we exported $4,257,000,000, and of coin and bullion we exported $120,000,000. During the same period we imported $5,000,000,000, or about $750,000,000 more than we exported, and we imported $150,000,000 of coin and bullion, or $30,000,000 more than we exported. Did we send out that money to pay for the balance of trade against us? The hon. gentleman, if he knew the first thing about political economy, would know that we did nothing of the kind. He would know that the reason for the balance of trade is altogether something else, and it has nothing to do with our exports of coin and bullion. The United States has practically had the same experience as Canada in that respect. I find that the imports of the United States for 116 years amounted to $37,000,000,000, and the exports to $42,000,000,000, or $5,000,000,000 more than the imports, and that the exports of coin and bullion at the same time were $1,500,000,000 more than the imports. There are, however, two countries which at the present time are held up as high protective countries apart from the United States. Germany at the present moment is held up all through the English-speaking world as the great example of protection, the country which is driving free-trade Great Britain out of all the markets of the world. We would suppose then, according to this theory, that the balance of trade would be in Germany's favour. Not a bit of it. Germany introduced protection in 1879, and in 1880 she exported $18,000,000 marks more than she imported.

But having introduced protection, the balance of trade began to go against her. The next year she had a balance of trade of 19,000,000 marks against her. The following year it was 200,000,000 marks; the next year 200,000,000 marks; and last year the balance of trade against her amounted to

300,000,000 marks. And this is Germany which used to have, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, the balance of trade in her favour, but which to-day, having introduced protection, has had the balance turned the other way. France is a country renowned everywhere as being probably the most stable and having the largest amount of available capital always on hand. France would be expected, therefore, to have the balance of trade in her favour. Well, I have here the returns for five years ; and I find that with the one exception of 1905, she had a balance of trade against her. In 1902 she had a balance of trade against her of one hundred million of francs ; in 1903, 100,000,000 francs ; in 1904, 100,000,000 francs ; in 1905, 66,000,000 francs in her favour ; and in 1906, 200,000,000 francs against her. Both France and Germany are highly protected countries ; and Germany is held up to us as the successful rival of our free trade motherland, while France is known the world over as being in the soundest financial position. Let me now give an instance of a country in which the balance of trade is the other way. I shall only give the round figures. From 1892 to 1896 there was on an average a total export amounting to 571,000,000 roubles and a total import of 432,000,000 roubles. From 1897 to 1901, the average yearly export was 648,000,000 roubles against an import of 522,000,000 roubles. In 1902 the export was 860,000,000 roubles against 599,000,000 roubles imports. In 1903 the exports amounted to 1,000,000,000 roubles as against 681,000,000 roubles imports. In 1904 the exports amounted to 1,005,000,000 roubles and the exports to 654,000,000 roubles. In 1905, the last year I have, the exports were 1,047,000,000 roubles as against imports of 582,000,000 roubles. There you have a magnificent example of the advantages of the balance of trade being in favour of the country, or the exports being greater than the imports. That surely must be the most prosperous country in the world. Surely it must be a country whose example we all ought to copy. Well, what country do you think that is ? Is it Russia ? Does the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) go to Russia for his inspiration ? I remember one occasion when he read a lot of Russian names to a political meeting. Perhaps he has gone to Russia for his inspiration as well as for his names.

Let me read here the epitome of an opinion on this question by an extreme protectionist, a gentleman who lives in Germany, and who bases his opinion on the experience of Germany and his knowledge of what goes on in that country. I shall have to read it in French as I am quoting from a French publication, 'La Revue Economique Internationale' :—

Malgré tous les efforts tentés pour la refuter, on rencontre souvent cette opinion dans le public qu'en présence d'un écart considérable entre l'exportation et l'importation de deux pays, l'avantage est toujours du co té du pays qui exporte le plus. Ma tâche ne saurait être ici de combattre cette erreur. Je dois me contenter de rappeler que la science économique a appris depuis longtemps déjà à évaluer plus exactement les bilans commerciaux.

Mr. DANIEL. Translate.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly, I shall do my best to satisfy my hon. friend :—

Notwithstanding all the efforts made to refute it, we often meet this opinion in the public, that when there is a considerable difference between the exportation and the importation of two countries, the advantage is always on the side of the country which exports the most. My purpose here is not to combat this error. I must content myself with recalling the fact that economic science has learned, since a long time ago, to estimate more accurately commercial balance sheets.

I thought that on these two questions, the rural mail service and the balance of trade, it was well perhaps that I should put these few facts before the House, and I must apologize to the House for having taken up their time at this length.

On motion of Mr. Lancaster the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 5, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE LATE HENRY LOVELL, M.P.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to inform the House that I have received the sad intelligence of the death of one of our colleagues in the person of Mr. Henry Lovell, member for the electoral division of Stanstead. Mr. Lovell was not a very widely known member of this House. He came in late, but was one of those public spirited and highly respectable citizens who command the highest measure of respect in the community in which they lived. In the community in which he lived, Mr. Lovell had the sympathy of all his fellow-citizens, not only of those who were associated with him politically, but of his opponents. His loss is a great one to the party to which he belonged, and I am sure it will also be felt by those to whom he was opposed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). On behalf of those who sit on this side of the House I desire to say that we associate ourselves with the Prime Minister in the words of sympathy which he has just

uttered. I had not the privilege of a very intimate acquaintance with Mr. Lovell; but I always found him a very courteous gentleman, and one who, although he did not speak very often in the House, took a deep interest in the affairs of the country and in the performance of the duties which devolved upon him by reason of his membership in this House.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 7) to incorporate the Northern Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Adamson.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.'—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 10) respecting irrigation.—Mr. Oliver.

SURVEYS OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) respecting surveys of public lands of the Dominion, and the surveyors entitled to make such surveys.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Did not some Bill of this character come before the House last year, and did it pass, or was it withdrawn?

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill in an almost identical form came before the House last year. As it stands at present it is a part of the Dominion Lands Act. It was intended by the legislation of last session that the part of the Act relating to surveys should be passed separately from the remainder of the Act. The Bill was so drafted, and it was put through the House in that shape, but on account of the Act relating to Dominion lands, aside from surveys, not being put through, it was found that the Bill had not been drawn to meet that contingency. It was necessary therefore to withdraw it, and it is now introduced this session as an entirely separate Bill and repealing the provisions of the existing law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENTS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: In a word, this Bill proposes to apply the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission to sleeping car companies and telegraph companies, as I introduced it last session, and with the promise of legislation on both those points at that time. It also brings up again the amendment I proposed last session in regard to telephone companies. It also provides for a two-cent a mile transportation rate, and, finally, it will give Canadian railways an opportunity of giving the same rate of transportation to Canadian passengers that they give to passenger traffic on roads in the United States, namely, they are carrying any number of Americans through Canada at two cents a mile while they charge Canadians three. This provides for the same treatment for Canadians as for Americans.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

ROYAL MINT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. How much money has been expended to date on the Royal Mint, for construction and equipment, respectively?
2. What sums are required to complete on both accounts?
3. What officers and employees, and at what yearly salaries, are required to man the institution?
4. What is the face value of copper and silver and gold coinage obtained by the government per year for the last ten years, and what has it cost the government therefor?
5. What has been the total profit on coinage in the ten years?
6. What amount of coinage is it in contemplation to issue in 1908, and in what denominations?
7. Who is to make the purchases and fix the price of bullion necessary for the use of the mint?
8. Upon what system are officers and employees of the mint appointed, promoted and dismissed?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). This question, I find, covers a considerable amount of information, and I would prefer that the hon. gentleman should make a motion. In the meantime I will give instructions to have the information prepared and a return will be brought down at an early date.

Mr. FOSTER. All I am anxious for is to have it before the Budget speech.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it will be within a few days. I would ask that the various questions regarding my department be passed over in the meantime, but I hope before the order is passed through that I will have the information which is on its way.

INSURANCE COMMISSION—TOTAL COST.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the total cost of the Royal Commission on Insurance to date?
2. Have all payments therefor been made?
3. What amount has been paid to Mr. Shepley?
4. How long were Mr. Shepley's services retained after the close of the inquiry, what was the nature of such services, and what did he receive therefor?
5. What sums have been paid, respectively, to each of the commissioners, to Mr. Tilley and to Mr. Dawson?

6. What was the total cost of printing, and by whom was it done?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. Total cost of commission to date (exclusive of cost of printing and paper for 5,000 copies of evidence, $9,500), $85,842.31.
2. Yes.
3. $25,000.
4. Mr. Shepley's services were not retained after the close of the inquiry. The last public session of the inquiry was held November 24, 1906, but the inquiry was not closed at that date. Mr. Shepley's retainer to conduct to an end the inquiry referred to did not terminate with the closing of the hearing of evidence by the Commission, but continued until the completion of the report of the Commission on or about February 21, 1907. During the time referred to Mr. Shepley was assisting in the preparation of the report and advising the Commission in regard thereto. No specific sum was received by Mr. Shepley for the particular services referred to.
5.

D. B. McTavish :		
Remuneration for services ..	$4,650 00	
Transportation expenses and living allowance..	947 80	
A. L. Kent :		
Remuneration for services..	4,290 00	
Transportation expenses and living allowance..	1,087 50	
J. W. Langmuir :		
Remuneration for services ..	4,470 00	
Transportation expenses and living allowance..	768 08	
W. N. Tilley :		
Remuneration for services ..	12,300 00	
Transportation and living expenses..	1,395 48	
Miles M. Dawson :		
Remuneration for services ..	5,350 00	
Transportation and living expenses..	1,118 95	
6. Total cost of printing	7,095 04	
Warwick Bros. & Rutter for printing and binding 5,000 copies, 4 vols. each, evidence, including delivery to Printing Bureau..	$6,874 00	
Ottawa 'Free Press'..	17 50	
Government Printing Bureau..	203 54	
	$7,095 04	

TEMPORARY LOANS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount of the temporary loans of the government at present?
2. What rate of interest do these loans bear?
3. What temporary loans have been entered into by the government since July 1, 1907?
4. From what banks or bankers have the temporary loans made by the government since July 1, 1907, been obtained, and what rate of interest do they bear?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the question to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It seems to me that I am entitled to an answer to this question. The point of order which I mention is that I am entitled to an answer to this question. The government cannot withhold that answer; that is the point of order which I desire to bring to your observation. Of course, the right of members to put questions does not admit of any doubt. It was a long time in doubt, but there is no doubt whatever now. A question can be put by a member which the government is bound to answer. I understand that under certain circumstances delay may be aked by the government, but where it is simply a question of fact I do not think that the government have any right to delay or withhold the answer. In this instance the question is one, if you will take the trouble to look at it, Mr. Speaker, that was put on the opening day of the session. Surely it would not take the department of the hon. gentleman more than ten minutes or a quarter of an hour to fully answer this question.

Mr. FIELDING. Is this a question of order, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. MONK. It is a question of order, which I submit to His Honour the Speaker. It would not take more than ten minutes to make up the answer to so simple a question. At the present moment we are discussing an amendment to the address——

Mr. FIELDING. I submit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is not discussing a point of order at all.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I am putting my point of order before you.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order ?

Mr. MONK. The point of order I put before you, Mr. Speaker, is that the government have no right to withhold or delay the answer to this question. I am arguing my point of order and I think I am in order in doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this is hardly a point of order. The right of the government to answer a question is plain, of course, under the rules.

Mr. MONK. I have stated my point of order, if you will allow me to put it before you, and I am quite prepared to abide by your ruling. I say that where a question is put by a member as a question of fact, unless there are some special circumstances, the question being in order, the government has no right to withhold or delay the answer to that question, and, in illustration of that argument, I said that at the present

moment we are debating an amendment to the address involving a question of finance where an elightenment upon this question is necessary for an intelligent discussion of the amendment. If the government have the right, upon the putting of so simple a question of fact, to delay or withhold the answer, how long can they delay it? Here is a question which was put on the 28th of November involving what fact? What are our temporary loans at present?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is hardly a point of order that the hon. gentleman is raising. If he sees fit to censure the government for their course in delaying an answer I think there will be a way of doing that by motion or otherwise, but I can hardly see that a point of order can be founded upon delay in the government's reply to a question when they simply ask the question to stand until a later date to be answered.

Mr. MONK. Is not the decision of the request of the government either in my hands or theirs, Mr. Speaker? If the government ask for delay to answer a question, of course, as a rule, that delay is never refused, but here it is inopportune to grant delay.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not within the province of the Chair, I should think, to order the government to reply or not. If the government see fit to give a reply which is not satisfactory to an hon. member his recourse would be other than the raising of a point of order, which I do not think would be appropriate to the purpose.

Mr. MONK. Your decision is that my point is not a point of order at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would decide that. I think it would raise a discussion which would not be in order.

Mr. FIELDING. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to permit me to repeat what I said at an earlier stage that I expect this information will be before me before the order is disposed of. There is no desire to delay or withhold it, but I did not wish to discuss it. If the hon. gentleman wishes to stand on his rights I will stand on mine; he has no power to enforce his question.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What temporary loans have been made by the government since October 31, 1906, and at what rate of interest?
2. Which, if any, of said loans are still outstanding and unpaid?
3. What rate of interest has been paid, or payable, on each of said loans, since they were made, respectively?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would be obliged if the hon. gentleman would allow that question to stand. I believe the information is prepared but through some mistake it has not been sent over.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman told me yesterday that the answer was ready but that owing to the two o'clock rule it had not been available.

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite correct. If the information comes over during the day as I expect, I will furnish it to my hon. friend and let it be answered publicly at a later date.

COLD STORAGE PLANTS.

Mr. E. D. SMITH asked:

1. How many cold storage plants were commenced during the past season, applications for assistance for which were made to the government, under the provisions of the Cold Storage Act of last session?
2. What is the proposed cost of each?
3. Where are they situated?
4. Who are the proprietors in each case?
5. How much of the government grant has been paid so far to each?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Three. The department has been and is in correspondence with divers other parties who are desirous of taking advantage of the Act, but their formal applications in accordance with the regulations have not been as yet filed.
2. $125,000, $63,289, and $75,000 respectively.
3. In the city of St. John, New Brunswick, the town of Morrisburg, Ontario, and the city of Edmonton, Alberta.
4. The New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Ltd., St. John, N.B., Scott, Ashton & Co., Morrisburg, Ont., and the Edmonton Produce Co., Edmonton, Alta.
5. None. Under the provisions of the Act no part of the subsidy is yet due.

N.B.—The application from Edmonton is still pending owing to an irregularity which was found in its form and the department is not aware whether the construction of the plant has been commenced or not.

CAMPBELLFORD, LAKE ONTARIO AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. OWEN asked:

Has the government any, and if any, what information as to the exercise by the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company, of any of the powers conferred upon that company by section 10 of 4 Edward VII., chapter 54, or as to whether such company have transferred or otherwise dealt with the charter granted them by the said Act?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). There appears to be no information in the department relative to the above matter.

TIMBER LIMIT GRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Have any timber limits been granted during the calendar year 1907 to George B. Mc-

Leod, Tobin E. Lundy and Lessan, of Edmonton, Alberta? If so, what?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

No timber berths were granted in the name of George B. Macleod, Tobin E. Lundy and Lessard, but the following berths were granted to Lessard and McLeod:—1360, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1364 and 1365. These berths are located on Red Deer River, one of the upper streams of Peace River, in the province of Alberta, and comprise an area of seventy square miles. If I am permitted I will lay on the table in further answer to the question the bids received and the names of the bidders. The tenders and amounts received are as follows:—

Timber Berth No. 1360—	
J. S. Hough	$ 637.00
W. F. Fawcett	225.00
Lessard & McLeod	1,000.00
Timber Berth No. 1361—	
J. S. Hough	637.00
Robert L. Fowler	360.00
Lessard & McLeod	1,000.00
Timber Berth No. 1362—	
J. S. Hough	637.00
W. J. McCallum	336.00
Lessard & McLeod	1,000.00
Timber Berth No. 1363—	
J. S. Hough	637.00
L. J. Auten	372.00
L. A. Goodridge	433.00
Lessard & McLeod	1,000.00
Timber Berth No. 1364—	
J. S. Hough	337.00
E. C. Jones	363.00
Lessard & McLeod	1,250.00
Timber Berth No. 1365—	
J. S. Hough	337.00
John H. Welch	348.00
Lessard & McLeod	1,250.00

VICTORIA BEACH PIER.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What has been expended to date on the public pier at Victoria beach, Annapolis county, Nova Scotia?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The expenditure on the public pier at Victoria Beach, Annapolis county, Nova Scotia, up to 30th November, 1907, has been $97,027.15.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

At what dates were the last payments of provincial subsidies made to the various provinces of Canada, and what amount to each province?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

Ontario, $394,742.40, paid 30th November, 1907.

Quebec, $299,932.80, paid 30th November, 1907.

New Brunswick, $65,000, paid 30th November, 1907.

Nova Scotia, $88,829.60, paid 30th November, 1907.

British Columbia, $107,500, paid 30th November, 1907.

Prince Edward Island, $35,000, paid 30th November, 1907.

Saskatchewan, $22,298.27, paid 30th November, 1907.

Alberta, $23,333.34, paid 4th December, 1907.

Manitoba, $65,000, paid 30th November, 1907.

CONVICT LABOUR.

Mr. VERVILLE asked:

1. Is the labour of the convicts in any public institution under the control of the Dominion let out by contract?
2. What disposition is made of articles made or manufactured by convicts in Dominion institutions?
3. If convict labour in Dominion institutions is let out under contract or agreement (a) what contracts are now in force, (b) date of contract, (c) terms of any and all such contracts?

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Solicitor General):

1. No.
2. They are used, so far as practicable, in the maintenance of the penitentiaries. The exception is binder twine, which is sold direct to the consumers.
3. Answered by No. 1.

ST. ANDREWS RAPIDS.

Mr. AMES asked:

In connection with the improvements of the St. Andrews Rapids on the Red river, has the Dominion government granted land to the Great Falls Power Company or to any other corporation or individual? If so, to whom was such grant made, for what purpose is the land to be used, and what consideration has the government received therefor?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). No.

GRAZING LEASES.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What applications for grazing leases were made to the Department of the Interior in 1905 on behalf of James W. Woods, A. W. Fleck and D. M. Finnie?
2. What leases were granted to each or any of the above?
3. What amount of land was included in each lease?
4. Were the leases subject to cancellation on two years' notice?
5. What assignments of said leases have since been made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Application were made by Messrs. Belcourt and Ritchie on behalf of James W. Woods for townships 1 and 2, ranges 23

and 24 ; on behalf of A. W. Fleck for townships 1 and 2, ranges 28 and 29, and township 1, range 27 ; and on behalf of D. M. Finnie for townships 3 and 4, ranges 28 and 29, all west of the 3rd meridian.

2. Leases were not granted to any of the applicants, but Messrs. Fleck and Finnie transferred their applications to Mr. J. R. Craig who was granted leases of portions of the tracts applied for by them, namely : Ranch No. 2873 comprising township 1, range 27 and township 2, range 28, all west of the 3rd meridian ; and ranch No. 2874 comprising townships 3 and 4, range 28, west of the 3rd meridian. Mr. Woods' application was not granted.

3. Each ranch contains an area of 43,840 acres.

4. Yes.

5. None.

RAILWAY SEMAPHORES.

Mr. ELSON asked :

1. Has the iron ladder and post manufactured by the Union Switch and Signal Company of the United States for semaphore purposes on railways been adopted by the government as a standard ladder and post for semaphore purposes?

2. Is the government aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway is erecting such semaphores at the interlocking plant at the diamond crossing east of the Asylum station in London township?

3. If accepted as a standard ladder and post, is it considered by the government as being convenient and safe for life and limb for those whose duty it is to attend to the lighting and care of said lamps, as the Piper semaphore which has been used previous to this date?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No ; the Board's Chief Engineer has seen the Union Switch and Signal Company, and the Canada Switch Company and considers both good, there being no apparent difference.

2. The Board's Chief Engineer states that the semaphores that are being installed at the point in question are manufactured by the Union Switch and Signal Company of the United States.

3. The engineer of the Board considers the Standard Ladder and post of the piper, the Union Switch and Signal Company, and the Canada Switch Company equally good.

PORT STANLEY BREAKWATER.

Mr. WM. JACKSON asked :

1. Who are the contractors for building of breakwater at Port Stanley?

2. Was this work let by tender? If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of their tenders?

3. When was work to be completed?

4. How much has been paid on account of work?

5. Have plans and specifications been changed in any way?

Mr. OLIVER.

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

1. M. J. Haney & R. Miller.

2. Yes. Haney & Miller, $105,828 ; The Pacific Construction Company, $111,000 ; Quinlan & Robertson, $115,000.

3. Twelve months from commencement of contract.

4. $59,620.

5. An order in council was passed, on the 30th of August, 1907, authorizing the substitution of mass concrete in place of the Fraser system.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL SURVEY.

Mr. BRABAZON asked :

1. Has the government received the final report of the engineer in charge of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian bay canal survey?

2. If so, what is the approximate cost of a 20 or 21 foot waterway from Montreal to the mouth of the French river?

3. When will said report be presented to parliament?

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

1. No.

2. Information not yet at hand.

3. Preparation of report is being pushed as rapidly as possible, and it will be presented to parliament as soon as completed.

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS.

Mr. BRABAZON asked :

1. What was the total number of immigrants arriving in Canada for the ten months ending October 31?

2. How many were rejected by the medical inspectors at the several ports of landing?

3. How many were sent to hospital for treatment, and how many were deported?

4. How many immigrants have been deported during the past season for insanity, criminal acts, or causes other than those detected by the inspectors at the port of debarkation?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 253,820.

2. 611.

3. 3,716 were sent to hospitals and of this number 611 were rejected.

4. 454.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. WHITE asked :

1. Has the final report of the Georgian bay canal survey been completed?

2. When will this report be presented to parliament?

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

1. No.

2. The preparation of the report is being pushed as rapidly as possible, and it will be presented to parliament as soon as completed.

INSURANCE COMPANIES' DEPOSITS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. What is the total amount, (a) of money, (b) of securities, required to be deposited with the government by all the United States insurance companies doing business in Canada?

2. Are such securities Canadian securities, or United States securities? If both, in what proportions?

3. Is the government aware whether or not the United States government requires all securities deposited with it by Canadian insurance companies doing business in that country to be United States securities?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1 and 2, 36 American companies are licensed to do business in Canada at the date of this return. These companies have fully complied with the requirements of the existing law in respect of their deposits in Canada. 31 of the said companies have made their entire deposits with the Receiver General ; while the deposits of the remaining 5 are held partly by the Receiver General and partly by trustees appointed for that purpose under the terms of the Insurance Act.

The following statement gives the facts called for, the amounts given being the par value in all cases. As regards direct deposits with the Receiver General, the values at which securities are accepted, or given credit for, never exceed par : deposits, however, made with trustees are subject to a reasonable margin allowed for at their market value, whether below or above par.

Deposits of American companies with Receiver General.

	Par value.	Per centage.
In Canadian securities	$19,183,129.63	90·20
In other British securities	535,333.33	2·51
In United States securities	1,550,000.00	7·29
	21,268,462.96	100·00

Deposits of American companies with Trustees.

	Par value.	Per centage.
In Canadian securities	$ 4,827,125.32	25·80
In United States securities	13,880,000.00	74·20
	18,707,125.32	100·00

Merging two classes together, the percentages are : In Canadian securities, 60·06 per cent ; in other British securities, 1·34 per cent ; United States securities, 38·60 per cent.

3. There are no securities deposited by insurance companies with the government of the United States. Deposits are made with the government of the various states. These states do not require all securities deposited with them by Canadian companies to be United States securities.

DISTRIBUTION OF BLUE BOOKS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday asked for some information as to the distribution of blue books this year. The information I am given is as follows : Owing to the crowded condition of the House of Commons post office it has been found impossible longer to distribute the larger and bulkier volumes of blue books at the post office. The smaller blue books will continue to be so distributed. Special arrangements are being made this session for the distribution of the larger books.

DESTITUTE IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if he is ready to answer the question which I asked yesterday regarding the stranded immigrants at Toronto, as the matter is of extreme urgency and pressing importance.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). An officer of the Department of the Interior went to Toronto last night to meet these people, but found difficulty in communicating with them. He is now awaiting an interpreter, who will go to Toronto to-night, to see what the condition actually is.

Mr. MACDONELL. Will the minister kindly give me the name of the officer who went to Toronto last night ?

Mr. OLIVER. Edward Blake Robertson.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, for the last four or five days the Heavyweights of parliament have been pounding each other across the floor of this House with political missiles, not always under the Marquis of Queensbury rules. If it were permissible for a stranger to be in the gallery and see this House opened with prayer, he might be reminded of the remark made by a celebrated after-dinner speaker at the Pilgrim Club in New York ; 'When the pilgrim fathers first landed on this, to them, foreign shore, they fell upon their knees, they then grabbed their battle-axes and fell upon the aborigines.' Mr. Speaker, in this wordy warfare, these heavyweights have gone long distances back and have had to use long guns ; but these long shots have, I am afraid, gone over the heads of the plain people whom I represent and of whom I am one ; and I ask you, Sir, to listen to me while I try to bring to your attention certain omissions from the speech from the Throne, of things which I think would

tend to the comfort, morality, peace and happiness of the people of Canada. I am not like some hon. gentlemen who rise from their seats and say, 'had it not been for what some hon. gentleman said, I would not have taken part in this debate,' and then produce a bundle of papers and speak for hours. I have been diligent during the recess, Mr. Speaker. As an ordinary plain citizen, I do not think I am able to perform the duty which I have been asked to perform by my constituents unless I devote my whole time to it. Consequently, during the recess I have been busy. I have here thousands of quotations, extracts and interviews which I can produce if necessary; but if hon. gentlemen will take as correct what I say, I shall not quote in full of these documents.

Now, Sir, for fourteen years I have had the honour of acting for the Crown in one of the largest agricultural counties in Canada. I believe that there are certain amendments to the Criminal Code which, if the government of the day will introduce them, will tend greatly to the morality and the health and the peace of the people of Canada. They are matters which are talked of every day and to the importance of which the people are very much alive. I do not think it is the province of a member of the opposition to introduce Bills. I believe it is the duty of the government to introduce all legislation and all amendments to legislation, and I have no doubt the government will be only too willing to do so when convinced that the legislation called for is right and proper. The first amendment I would suggest would be an amendment to the Criminal Code regarding injuries to persons by the knife. A great many Italians are given to this form of attack. No one else seems to use the knife but the Italian. A large number of good citizens have been killed or injured, and occasionally we hear of one of our policemen done to death by some Italian with a knife. Montreal papers of yesterday speak of one case a day, and ask for sixty more police. In my opinion we should give the power to our immigration authorities to deport any Italian or person of other nationality who is found with a knife on his person. That would wipe out the evil to a certain extent.

I find that in the presentment of the Grand Jury in the city of Toronto last assizes, they referred to the evil resulting from the carrying of deadly weapons. They said :

> Cases of murder and manslaughter are occurring with alarming frequency. We are of opinion that many of these are the result of the carrying of deadly weapons. We submit that strong measures should be taken to prevent this dangerous practice. We respectfully urge upon the authorities the necessity of making it the duty of police officers and constables generally to search at any time such persons as might be suspected of carrying concealed weapons, and that the person upon whom such weapons are found shall be liable to imprisonment for a term of not less than three months without the option of a fine.

That is not sufficient in my opinion. Any one who follows the course of crime in any country will find that it is to a certain extent epidemic. Thus when one person uses a knife and the crime is described in the newspapers, that acts as a suggestion to others to do likewise.

Another amendment which I would ask the government to consider, has reference to offences committed on women and children and the penalties imposed therefor. The other day the Grand Jury in the city of Toronto made a presentment which dealt with this evil as follows :

> We regret that in view of the heavy docket at the present assizes, and from information received at the jail and Central prison, it would appear that crime, and especially offences of a grave nature, are on the increase rather than otherwise. It is to be deplored that brutal offences against females are of such frequent occurrence. We strongly recommend that the lash be not spared in the penlties imposed upon those convicted of such revolting crimes.

The Central prison covers all Ontario criminals as well as Toronto.

If you will take notice of the penalties imposed, you will see that I am speaking of a matter in which the public is very much concerned, and it is also a crime which is epidemic in its nature. Look at the city of Vancouver. A man there commits burglary and he gets fifteen years imprisonment and the lash. Another man in Montreal breaks into a railway car and gets five years. Another in Ontario sends indecent post cards through the mail, and his punishment is two years. But here, in a city within fifty miles of this, a man who was guilty of violating a child, not more than eight years old, was only given fifty days in gaol. The other day in the city of Port Arthur, a hunchback, a foreigner, who had a shack outside the city, and who was wont to entice little girls into it, from eight to twelve years old, and to outrage them, was given a punishment of three years penitentiary. In my opinion that crime should be a capital offence, and the punishment should not be left to the discretion and the kindness of a jury or a soft hearted judge. The punishment should be obligatory. Where such offences are absolutely proved, the criminal should be adequately punished. This crime should be stamped out. There are hundreds of other cases of this kind which I could mention.

There is another amendment needed. Just consider the number of valuable lives which are lost by negligence in shooting, who are accidentally shot in the woods. A poor habitant or native, living in the woods with his little family, who is in want of food, and who shoots a moose, which turns out to be a cow moose, is hunted out of the

country. But what is done to the man who through criminal carelessness shoots another in the woods by mistake for a deer? You read of such mistakes every day in the paper. Here is one instance:

Freelton, Ont., November 14.

While hunting in Muskoka Henry Chambers of this place, was accidentally shot. Another member of his party mistaking him for a deer in the distance fired, shooting him through the bowels. A doctor was sent for, but Chambers died before his arrival. A coronor's jury exonerated from all blame the man who did the shooting.

Press reports say there were three hundred and seventy-five men killed last year in the Adirondacks. We are told that every immigrant is worth a thousand dollars to the country. If that be the case, every man who goes for his vacation for two weeks into the woods and has the money to pay his expenses, is worth $10,000. An amendment should be made to the Criminal Code providing that the man who shoots his fellow man by mistake, unless it is a pure accident, which was unavoidable, should be punished. Why should he not take all the precautions necessary? I am not a hunter myself and at one time I thought that the fault lay with the long distance rifle. I have conferred however with people who have knowledge, with men who have been in the woods this year, and they tell me that the long distance rifle should be a preventive. Because, instead of having to crawl up to the quarry and shoot quickly, as was the case when we had the short distance rifle, you can shoot at any distance when you have a rifle which carries two or three miles, and there is no necessity to shoot before you are absolutely certain what you are shooting at.

I would add that a few amendments to the Criminal Code regarding accidents on railways would benefit the people. I think that the members of the Railway Commission will bear me out. I was glad to see in the speech from the Throne that the Railway Commission is to be increased. They are doing good work. I believe that an impartial body like the Railway Commission is a great advantage both to the public and the railways. But instead of increasing the number here, there should be a commission for the western country, which is entirely different from the east, and a commission for the east so that the work could be handled properly.

As to preventing accidents on the railways, I do not see why we should not take a lesson from our own methods of preventing accidents on steamboats. The government will not allow a steamboat to go out until she has been fully examined. But there is no government inspection of locomotive steam boilers. Not long ago, an accident occurred on a railway train. The boiler burst, and the engineer and fireman were killed. It happened that the members of the Railway Commission were on that very train. Why should there not be an inspection of these locomotives, and also of the tracks of the railways? If the government had inspected that Caledon horse-shoe curve, they could have made regulations which would have made it impossible for an accident to occur there; or, if it happened, it would be through failure to obey laws for which somebody would be responsible. I speak in this matter as much for the men who are employed on the railways as for the travelling public. An engineer who, night after night and day after day, in the winter with the thermometer twenty below zero, or in summer with ninety degrees of heat, carries his passengers without losing or injuring any of them, is a man to be commended and admired. These railway employees are a fine body of men. When we lose an engineer, we lose a man who is of value to the state. And it is hardly creditable to us that 284 employees of the railways of Canada were killed last year and 390 injured. I ask that provision be made in the criminal law—and I have no doubt that in making that provision, we should have the concurrence of the managers of the railways—that roadbeds and equipment should be inspected, and trains run in a certain prescribed fashion at this or that point, as might be shown to be necessary by the inspection of the government officer. The Railway Commission is highly approved by the managers of the railways themselves. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy says he believes it is a good thing to have government control of rates. These railways are like all corporations—they have no soul. But that does not alter the fact that the railway managers feel these railway accidents more poignantly than any other persons except those directly interested. They earnestly wish that their roads could be without accidents; and, while they have to make money, and put money by, yet, if the government will say to them that they must do certain things, those things will be done. The railways may not make so much money, but it will be much easier for the managers to run their roads without accidents and the managers will be assisted in managing their roads with fewer accidents. Those men who took their financial lives in their hands and built the first railway across this continent on Canadian soil, have our admiration and I am glad to say have made millions, and I believe they are entitled to them. But to-day is different the railways are making millions. There is one railway corporation in this country that has a surplus of $30,000,000, and they added to that surplus last year $12,000,000. That company and every other company that runs a railway through a thickly-settled part of the country—as for instance that part of Ontario west of Toronto,—should be obliged to double-track their

roads. The government inspectors should decide what roads are to be provided with double-tracks, and the surpluses might well be used for such purposes as these. Our roads to-day are like a carpenter trying to do work with tools of twenty years ago. The law ought to compel them to provide proper working tools, and one of these is a system of double-tracks in the thickly-peopled parts of the country.

Now, I am glad to be able to say that I cannot agree with the hon. member or any other hon. member who rises in this House and talks hard times. I am speaking for the section of the country in which I live, and I have talked with hon. members from different parts of the country on this point. I am sure that the hon. members for Ontario and Eastern Canada will agree with me that, while there is a little shortage of money and the banks are not loaning as much as they did, there are no hard times. Certainly there are no hard times where I come from. It is almost impossible to find a man needing employment. I am one who always stands up for the banks of Canada. The system which they carry out is a most commendable one. It was a grand spectacle that was presented to us the other day in the city of New York, when banks were tumbling and trust companies and corporations failing like trees before a hurricane, there stood the banks of Canada like the old British square, four square to every blast. But there is one respect in which our system could be improved. I think it quite proper that our banks should call in some of their capital, because, no matter how prosperous we in this country may be, there is nothing like prudence, yet our prosperity depends upon the farmers; and, while the farmers of Canada are as prosperous this year as they ever were—for, if they have not quite as much produce, they have better prices—we must recognize the fact that outside countries will not buy as much from us as formerly, and it is necessary that we should be prepared for that condition when it arises. It is a wise saying that warns us in times of peace to prepare for war—and it is a wise thing to prepare even though war may not come in the end. But while I quite agree that it is right that the banks should call in some of their capital, there is one little matter in which I cannot quite agree with the banks, and for which I believe a remedy can be found. Our banks hold themselves at liberty to notify their customers without even one day's grace; 'I am instructed from headquarters to notify you that your rate of interest on discounts hereafter will be 7 per cent instead of 6 per cent,' is the notice lately sent out. I speak with knowledge in that matter, because I got one of these notices myself—and I have it here if any hon. gentleman would like to look at it. Now, if a bank—I speak of a commercial bank—wants to increase its discount rate from 6 per cent to 7 per cent, it should be obliged to increase its rate of interest on deposits from 3 per cent to 4 per cent—it's a poor rule that won't work both ways. This would affect a good many people in my section of country. For instance, take the village of Exeter, with a population of about 2,000 and surrounded by Devonshire and German people. I will undertake to say that there is not less than $2,000,000 of hard cash deposited in the banks at Exeter drawing 3 per cent. That is the way they do things in Huron. If the banks are to charge more for loaning money, they should pay more for the money they have in charge. I am not a financier, but I have conferred with financiers on this matter, and I would like the government to consider one point. This is the only country in the world in which banks are commercial banks and savings banks together. And, so far as I know the law, there is no authority of law for our banks carrying on savings bank business in connection with the commercial banks. The savings banks receive the money of the people and pay them 3 per cent on it. But they tell their depositors: You cannot get this money back in three months. It loans that money out to the people in the neighbourhood. A man wants to build a little house, or go into some business, and he is not called upon to pay the money back at a day's notice. But the commercial banks are different. They do not pay interest on deposits. Their stability is undoubted, and, that it may be undoubted, they must have their assets in what is called liquid form. They discount commercial paper. The savings bank withdrawals are subject to notice. Commercial banks pay no interest on the money deposited in their banks. We have no Banking Act except for commercial banking. I merely draw this matter to the attention of the Finance Minister.

I have said that there are no very hard times in the section of country from which I come. There is a stringency of money. I notice that the banks, on the 31st of last July, had nearly $10,000,000 less loaned to the people of Canada than they had the year before; I presume that figure is a great deal higher just now. They are taking in sail; but I don't believe there is going to be any storm, I hope not. But there is one thing which I ask the government to take particular notice of. Factories are stopping for a day, and the men lay there under pay. Large institutions cannot get their orders out; merchants cannot get goods in; farmers cannot ship their apples and produce, and it spoils. Notwithstanding the shortage of grain in the Northwest, they cannot get their produce out, and business generally is to a certain extent in stagnation. Never before has there been so great a shortage of cars. One institution that I know of that wants

from fifteen to twenty-seven cars a day, on the 13th 14th and 17th of November, did not get a car. Thirty-six new cars came across from Detroit, but before they got there they were all gobbled up but three. What is the reason ? I say that the government should instruct the Railway Commission to say to the railways, if you undertake to do business you must do it, you must haul the load or break the harness. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy said, I have $10,000,000 in that drawer which I will pay for motive power, for cars and equipment, but I cannot get it. An hon. gentleman in this House who is connected with some engine works says that he can give them all the engines they want. Where then is the trouble ? Why, Sir, two lines of railway to Fort William bring in more grain than seven lines from the lower end of lake Huron can carry away. What is the reason ? 12,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain going to Buffalo that should go through the port of Montreal. Why ? Because they cannot get cars to carry it away. There are seven lines from the lower end of Lake Huron to the Georgian Bay, there is Depot Harbour, Midland, Meaford, Collingwood, Owen Sound, Goderich, Sarnia and Tiffin, to say nothing of Kingston on Lake Ontario. I think it is a hindrance of trade on the part of the railways. One gentleman said it was because the railways were carrying Armour's beef to the sea. If you live at Napanee or Belleville you will see train after train going to the sea with Armour's beef. I think the railway managers should be more interested than I am in this matter. And I wish that some one would compel them to take that surplus and buy more equipment.

I will now mention another matter in which perhaps some hon. gentlemen will not agree with me. I took a little trip to the other side last year, and came across an American gentleman who had retired from business. He had been connected with one of the largest paper making establishments in the United States, from which they sent out every morning one or two carloads of paper made up ; and this gentleman said that he never could understand—we were discussing quietly one evening, not knowing that the matter had been brought up in Canada—why Canadians acted so foolishly—why they were killing the goose that laid the golden egg. The newspapers of this country are more concerned in this matter than anybody else ; they are now paying double price for their paper. I have looked into the facts. England took $28,000,000 worth last year of paper. Where does she get it ? 82 per cent of it from the United States. Sweden and Norway, the balance from Germany and Russia ; Canada is not mentioned. Where does the United States get their pulp wood ? From Canada. She pays $6 a cord for Canadian pulp wood, and she sells it for $30 a cord when it is made up. $7,000,000 are lost to the workingmen of Canada by the pulpwood being taken out of the country. Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Ohio, Illinois, Dakota, Minnesota, Michigan, are denuded of pulpwood ; there is a little left in Maine and Wyoming. We have the pulpwood supply of the world. Why, Sir, the United States do not even allow us to carry it in our own vessels. There is a line coming down from Chicago to Quebec with grain through our canals without paying anything for the use of them, and they take back pulpwood to the State of Wisconsin and the Fox river valley. Every evening, Sundays, included, you will see from three to five train loads—not carloads—of paper going out there to the markets of the world, made out of Canadian pulpwood. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy says, if the United States people wish to benefit from the raw material of Canada, let them come inside our tariff and manufacture it here. We have the water power, we have the pulp, we have the business in our own hands. I say that the government of Canada have been remiss in conserving the natural resources of the country, in that they do not put an export duty on pulpwood, or prohibit it altogether. On the 5th day of last October the International Paper Company of the United States bought 45 square miles of pulpwood forest in New Brunswick ; they have bought or leased 300 square miles of pulpwood forest in New Brunswick. They had watered their stock. Here is a little item I picked up yesterday.

The International Paper Company is producing less news print paper to-day than it turned out immediately after its organization.

They have raised the price over there.

The available funds at its command which should have been used for new paper machines, has gone towards the acquirement of 2,597 square miles of timber limits registered in one of the four land offices in the province of Quebec, Canada.

I have heard arguments against this proposition, but they have always come from interested parties, either from a corporation who wanted to get their material, or from somebody who is afraid of something else, but they are always interested. I would probably say the same thing if I were personally interested, but I am not. Human nature is human nature.

Now, there is another matter which I proposed to bring up last year in reference to mining companies of the country. I discussed the matter with an hon. gentleman, one of the leaders on this side of the House, and he informed me when I told him I thought of bringing it up, that people could not be prevented from making fools of them-

selves by Act of parliament, that if a man liked to go out and throw his gold into the sea, we could not prevent it. But, I think we can prevent them from being fraudulently deprived of their money. I did not take it up last session because an hon. member from Alberta—I may mention his name as I do not think he will object to it—told me that if I did it would probably injure a good many poor people who had invested their money in the mines. My point is this : Why should a man who has never been in the mining country send some one there, buy a quarter or a half an acre of land, get an Ontario government metallurgist or assayer to stamp a piece of rock taken from that land as ore, float a company for $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 or more, and then take that stock around and sell it for five or ten cents a share ? The allurement is in selling it for five or ten cents a share ; it looks cheap. Why, Sir, if a bank wants to circulate its bills it has to have money behind them. If a manufacturing company wants to take out papers of incorporation it has to show something tangible behind it. To illustrate the difference between mining and industrial companies I will give a few comparisons. Here is a list of three weekly sets of companies incorporated last year. There were thirteen mining companies whose capitalization was $14,000,000 and there were sixteen industrial companies with a capital stock of $900,000. There were two mining companies with a capital of $3,600,000 and ten commercial companies with a capital of $600,000. There were two mining companies with a capital of $1,500,000 and six industrial companies with a capitalization of $600,000. I think that the mines of Canada are going to be the richest mines in the world, they ought to be exploited and the man who goes out and devotes his time and money to the exploitation of these mines deserves to be successful. But, there are only ten producing companies to 150 which are not producing. What I wish to impress upon the government is that they should make some provision in the mining law, that all money which is put into mining, whether the stock is bought for five or ten cents on the dollar or not, should be invested properly for the purpose of exploiting the mines, for the purpose for which it is intended and not go into the pockets of fake shareholders. That would be a good Act. An English member of parliament, the other day, discussing this question in Toronto, said that most of the mines in one portion of our country consisted of holes in the ground and a number of deluded shareholders. It is all right to invest money in mines if it goes there, but if all the mining companies which have been incorporated within the last two years in Canada were to pay 6 per cent on the money invested in them they would have to take out 3,000 tons of silver every year, which is impossible. The trouble is that it is the poor person who puts up this money and that is where a good deal of the money stringency comes from now. Their money has gone into other hands. A poor person is allured by the idea of making 300, 400 or 500 per cent and he or she is urged to buy stock to-day upon the representation that it will increase in value 20 per cent in a short time. I was informed last year by one of our leaders that a reputable brokerage firm—and they must have been a reputable firm or they would not have done so—had shut their doors to women who were coming in to invest their money in stocks in Ottawa. Stock are a rich man's game, one who can afford to lose.

I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to another matter. There seems to be something incongruous in the guardianship or control of the fisheries on the great lakes. On Lake Erie the Dominion government cruiser 'Petrel' is in charge. On Lake Huron, the other day, an Ontario government cruiser was wrecked at the breakwater off the Port of Goderich, which should have been fixed before. The point which I wish to bring to the attention of this House is this : The farmer has his farm worth $5,000, he pays taxes on it and he is generally well-to-do. There is no chance of that farm running away or being burnt up. But, the fisherman—and he is generally a poor man like myself—who risks his life and takes his boats and nets, costing as much as the farm, out into the deep, night after night and day after day, to make his living by garnering the harvest of the sea, is in a different position. What has he to do ? He pays taxes on his property at home, but he has to pay to the government—I do not know which government, whether it is this government or the government of Ontario as it applies to both administrations and there is no political capital to be made twenty miles away from there he has to pay another $100. If he has a machine at the back of his boat to help him take in the nets and save the cost of a man he has to pay $50 or some amount like that. Why should these men be obliged to pay these enormous sums and why should they be treated differently from the farmer or merchant or any person else especially when he takes into consideration the fact that the fisherman has to risk his life. I thoroughly understand that the fisherman should have a permit and that fishing should be controlled by the government in certain places because otherwise the fisheries would be done away with entirely, but for that permit he could pay $5. Why should he have to pay $100 or $200 and, if the fishery gets poor and he has to move his nets away, pay another $100 ? I bring this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

In reference to immigration there has

been some discussion as to a number of people walking the streets in certain cities without employment. I think that the manner in which immigration has been conducted for the last year or two is responsible for the condition which we find existing to-day. Two hundred and eleven thousand people were brought into this country in the last seven months and of these 104,000, or half, were English-speaking people. The trouble is that they are bringing in people from the slums of the cities and not the kind of people we want, not agricultural labourers, but people who will not go on the land, people who have been assisted at home before they came out here and they expect to be assisted here. There was in all the Toronto papers a story of a man who could not get work in Hamilton, who walked to Toronto, who said that he could not get work and who also stated that for three days he could not get anything to eat. I believe that is untrue and that the fact is the man would not work. Conductors on the railways west of Toronto tell me that they have these people on the trains every day. They think that the trains must carry them for nothing. They would not work at home and they will not work here. I propose to move—and I give notice now—that all assistance to immigration from this time out shall stop, except to agricultural labourers or domestic help. The men we want are men who will go on the land, or farm labourers. If they were no good at home they will be no good here, and they should have enough money to bring them here. I find that one trouble is that societies are bringing these people out. I am not referring to the Salvation Army—I am told they only bring out deserving people, or to those who bring out domestics, who are, I am informed, doing good work, but there are other societies who bring paupers from their own congregations and land them in this country. I think that if inquiry is made at the immigration office it will be found that what I state is the fact. Twenty six hundred people from the old country have been debarred from this country and nearly 900 have been deported. Showing that the immigration officials are carrying out the law as it now is. I wish to bring to the notice of the newspapers of this country the fact which people do not seem to know, that if in any town, village or other place there is an undesirable immigrant, a card sent to the Immigration Department will result in his immediate deportation. It is not so much that these people are no good to themselves, but worst of all, that they are a bad example to the community. For instance, we had a couple of immigrants from Whitechapel in our town which has a population of 5,000 inhabitants, all people of the highest morals, and we never saw a drunken woman on the street until one of these poor immigrants was picked up half a dozen times drunk, sometimes she was taken to jail and generally she was a discredit to her sex. I regret to say that her bad example was followed, although I may say that this particular woman to whom I refer was deported.

Now, Sir, I wish to state that at the earliest opportunity I propose moving a resolution in this House with respect to the Senate. In a recent speech which he delivered before the Canadian Club, Dr. Falconer said it was a wise thing to submit to the people the great questions of the day for their judgment. We are a democratic people in Canada; we should be governed by ourselves, and I think our laws should be made by the direct representatives of the people, who are directly responsible and can be punished if acting wrongly. The great question in the old country to-day is the abolition of the House of Lords, and one of the great questions which for a number of years has concerned the public mind in Canada is the construction of our Senate. I therefore purpose submitting a resolution to this House to the effect, that at the next general election a vote of the people of Canada shall be taken on two questions (1) on the question: Shall the Senate of Canada be abolished, (2) Shall the members of the Canadian Senate be elected by the provinces. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the House for the courtesy which you have extended to me.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex.) I must congratulate the last speaker (Mr. Lewis) on the very moderate tone of his address. With much that he has said I heartily concur; I believe that so far as this parliament can it should give effect to the provisions of the criminal law in the direction of protecting all members of the great Canadian family, and especially our youth, and the hon. gentleman is to be commended for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. I can assure him I will give him my support in any proposition he makes tending towards that desirable object. I rose more particularly, Sir, to offer some remarks on the important question of the Canadian hog trade, a topic which was dealt with in so characteristic a manner yesterday by the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements). As that hon. gentleman said, this question is of great importance to all Canada, and it is of special importance to the counties of Essex and Kent which probably ship more dressed hogs than any other counties in the Dominion. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) is not in his seat to-day, but I may say that I have endeavoured to ascertain from the speech just what his attitude on this question is. At one time he said that the meat inspection law was an innocent looking Bill, but I would gather that the conclusion from his speech is that he is entirely opposed to any inspection at all. Now, the farmers of his constituency

are interested in the same way as the producers of my constituency, and our interests are to that extent the same. Further, it is a question into which politics should not enter; it is a question concerning the interests of all the farmers, Conservative and Liberal alike, and I therefore regret that I cannot see eye to eye with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) on the matter. Speaking of the Minister of Agriculture, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) said:

I congratulate that hon. minister upon his safe return from the city of Chatham where he was forced to meet the farmers who were up in arms against the legislation which he is solely and entirely responsible for, and which has been placed upon the statute-books of this country.

In another part of the speech he said:

I can see no reason for the legislation at all.

From this I conclude that the hon. member is absolutely and entirely against the Inspection Act which was passed after careful consideration by this House last session. That attitude of his is not complimentary to many members on his own side of the House who not only approved in strong terms of the principle of the Bill, but who would have gone further and would have extended the inspection to all meat consumed in the province of Ontario, not confining it, as the Bill does, to interprovincial and export trade.

Mr. BLAIN. In the absence of the hon. gentleman (Mr Clements) may I be permitted to say that I understood him to state that he had no objection to the Bill but that he dissented from the regulations passed by the minister.

Mr. CLARKE. I was anxious the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) should be here so that I might ascertain from him exactly just what he does mean. I was anxious that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) might be here to give the House and the people of the country the benefit of some of that great store of wisdom which according to his own estimate is concentrated in him. I would judge, however, from some remarks of his which I see in 'Hansard' that he is out flat-footed against the legislation. I can well understand why he should want to creep out of the position of being opposed to the legislation, because when we refer to what took place last session we find that this Bill was under discussion in this House from time to time for almost two months. It was introduced by a motion to go into committee on the 4th of December, 1906, and it did not receive its third reading until the 29th of January, 1907. First the resolution to introduce the Bill was discussed; then the Bill itself was discussed on three separate occasions in committee at very great length, and most of the prominent members on both sides of the House took an active and interested part in that discussion. On the 11th of December the discussion on the resolution preceding the introduction of the Bill occupies thirty-four pages of 'Hansard'; on the 11th of January the discussion covers twenty-nine pages; on the 17th of January the discussion takes up thirty pages and the discussion in the last meeting in committee ranges over fifty pages of 'Hansard.' And notwithstanding the furore now raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements), and notwithstanding all the wisdom which he professes to have not one word did we hear from him on this important question. If his opinion be now, as he professes, that this was an iniquitous measure, then he surely was recreant to his trust and negligent of his duty that not one word of protest was uttered by him either in this House or in the committee.

As I have said, this is an important question. I may say that last session the House was all but unanimous as to the wisdom of the adoption of this legislation. One or two members thought it was perhaps not necessary in that it would put an expense on the country which was scarcely warranted by the prevailing conditions. Well, I would be very glad if the conditions were such that no such legislation was required. All legislation of this sort creates more or less irritation; we have had the same difficulty with our Public Health Acts; the vaccination law created a great deal of controversy and disturbance, the hog cholera laws at first engendered irritation, but I venture to think that to-day in the counties of Essex and Kent no man who has regard for his opinion will deny that that legislation has protected the hog-raising industry, and that it was a boon to these counties. It would be unreasonable to expect that irritation would not be caused by this Meat Inspection Act. If a man finds his hog is diseased and he cannot sell it, there is bound to be disappointment. But the real question is: Is the legislation justified, and that question presents two aspects. In the first place, is there such danger from the use of infected pork as to call for these regulations which some have characterized as drastic. There are differences of opinion on that. I have discussed the question with farmers of both political parties and I must say that the strongest approval I have heard of this Act and of the regulations framed under it has come from Conservatives. I find a good many kickers as they say, among the members of my own party. But after all it is not a matter on which people should divide politically. What the farmers want to be convinced of is as to whether it is necessary that these restrictions should be made, and if they are necessary in the interests of the trade. I believe the farmers will be satisfied to put up with the inconvenience in order that good may result. Last ses-

sion the Minister of Agriculture pointed out cases in which disease had been communicated. He instanced a case in Germany, where the disease had been traced to the human being directly from the use of pork. The minister has favoured me with a circular letter on this important question, dated the 6th of September, 1901, which was sent out from the Local Government Board in London to the councils of the metropolitan and other boroughs and rural districts. From this letter I make the following extracts:—

I am directed by the local government board to state that at the recent congress on tuberculosis, Professor Koch called in question the correctness of the opinion that tuberculosis can be transmitted from animals to man. The views expressed by Professor Koch on this subject have not received the general assent of scientific men; but, having regard to the great importance of the matter, His Majesty's government have thought it right to accede to a request made by the congress that there should be an inquiry with respect to it. A royal commission has accordingly been appointed to inquire and report whether tuberculosis in animals and man is one and the same disease; whether animals and man can be reciprocally infected with it; under what conditions, if at all, the transmission of the disease from animals to man takes place; and what are the circumstances favourable or unfavourable to such transmission.

In view of the greater tendency to generalization of tuberculosis in the pig, we consider that the presence of the tubercular deposit in any degree should involve seizure of the whole carcass and of the organs.

In respect of foreign dead meat, seizure shall ensue in every case where the pleura have been 'stripped.'

My information is that that inquiry was made before a royal commission, and the finding of the commission was that Professor Koch was wrong in stating that the disease was not transmissible from the hog to man, and that the opinion prevailed that the disease was thus transmissible. If this is so, it is a matter of very great seriousness, not only to the people of the old world, but also to the people of Canada. It is of very great consequence to us all that safeguards should be provided, so that the disease which is so common in the hog should not be transmitted to the human being. Then, in a letter of April 11, 1907, written to Mr. William L. Griffith, Esq., secretary of the Dominion government offices in London, by Mr. W. Collingridge, medical officer of health of the city of London—that is, since the introduction of the Bill into this House—I find the following:

I note that under section 18 of the Bill (No. 33, 1906-7) respecting the inspection of meats and canned goods introduced by Mr. Fisher in the House of Commons of Canada on December 8 last, the Governor in Council may make orders and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the Act.

In the interests of Canadian exporters it is desirable that any regulations that may be made with regard to meat inspection in the Dominion should conform to these in operation in the meat markets in the metropolis, all of which are under the administration of the corporation of London, otherwise meat consigned from Canada would be liable to seizure and condemnation as, although passed as fit for export, it might not be in accordance with the standard required in the London markets.

In these circumstances I inclose for your information a circular letter issued by our local government board containing the recommendations of the Royal Commission on tuberculosis with regard to the inspection of tuberculosis cattle and pigs, and which have been adopted by the corporation.

It may be useful for you to know that both the authorities in Denmark and Holland have adopted these recommendations as regulations in their respective countries, and an opportunity will be presented to the Canadian government when the Bill referred to is passed of also incorporating them in any regulations made under this Bill.

In view of the importance of the question, I strongly urge the adoption of this suggestion by the Canadian government, and trust that the High Commissioner will see his way to lend his kindly co-operation in the matter.

Now, the question is not altogether whether there is danger from the eating of the diseased meat; the greater question, as pointed out last session, is the probable effect on the market for our hogs. I read from a report of the medical officer of the city of London, for November, 1906, as follows:

A considerable proportion of the foreign and colonial meat passing through the city markets bears a label or stamp professing to indicate that the article so marked has undergone some kind of official inspection before export.

At the present time such meat comes into the market from the following countries:—Argentine Republic, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, New Zealand, United States of America.

It therefore appears desirable that the whole question of the inspection and marking of foreign and colonial meat intended for export to this country should be made the subject of a detailed investigation, inasmuch as it appears that English breeders are placed at a disadvantage in their own markets, in having to compete with imported pigs from both Belgium and the United States, from which countries pigs can be sent here showing evidence of disease at the time of slaughter which would compel their condemnation in this country.

This inquiry should, of course, embrace all those countries mentioned above as sending marked meats to the city markets, and in addition those which export unmarked meat to this country should be included.

That includes Canada. These references, and the references which were given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the discussion last session, prove conclusively that the opinion prevails, at any rate in the mother country, that it is necessary to have the inspection, and unless that inspection is such as to meet the requirements of that market, the Canadian export trade to Great

Britain will be very seriously damaged. If that is so, surely any member who represents a community of hog shippers is not doing his duty to his constituents if he does not promote whatever steps are necessary to maintain that very profitable market. Let me for a moment refer to the extent of the hog business of Canada. I find that in bacon, which is our principal item of export of the products of the hog, we have been steadily increasing our output to Great Britain. Going back to 1896, we find that in that year it amounted to $3,385,463. It has gone on increasing from year to year, with some fluctuations, until in 1895 it reached the magnificent proportions of $13,391,675.

That is the export of Canada to Great Britain, taken from the British figures, of bacon alone. We find that in hams there has also been a very profitable export. In 1896 it was $1,778,387. In 1906 it amounted to $3,282,415. So that steadily from year to year the market has been improved, and for some years back, in bacons and hams alone, the farmers of this country have been receiving between $12,000,000 and $13,000,000. How has it been in the United States, our trade competitors: With them the conditions have been the reverse since 1901. In 1896 they exported to Great Britain $19,791,312 of bacon. They increased that up to 1901 when they reached their top notch. In that year they exported to the extent of $45,045,142. Since then, however, their export has been declining at the rate of $5,000,000 a year, as the following figures show:

In 1902	$40,099,007
1903	35,871,850
1904	30,217,177
1905	28,364,841

Here comes the significant fact for Canada. Although the exports were diminishing in the United States during those years at the rate of $5,000,000 a year, they showed an increase in Canada. In 1906 the export from the United States increased to $33,380,704 as compared with $28,364,841 the previous year. It looks as if there were a reaction in the United States. There is an increase of practically $5,000,000 in one year. That is what Canadians have to compete against. We find that the United States has a stringent meat inspection law and stringent regulations. These regulations are required in their trade with England, and, therefore, it seems to me that the Canadian producer and packer would be guilty of trade suicide if they did not take care to place themselves in the same position as their competitors. I have, therefore, not the slightest hesitation in saying that I consider the meat inspection law in the interest of the public. Its intention is to maintain and promote the profitable trade we have. If we do not have proper inspection, our trade in this direction must inevitably fall off. Instead of censure, I think that the Minister of Agriculture deserves commendation. With the knowledge he obtained, it was his bounden duty to take some steps to protect this trade, and the measure he submitted to the House received our unanimous approval last session. I take it that the House is still of the same opinion. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) thinks not, let him introduce a Bill to repeal the Act and take the sense of the House once more. Some of the regulations, however, have caused considerable irritation in my constituency as well as in that of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clements). There was a good deal of apprehension that they were going to very materially affect the dressed hog trade. That was an apprehension which I myself shared. Perhaps the matter is one which is more important to those western counties, which deal more largely in dressed hogs, than to some other parts of the country. The objections made were these. The regulation which caused the principal uneasiness was No. 19c:

> 19. No carcasses or portions thereof other than those bearing the words 'Canada approved,' and which have been inspected and found fit for food, shall be allowed to enter any establishment at which inspection is maintained, except as hereinafter provided:
>
> (c) Dressed carcasses, with the head, heart, lungs and liver, held by their natural attachments, such carcasses to be inspected before entering the establishment, and if found fit for food to be marked with the crown and the words 'Canada approved.' If found to be diseased or otherwise unfit for food, to be dealt with as provided in the regulations.

That clause is the only one to which serious objection is made, and the only one which was objected to at the large meeting in Chatham which I had the privilege of attending. It was contended that it was impossible to ship with the organs in. The farmers said, and I think rightly, that owing to the temperature being warmer in the southwestern part of Ontario than in many other parts, there would be a heating, on account of these parts, which would extend to the entire animal, and by the time it got to the packing house the meat would be practically destroyed. The shippers announced that they would not take the risk of shipping the carcasses in that way, and it was considered that this regulation was a great blow to the dressed hog business. The farmers' wives also raised objections. They have been accustomed to getting the fat for lard, and it was a serious disappointment to them when they found they could not do this and the hogs would not be dressed as formerly. That is what caused the agitation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) has taken credit for himself that he was the only one who brought this matter to the attention of the minister. He said:

When I first took up the fight against the regulations, I was practically alone in the district. I have a very great regard for the

gentlemen who represent the adjoining constituencies, but I had not heard from them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, reputations travel slowly. I thought that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was the man to whom I ought to address myself. I did not know at that time that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) knew more in twenty-four hours than the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) could possibly know, with all his practical experience and with all the information he had obtained. I may say that whenever any one speaks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) as a farmer in his part of the country, where he is best known, a broad smile illuminates the audidence. Hereafter, however, I shall pay more attention to him, having learned from himself that he has so much wisdom. I am sorry that he did not make use of it to suggest something valuable or some new regulations which would be more workable, but he sat down leaving us in entire ignorance as to what he would do if he were Minister of Agriculture, and we can only guess at what he would do. I think that the hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) should be commended for his desire to meet the wishes of the people. The regulations do not cover all the details. They do not expressly say that the hogs should be inspected at the packing house. There is nothing in the regulations which prevents their being inspected at the shipping point. The farmers, at the meeting I have mentioned, did discuss the Act pretty thoroughly. They were invited to do so by the Minister of Agriculture. I took two gentlemen down from the county of Essex, and they discussed the matter very freely. When they were asked their opinion as to what would make the system more workable, their suggestion was that the hogs should be inspected at the shipping station, which would enable the farmers to ship dressed hogs as they had been doing before. I think that all agreed that inspection is necessary and proper. The people did not object to the inspection, but objected to shipping the carcasses with the vital organs to be inspected four hundred miles away. I am glad the minister saw his way clear, even at some additional expense, to adopt the suggestion made. I do not think the members ought to begrudge the payment of some money in the interests of the farmer. The minister has consented to the inspection at the shipping station. I would impress upon him that the instructions for carrying out the regulations should be elastic enough to allow the inspectors to go to the farms where there is to be a large killing, so that all the entrails and organs may be removed at the same time. The minister has adopted the suggestion for inspection at the station, and, if there is any other sugestion which my hon. friend (Mr. Clements) would like to make, I think it was his duty to have made it at the meeting in Chatham, or in the course of his speech yesterday. I was in hopes he would assist us, because what we want is the best regulations possible, the regulations that will carry out the inspection with the least inconvenience to those interested. This is what the hon. gentleman said :

> My object in rising, sir, was to plead with the Minister of Agriculture to abolish or amend the meat inspection regulations.

He does not say what amendment he would make.

> I ask the Minister of Agriculture to annul these regulations altogether because I can see no good reason for their existence.

A more silly statement, I think, could not well be made, if we are to have the Act at all. If we are to have inspection, there must be regulations made under which that inspection is to be carried out. The hon. gentleman suggests that the regulations should be wiped out. If you wipe out the regulations, you nullify the Act, and make Canada a laughing stock in the eyes of the world. I do not say that we will not make complaint, if, in the working out of these regulations, unnecessary inconvenience is caused to the farmer. I hope that, under the instructions that have been given, there will be nothing of that kind. This is a new Act, and an experimental one, and I do not think that the minister will refuse to accede to any reasonable suggestion designed to facilitate the working out of the Act without inconvenience to the farmer.

The hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements) referred to another question which is of importance to my riding—the question of the tobacco regulations. With his remarks upon that subject, I agree.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Before going on with that, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Clarke a question? His riding of South Essex is similar to my own in relation to the hog industry. Did he approve of the Bill and regulations as they came down, and as they are now in force ?

Mr. CLARKE. I did not approve of the regulations as I expected and feared that they were going to be carried out. I have already stated that. There was a great deal of apprehension of the result if the inspection was to take place at the packing house. It was thought that it would be a serious blow to the dressed-meat trade. I made representations to that effect to the Minister of Agriculture, and pointed out to him in a very forcible way the need of change. I am very glad to say that he has adopted the best suggestions that the people of the two counties could make to meet the wishes of the farmers in this matter.

I was about to speak of the tobacco question. I think that all the tobacco-growing counties are agreed that the present law,

which has been in force for a good many years, requiring three separate manufactories, one for foreign leaf, one for Canadian leaf, and one for combination tobacco, with separate stamps for each, should be changed. I have been pressing upon the government for the last two or three years, the advisability of changing to a uniform stamp. I think that ought to be done. We were disappointed in this matter last session. The departure of the Prime Minister from the country prevented the carrying out of our wish. We are expecting that it will be done this year, and, in that respect, my hon. friend and I are entirely in accord.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of very interesting speeches in this debate. The last two speakers, I think, spoke in a fair spirit, and expressed themselves in good terms. I am not much dissatisfied with the speech of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke). It is impossible for me, as a medical man, to say that I am not in favour of the inspection of meat. We know that tapeworm is conveyed through the eating of pork as well as trichina spiralis and other diseases. The communication of tuberculosis in this way is in doubt according to the best medical men in the world, but it is better for us not to run any risk. We should have some way of indicating to the foreign buyer that our meat has been properly inspected, and is in a healthy condition and fit for food. But I should think it would be much better if the Act were so drawn and the regulations so made that our Canadian people would be protected also. It would appear that this is not provided for by the present regulations. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for South Essex say that when the interests of our farmers were being discussed, politics should be left out of the question. I think that is a proper stand to take. It would be well for the members on both sides if they would try and give a little more attention to our farming interests and not carry politics into these discussions so freely as they do.

However, I rise, not so much to talk on this question, as on another question that has attracted my attention. I wish to make a few remarks on the subject of the treaty which our government have been negotiating with the representatives of France. When I glanced at the terms of that treaty I was very much pleased. I thought it would benefit the farmers of this country to a very great extent. I was inclined, if possible, to give credit to the government, to commend them where I thought they were worthy of it, going on the principle of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down—that is, that we ought to leave politics out of consideration when the great farming interests of this country are under discussion. For almost the first time in the history of Canada, we were in a position to discuss a question of this kind properly in this House. Formerly, when treaties were made between Canada and foreign countries, we always had some British nobleman, or some great jurist or other prominent Britisher, as part of the commission. Now, we have had a treaty directly negotiated by two of our own ministers, two of our experienced ministers, and two men in whom I myself would have had considerable confidence. They must, I think, receive credit for all that is good in this treaty; but, for once, we have them in the position that they must take the blame for all the bad points in it. Formerly, when a treaty was negotiated the members of the government, whether Conservative or Liberal, have been able to put the blame for the faults of the treaty on the British member of the commission,—he was made scapegoat for any mistakes, while the government always took the credit for the good points in the treaty.

Now, in these matters the government must get the credit for all the good points of the treaty, and must for once take blame for all the bad points. When I began to examine the treaty, I saw that our horses, cows, cattle and wheat, and all those things would be introduced into France under the minimum tariff. I read schedule A, where horses were found, and I could not see that our farmers were going to be greatly benefited by this item. But on examining more closely the item of horses, I found out that the duty on horses under the French general tariff was 200 francs and under the minimum tariff 150 francs, that means that a duty of $30 has to be paid on a horse going into France even under the minimum tariff. I thought that would be of little use to our farmers. No farmer in Canada would ship horses to France and pay a duty of $30 each on them, when he could take them across the channel into England for nothing. I thought the duty might just as well have been $100 on each horse, because it is already prohibitory. Then I took the item of oxen, on which there is a duty of 30 francs per 100 kilogs under the minimum tariff, that would be about two cents a pound. You would have to pay $30 or $40 to get a good fat ox into France, and that is a prohibitory duty. It is no use to our farmers at all; and this, remember, is the minimum tariff. Then I took the items of steers, heifers, bullocks, and so on, and I saw that these would pay two cents a pound, which will amount to a prohibitory duty; it is of no use to us at all. Then I saw some words in italics, and turning back to the end of the book, I found that the articles in italics are those appearing only in the general tariff, on which the duties are identically the same in both tariffs. When they say that some of these Canadian products get the benefit of the

minimum tariff, there is practically no such tariff. Then I found that on the item of fresh meat there is a duty of three cents a pound on mutton, of more than two cents per pound on pork; and the duty on beef, if it is under this minimum tariff, was still more than two cents a pound. Why, that is a prohibitory tariff, it is no use to the farmers of Canada. Then I found dead poultry in italics, which meant that there really was no minimum tariff on this also. Why was it put in there?

Well, I thought that if we could not make anything out of the cattle schedule, nothing out of dead meat, perhaps this wise government had been successful in getting our grain into France on better terms. I turned up to the item of wheat and I saw that it was in italics also, no minimum tariff on wheat, just the same as before the treaty was concluded, and still under the general tariff. The same on barley, on rye, on maize, on buckwheat—what advantage is this treaty to us in these articles? Then I noticed potatoes similarly situated, and I said to myself: If the farmers get no benefit out of these items I have mentioned, perhaps we are going to get some advantage on some other industries besides the farming industry. I saw that we were to have the privilege of taking our great iron products into France, and I began to think that we might get some benefit for the iron industry on the millions and millions of tons of iron that we might be able to send into France. But then I considered that it would after all only benefit our iron manufacturers on the sea board, because they had the benefit of ocean transportation. I thought perhaps that the Finance Minister, following out the old suggestion about some one being good to his own, had kept in mind the iron mines and furnaces of Sydney, and that he was trying to do something for them. I could see that these iron manufacturers at Sydney had the advantage of ocean transportation, not only so, but they had in the immediate neighbourhood of their works all the ingredients necessary for the manufacture of iron, millions of tons of iron ore, immense beds of coal lying beside the limestone necessary to be used as flux, and I thought they might be able to send a great deal of iron to France. Then I looked to the county of Huron to see if the farmers there would be benefited by the immense amount of money it would cost them to pay the bounties on that iron going to France. I saw that the manufacturers in Sydney would put the money they got from the farmers into their own pockets and pay it to France to get their iron into that country. Once more I was at a loss to see how we were going to be benefited in Huron and Ontario by this French treaty.

Then I turned to the other side of the treaty, to look at the products that were coming into Canada from France. I thought that perhaps we might get a certain amount of benefit from them. Schedule B gives the products coming into Canada which enjoy the benefit of our intermediate tariff. Here I read about what was coming into Canada, and that this treaty was to encourage the importation of certain things into this country under the intermediate tariff. I found spirits, wine, gin of all kinds, rum, whisky, spirits of alcohol, and finally I came to absinthe. Why, that poisonous, deadly drug that has been called the curse of France! In the treaty of 1893 it slipped in in some way, but you remember there was a good deal of talk about it being allowed to come in. Why, sir, the use of that absinthe has been totally prohibited in the French army. I was reading in the 'Lancet' the other day where an assembly of medical men in France had passed a resolution asking the government to prohibit the use of it entirely in France. Are we poor Canadians to be fed with this deadly intoxicating drug? Are the manufacturers of this poison looking for a new market in our country? It sends more lunatics to the asylum in France than alcohol, opium and the nicotine curses all combined, and now it is going to be introduced here. In France it produces so many evils and halucinations that it has been called the Lady in Green and the curse of France. Is that the advantage we are getting for being allowed to send our cattle into France for a duty of $30 and $40 each and our horses for $30 each? Then further down I saw brandy, and it is mentioned as artificial brandy, an imitation brandy, that is to be brought into this country. We have seen a great deal written not long ago about this very thing. In France you can buy a bottle of this imitation for one franc, while a bottle of real brandy costs 20 francs. It is one of the most poisonous of drugs, and should not be allowed into the country at all. Now, here was a grand chance for our Liberal friends who are so fond of posing as friends of the Conservative principle of protection. They had a grand chance to make a tariff against the introduction of this French absinthe, a chance to put up a prohibitory tariff against it. Why did they not do it? They could put the tariff up as high as Haman's gallows, and the people of Canada would have thanked them for it. But they did not see fit to do it. I hope, however, that even yet this item will be stricken out of the list of goods to be encouraged into our country under this new and much vaunted tariff treaty with France. It is not going to benefit our farmers, I do not think it will benefit our iron manufacturers a great deal, and I am sure it will not benefit the young people of Canada to become intoxicated with this stuff that they have such a dread of in France. I hope that even yet the government will see that this absinthe is prevented from coming into

our country. I am sorry for having taken up so much of the time of the House, but I thought it was right that I should draw the attention of the House to this matter.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax.) Mr. Speaker, I rise at this period of the debate, as I am permitted to do, intending to give my vote and to also speak as forcibly as possible against the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). In the first place, I regret the amendment as being a gross impertinence to His Majesty the King who has given us a speech in which he has referred to these matters, and who has in the 'Gazette' from week to week and from month to month been printing, for the information of his faithful subjects, statements with reference to these very matters to which the hon. gentleman from Brantford referred in his speech and in his amendment as showing from time to time to his subjects the precise position of the imports and exports so that they might derive whatever benefit could be derived from that information. I think that my hon. friend from Brantford has been reading the letters of Junius to the Duke of Grafton, and I think I should refer him to letter No. 36 in which Junius used language something like this: When the whole of the country was expecting information on an interesting matter, instead of the decision and firmness of a King you have given to us the lament of a ruined grazier and to the whining piety of a Methodist. At the bottom of the letter or of the next we have a quotation of Horne Tooke's observation on the King's speech: 'Nero fiddled while Rome was burning.' I think that the attention of the hon. member for Brantford should be called to that fact, but, remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was Nero himself who set fire to Rome, that he went singing in the theatre and that afterwards he blamed the setting fire to the city upon the unfortunate Christians. So it was with my hon. friend. He had gone about the country dilating upon the unfortunate condition of business, speaking of the scarcity of money and making one of the most lamentable appeals which could have been presented. I have no doubt that on that expedition he told the people who listened to him about the necessities of the country, the starvation of the inhabitants and the distress prevailing in various portions of the Dominion. There is no doubt that if he took the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) with him, or if he had with him the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) he could not use them as object lessons of distress, of the pinch of poverty, of cheeks attenuated by famine, but if he went and exhibited himself perhaps he might have been able to say that his appearance betokened distress, poverty and want of food in the community. You remember, Sir, that when Napoleon was addressing an audience in the Faubourg-St. Antoine, about the time of the revolution, when the people were really stricken with famine, he was speaking about the necessity of order, of government, of people observing the rules and regulations and of being quiet. In the crowd there was a great, big woman from that portion of the city of Paris, and she said: Look at these men, they are sleek and fat, and, look at us —poverty-stricken and thin by privation and famine. Napoleon said to the crowd: Now, just look at me—he was at that time as thin as a rat—and look at this woman. Here she was great, strong and fat. Napoleon said: Which of the two of us is the boasted aristocrat who is keeping down the people, and living on dainty fare while they starve? I am afraid that my hon. friend was like the raven, going about the country croaking, lamenting, doling out stories of dire famine, of want and privation after the deluge had passed. Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the cause of the lament of my hon. friend, what reasons did he give for the stringency of money and what reasons did he give for the dire and impending calamities? We know that Jeremiah, the prophet, after he had been liberated from prison, went up on the stairs and lamented the calamities that were coming upon his country. He was a true prophet, but I am afraid the hon. member for Brantford has all the frenzy of a prophet without one item of the prophet's inspiration. Dickens tells us in one of his stories—I forgot which one of them—that in one of the streets the boys used to look into the shop of an undertaker where every day he appeared arrayed in deep black. Now and then he arose, solemnly passed his handkerchief over his eyes and as the crowd looked in he shed tears of sympathy for the dead and dying. After all but one or two of the boys had gone away the undertaker put up his shutters, then reached up to one of the most elaborate coffins he had on his shelves, took out a bottle of the good old stuff, reached for a tumbler, mixed himself a 'stiff 'un,' and in this way forgot the vicissitudes of the day. I believe it was so with my hon. friend from Brantford. After the lamentations and the amendment which he put before the country which is the most serious part of the affair, I think he retired to No. 6 and was as jolly as the rest of them notwithstanding the calamities that had been impending over the country and are to impend in future according to his account. What was it which gave rise to the lugubrations of my hon friend? What was it that caused him to think that the country was going to the bow-wows? What was it that caused him to think that calamity impended? What made him think that the whole of the government expendi-

ture was so much money wasted, that it was not producing good results, that the expenditure of the government was bringing on this poverty and want throughout the country generally. He told us that in Brantford an Englishman called at his office and told him he was looking for work and had not been able to find it. Well, I do not think that is sufficient evidence on which to base such a speech as my hon. friend delivered, or sufficient information to warrant him in moving his amendment. No doubt, we will meet Englishmen who come out to this country who have no special trade and no knowledge of farming and no capacity for work, and who think that in coming here their education and standing will entitle them to at once occupy some dignified position without much exertion on their part. Unfortunately, such people are to be found in a great many of our cities. I do not wonder that in a city like Toronto there should be a large number of people out of employment, but if my hon. friend would go to the city of London, England, he would find ten times as many unemployed as the 500 he spoke of in Toronto. There is no financial pressure in London, England, and the fact that he found idle people in Toronto does not prove that there is distress in all Canada. The fact is that in many of the inland cities of our country where trade and business is restricted in the winter months, there is not a demand for labour, whereas in other portions of the country there is a constant demand throughout the year. I do not know that any special circumstances exist in Toronto, but probably in the industry in which my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) engages, his manufacture is restricted in the winter. However, the sunshine will follow the rain, and when the genial spring comes industry will be revived and employment plentiful. There may be reasons why my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) should find 500 unemployed people in Toronto. Toronto is the head centre of financial operations, Toronto was the scene of frenzied finance; in Toronto joint stock company promotion thrived and flourished; the banks gathered up the money of the country there, and there was constant manipulation of stocks and speculation to enable people to get rich quicker than by the ordinary methods of business. When the pressure came in the United States no doubt its reflection would be found in a city like Toronto, a city cut off from the ocean without an incoming flood of business; and so Toronto felt the conditions in the United States more quickly than other centres of population. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) is not to be blamed for taking his impressions from the conditions he found in Toronto. But, because of the conditions of Toronto why should industry in other places be restricted; why should other portions of the country feel distress because of the financial convulsion peculiar to that city? My hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) has referred to the excess of imports over exports and he has told us that because of that condition in the balance of trade the government were impoverishing the people. In the excellent speech made by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday, he gave us the views of eminent economists in which they showed that the old theory that an excess of imports over exports was detrimental to a country, was long since exploded. That this is true, is proven by the experience of other countries which resemble Canada in their economic conditions. Although the United States, 100 years ago, might have resembled Canada, it no longer bears any analogy to us, and the same applies to England. The vast excess of exports over imports in England may be due to the rapid exhausting of natural resources, and it may be because England exports millions of tons of coal and other such commodities. But this young country bears no analogy to England in that respect. England has no overplus of land, England is almost completely settled; but in Canada settlement is moving apace, immense tracts of virgin soil are being brought under cultivation and we have great undeveloped resources to rely on in the future. And, Sir, this government would be wise and patriotic in looking to the future and so adjusting its expenditure as to bring about at the proper time, the utilization of these resources. It is quite true that the cause of the financial stringency is want of confidence in the resources of the government, and in the resources of the banks. It is true that if in the United States, the trust companies were able to continue their cash payments one day longer the corner would have been turned. If the trust companies had not all their funds invested in large enterprises; if a certain amount had been reserved to meet raids of that kind the financial difficulty would have been overcome. There is a great difference between the Canadian banking system and the United States banking system. The banks in the United States are of two kinds; one kind issues its own notes and its currency is not expansive; while the national banks have United States notes which they issue upon the bonds and other securities they deposit. In Canada the banks have to deposit an amount of money with the government as security for the circulation and they also deposit with the government and must hold a certain amount of notes for security and exchange for money. The government of Canada can come to the help of the banks when required. I see by the financial return for September that the banks of Canada have in specie $24,097,000 and in Dominion notes $48,000,000, and that the government holds as security against the issues of the banks $4,000,000 more. Therefore the government has available to

meet any demand for money that shall occur in the country $97,000,000. In addition, the banks have assets in the United Kingdom and in other countries, amounting to about $50,000,000, which might be immediately available. So that there are ample resources to meet all the business demands of the country. This would double the present note circulation of all the banks $84,000,000.

Now, I am of opinion that this amendment of my hon. friend from Brantford is improper at the present moment, because it might cause distrust throughout the country lest the government and the banks should not have sufficient resources to meet the business requirements of the country. I do not imagine that this amendment will affect the people to any great degree. The financial stringency is passing away; the banks have sufficient money to meet all the requirements of the people. My hon. friend has declared in his amendment that the government has not acted in a wise and prudent manner in paying out such large sums as it has done, and that that has caused financial pressure and stringency. Now, what has been the course of some of the banks? They have been preparing for the stroke which has just passed over the United States, by strengthening their reserves. If they had all pursued the same course, in place of continuing discounts and supports to our manufacturing institutions and to the commercial community, there might have been severe stringency. But the safety of the community has been that the government has acted in the ordinary way; that it has continued to pay out the money that has flowed into the public treasury, with the result that money has continued to circulate in sufficient quantities to meet all the ordinary requirements of the people. If the government had not acted in that way, serious results might have followed. The hon. member for Brantford suggests that the government is to blame for the large expenditure of the people, for the large quantities of goods that they have imported, and for the balance of trade which has existed. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman what remedy he proposes for the existing evil? What does he suggest that the government should do? The people have made these large purchases of goods which they have imported; the change in the circumstances of large classes of people has given them the means of gratifying their desires in this way. What was the government to do? Was it to allow these goods to come into Canada without exacting the duty upon them? Would that have been a wise course to pursue? Was the duty too low, and would the hon. gentleman suggest that it should be increased? Did not my hon. friend on a previous occasion vote for adequate protection, for higher protection, which certainly would have increased the amount of money extracted from the people? We have not in this country sumptuary laws; we cannot regulate what the people shall eat or wear, or their scale of expenditure on these things. What would the hon. gentleman suggest? Would he suggest that we should prohibit the importation of the $60,000,000 worth of raw materials that are used in the manufactures of the country? He has placed before us one proposition of a logical syllogism; what are the second proposition and the conclusion? He has inveighed against the government and has attributed the stringency to the government exacting the amount of duty which this parliament has imposed by the tariff—a tariff which has been the subject of an investigation by a commission—and expending the moneys which had been voted by this parliament in detail. What would my hon. friend from Brantford suggest? Surely after the goods had been imported and after engagements had been made to pay for them, the government had no other function than to exact the prescribed duty and to trust that, if any change should take place in the circumstances of the people, the amounts which they had collected in revenue would be disbursed in the form of help to the financial institutions and through them percolate among the people of the country at large, so that any financial pressure that existed in any portion of the country might be relieved. If my hon. friend had reflected upon the possible injury which his amendment and his speech might do, I think he would never have moved that amendment or made that speech.

At this time it is necessary, regardless of party, to have confidence in our financial institutions, for without that confidence a single raid on the banks by depositors would create considerable embarrassment. Our resources are sound, our commerce has been moderate and adapted to our resources, and the last year is acknowledged on all hands, especially by those best qualified to know, to have been the most profitable of any year in our history. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has put before the King the statement that as our imports exceed our exports, that is a cause of great alarm and is a condition which should not exist. Without going into detailed figures, I would ask any one if that would be a prosperous country when the value of all that went out of it was not less than what came back. If what we export brings back no more than its cost price, where is the profit? But if there be $120,000,000 more imported into the country than went out, that is proof that our products exported sold for $120,000,000 more than they cost us, and the surplus profit came back in the shape of imports to be distributed throughout our various classes of consumers. I do not think that this is a condition to be deplored,

but rather one upon which the people can congratulate themselves.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has placed before the King a contrast between the conduct of the banks and that of the government. With $84,000,000 in its treasury, our government could by Act of parliament issue $84,000,000 more of Dominion currency to meet all the business requirements of the country. Therefore there is no cause for alarm or for bringing up any contrast, as the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has charged the government with not having used ordinary business prudence and with having been the cause of financial embarrassment. How has he proved that ? Has he shown it in any way ? Some of the banks, it is true, when the alarm came on, reduced their discounts and did not aid the enterprises of the country to the same extent and thus caused some embarrassment. But on the other hand those banks, which are sagacious and have stood by the country well in this financial storm, have supported their customers by furnishing them with money to carry on their business. These banks have supported the manufacturing establishments, they have protected our commercial men and in that way saved the situation. The government have acted wisely, it seems to me, just as wisely as the most prudent and sagacious bank managers have done. It is not in a time of pressure that you should withdraw your assistance from the commercial community. In that time when enterprises are expanding, when resources pass rapidly from hand to hand, that is the time to be conservative and prudent ; but when the pressure comes is the time to be liberal, and the government aided materially the operations of commercial men throughout the community by allowing the revenue to be disbursed, while holding a sufficient sum in the treasury, so that if the pressure should come on too great for the ordinary resources of the banks, they could afford them that relief which would tide over all difficulties. Therefore I have no fear, and I only regret that an hon. gentleman of the experience of the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) should have let loose upon the country such a mischivious amendment as the one he has proposed, and support it by his speech in which he pictured blue ruin, dismay and calamity and destruction as bound to result from the expenditure of this government. That expenditure, I submit, has been wise and well adapted to the exigency in which we found the country. I am afraid the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) did not glance his eye over that amendment. Its inconsequence, its want of logical result, its lack of sequence, must surely have escaped the vigilant eye of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). If it had been submitted to him or those around him and they had given their calm judgment to it, they would not have consented to such an amendment being let loose in the community at a time when possibly the financial pressure from which we have just emerged may return. This is a time when we should cultivate mutual confidences and assist in the great work of supporting the institutions of the country, and allow the natural laws of supply and demand to work out freely. Let the demands in one direction and the supply in the other work out their beneficent results and we shall all rejoice in a continued prosperity. Instead of being censured, the govment should be commended for their conduct, and no doubt will receive the support of the people when the people are called upon to give a verdict.

I pass from the amendment to a cheering subject in the King's speech, one which is of great interest to the country at large, especially that portion lying east of Quebec, and that is the announcement that notwithstanding the fall of the Quebec bridge, the Transcontinental Railway is making substantial progress; that there was no intention on the part of the government to postpone that work; that the expenditures for survey and construction was going on, and substantial progress made in the construction; that everything pointed to the completion of the work at a time when it will be of advantage to the people of the country, so that the products of Canada will be carried from the place of production to market and the returns brought back and distributed in this country. As it is time for the House to rise, I merely say that I think the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has advanced no reason for the amendment which he has placed before the House. I think that his generalizations were imperfect, and not sufficient. I think that there is evidence throughout the country of prosperity existing at this time, and indications of prosperity for the future. Therefore, I should add my vote, as I have given my voice, in support of the address, and in condemnation, so far as it will go, of the hasty, imperfect and misleading amendment offered by the hon. member for Brantford.

House divided on amendment Mr. Cockshutt.

NAYS.

Messieurs.

Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Beauparlant,	Loggie,
Béland,	Macdonald,
Black,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Macpherson,
Boyer,	McColl,
Burrows,	McCraney,
Caldwell,	McIntyre (Perth),
Calvert,	McIntyre (Strathcona),

Carrier,
Cash,
Clarke,
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Hall,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.)
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Zimmerman.—95.

YEAS.

Messieurs.

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Chisholm (Huron),
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Christie,
Clements,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Morin,
Osler,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—56

Mr. W. ROCHE.

PAIRS.

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Aylesworth,	Northrup,
Bickerdike,	Monk,
Brodeur,	Forget,
Bureau,	Ganong,
Carvell,	Gunn,
German,	Bristol,
Gervais,	McLean (S. York),
Grant,	Seagram,
Greenway,	Avery,
Guthrie,	Pringle,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Law,	Fowler,
Logan,	Sproule,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Thompson,
McCool,	Clare,
Paterson,	Cockshutt,
Devlin,	Leonard,
Adamson.	Tisdale.

Amendment (Mr. Cockshutt) negatived.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). In resuming the debate on the speech from the Throne, I must say that I am pleased at the tone of the debate so far; I think it has been conducted on a higher plane than on any other occasion since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. I am pleased the debate is going on, because I believe that the country is more interested in these debates than we imagine; and probably there never was a time in the history of our country that so much interest has been taken in the debate on the speech from the Throne as on the present occasion. I regret to see that the speech from the Throne was not framed so as to give us that information of the government's programme which we had a right to expect from them. When I had the honour of a seat in the Ontario legislature for many years, we were given the full bill of fare that the government intended to place before us, we knew what was coming, and we were prepared to deal with the measures when they were brought down. I regret that this government is departing from that very worthy custom; they have not brought down their bill of fare in a way that we can discuss it intelligently. We should be informed of the public measures which the government intend to place before parliament, so that the members on both sides may be prepared to discuss them when they are brought down.

Yesterday we heard the hog question discussed, a very important question indeed for the farmers, particularly in my section of the country. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture realizes the importance of that question. I may say here that while we have been taunted across the floor with

not having done our duty in failing to oppose the provisions of his Inspection Bill, we on this side of the House agreed for the most part with the principles of the Bill. We believe that it is necessary to have an intelligent inspection, one which will do justice both to the buyer and the seller. The Minister of Agriculture has taken apparently some part along that line. We know that he went to England, but from the time he left our shores until he returned we do not know what he was doing, whether he was gathering information useful to the farmers, or what he was doing while he was there. We know that the First Minister went over there and took a prominent part in the conference that placed him high up in the temple of fame. The Minister of Finance and one of his colleagues went over to France and succeeded in obtaining a treaty, which probably we have no great reason to be pleased with. As to the Minister of Agriculture, we have not heard from him, either what he went over there for, or what he accomplished for the farmers while he was there. I think the farmers are desirous of knowing what he did for them. We may say of him, in the words of the poet, that after the Minister of Agriculture left this shore,

> Where he has gone and how he fares
> Nobody knows and nobody cares.

But the Minister of Agriculture made a journey up to the county of Kent, represented by my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Clements). I may say that I think the intelligent farmers of the county of Kent owe a debt of gratitude to my hon. friend the member for that county for the active part he has taken in connection with that question, which so excited the people up there, and I think justly excited them. Their friends became alarmed. One of their friends wrote to the Minister of Agriculture telling him that if he did not come up without delay and say something to appease the righteous wrath of an indignant people, they would not get a farmer's vote next election in the whole county of Kent. What was the result? I read the result of that meeting in a paper that was formerly favourable to the Minister of Agriculture, but I can assure you that it was not on this occasion very favourable to him, and I would be very much surprised if it were otherwise. When he got up there he found an intelligent body of farmers, a body of farmers who knew what was right and what was wrong, who knew what they wanted, and were determined to get it. Well, the hon. gentleman went on to speak to them for some time with his silvery tongue, but it didn't go down, and the result was that the farmers told him that they didn't want any white kid gloved men up there who parted their hair in the middle. They told him that they wanted solid facts. They wanted to know why he had brought in such a regulation. I am not surprised at it. Imagine if you can, and I venture to say you cannot, a regulation such as he brought in, a regulation that allowed the hog buyer to go to the farmer and purchase his hogs, pay him a cheque. and the farmer takes the cheque to the bank and gets his money and puts it in his pocket. What is the result? The hog buyer goes up to London or to any other place nearby, and probably in collusion with a veterinary there, he puts the deal through. I heard the particulars of a deal not very long ago from one who lives there, and it was this : The buyer went to the pork packing establishment and sold twenty-three hogs, and they were all condemned. He said: I won't stand that. He started out to take action, but they ran after him and said: Just come back and we will fix it up for you. When he found they would not go half and half with him, when he would not divide up with them, when they could not buy him up, they paid him to the last dollar. What is the result? I know that on many occasions the farmers in the province of Ontario have been swindled out of their just money by these men that go there; because there are spots on the hogs, or something that they can find, and there are very few hogs upon which you cannot find some little defect. What is the result? The hog buyer says, I paid my money and I don't want to lose it. The pork packer says, Oh, you are all right, you don't have to lose much. He says: We will give you a cent a pound, that will pay for your trouble, and you go back and demand it, and you can get your money back from the farmer. That has been done on several occasions.

What justice is there in that ; is it not another case of the mighty oppressing the weak, a case of the rich pork packer barons taking advantage of the farmers. The Minister of Agriculture played into the hands of the pork packers, but he learned a lesson when he went to Kent. The farmers told him they wanted justice, and they proceeded to teach him how to do his duty. He was like the missionary who went to convert a savage but the savage converted him. The Minister of Agriculture came back from Kent with more experience than when he went there. The Minister of Agriculture so arranged it that the farmers had to take just what the pork packers gave, and be thankful to get anything at all, but the farmers demanded fair play and in order not to lose votes and so that the Liberal candidates would not resign as they threatened to do, the Minister of Agriculture relented. The farmers took the law into their own hands and convinced the Minister of Agriculture that he was perpetrating an injustice upon them. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Clements) is to be congratulated on the interest he has taken in this question, and if we had more men of his stamp in this House it would be all

the better for the farmers of Canada. I want to refer for a few moments to the French treaty, and I compliment my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Chisholm) on the manner in which he dealt with that question. When the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries returned to Canada it was heralded throughout the Dominion that the French treaty was going to give Canada a great advantage and that the battle cry next election would be the treaty with France and the All Red Line. We have the treaty with France, but the All Red Line stands where it did twenty years ago, and no progress has been made. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Chisholm) has told us what the result of that treaty will be. He has told us that it would allow the country to be flooded with absinthe, one of the most deadly poisons that has ever cursed the French nation ; a drug that has done more to drive men to the asylum than opium and morphine combined. That is the kind of stuff the French treaty will allow to be brought into Canada at reduced rates. I ask the temperance people of this fair Dominion of ours to remember the men who made such a treaty as that. Two days ago a deputation appeared before the Prime Minister and our genial friend from Brockville (Mr. Graham); and I asked the ladies who comprised that deputation what they think about the French treaty which will permit the importation at low rates of this horrid drug. The Prime Minister told these ladies that he could not prevent smoking because the Minister of Railways indulges in the weed, but he did not tell them that under the French treaty he had made provision that people could obtain at cheap rates, absinthe, adulterated brandies and wines and champagnes. If it were pure brandy and wine it would not be so bad, but they can bring in all kinds of spurious liquors. Not long ago when I was in France I saw an analysis made of these adulterated wines and they were composed of materials that would ruin the stomach of any man. You could buy a small bottle of the stuff for two pence and that is the kind of drink that the French treaty allows to be brought in to ruin our people. I say without fear of contradiction that while cigarettes are contributing to the ruin of our young men, the result of the French treaty in allowing these spurious liquors to be brought in will do a thousand fold more harm. I say that when the Minister of Finance renewed that treaty he did more to increase drunkenness in this country than anything else that can be thought of. I had occasion not long ago, in my practice, to tell a patient to get some good wine, and she brought in a bottle which she thought was all right because it was imported, but on examining it I found it was this adulterated stuff and had I not been there my patient would have partaken of it and would now be numbered with the great majority. I trust that those good ladies who were here the other day and who delivered themselves in such a brilliant manner before the Prime Minister, will take cognizance of the fact that the government has facilitated the importation of absinthe. That stuff will send to our asylums thousands and thousands of poor people who otherwise would be useful citizens. I hope it is not yet too late to amend that provision of the French treaty. No financial advantage to the country can be justitfied in the face of the moral and physical ruin of our people. We know that this absinthe is composed of the most deadly poisons, aconite chloral, hydrate of chloral, and drugs like that which will send men to the asylum or the grave if they partake of them for any length of time. Therefore I am glad that this discussion has taken place, and I hope it will have a good effect on the Minister of Finance, so that when he goes to the country, if he attempts to laud this much vaunted treaty with France, he will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Having dealt thus briefly with the speeches of those who have preceded me, I shall turn now to the great question under discussion, the speech from the Throne, and I want to say, as I said at the beginning, that it is the most meagre bill of fare we have ever had, small in quantity and worse in quality. What is there in it to discuss? Very little. Even of the measures promised there are only two or three. The First Minister and the Minister of Finance, the only two ministers who have attempted to discuss it intelligently, instead of doing so in a temperate and serious manner, tried to draw a red herring across the trail and treat it in a jocular way, throwing the people off the scent of the questions that ought to be discussed. I believe there has never been a time in the history of this Dominion when the people expected a more important bill of fare than they do at the present time. There is no use of acting like the bird that hides his head under his wing and thinks he is safe. There is no use of our attempting to conceal the fact that we are to-day face to face with one of the most serious financial crises that have ever struck this country, at least since the time of the government of Alexander Mackenzie in 1874. There are hundreds and thousands of men in every village and town throughout this Dominion standing on the streets and wharfs demanding work and bread. Those in charge of our charitable institutions are looking forward to one of the most severe winters we have ever had. At this early period of the year, almost before the winter has set in, we have hundreds and thousands of people, many of them brought in from foreign countries by our immigration laws and not understanding our ways, who will have to be largely supported by charity during this winter. What is the condition

of the industries of the country to-day? A great majority of our factories are running at half time. The two factories in my own town have dismissed over half of their men, and they say that if there is not a better outlook for their products in the very near future they will be obliged to close up. Then we shall have all these people on our hands. How could we expect our factories to continue working as they have been doing? We have a banking system that we are proud of; one that has stood the storms of many years without many shipwrecks. We have a good banking law, but one which I think is more favourable to the bankers than to other classes of the community. Our usury laws give advantages to our bankers which they do not give to other people, and I know that they are taking advantage of them; in some cases they are charging higher rates of interests than individuals who are not bankers. That is not as it should be. Our banking laws and usury laws should treat all classes of our people alike. How can our merchants, manufacturers and farmers continue to do business as in the past if they cannot obtain the usual accommodation from the banks, and we all know that such is the case. They were notified a few months ago that they could only have half the usual accommodation, some less than that, and some none at all. And yet we find this government riding for a fall. They have been going on day after day devising wild schemes for spending the people's money; building wharfs where there were no water and railways where there was no traffic. The result is that they are not in a position to assist the banks and the people as they should. The government must come to their assistance in some way. If they do not, the result may be even worse than we anticipate. What have the government done to relieve the difficulties of the country? We saw it heralded through the papers a few weeks ago that the hon. Minister of Finance had made arrangements with the banks to provide money to move the grain in the great west. I do not know whether anything has come of that, but thus far we have seen no evidence of anything. We know that the railways are not carrying the amount of local traffic which they should; the grain buyers are not buying grain, and the farmers are very much in want of money. The grain buyers say, we cannot buy grain because we cannot get money, and we could not ship it if we had it because we cannot get the cars. The time has come when our means of transportation must be decidedly improved; if not, we shall have worse conditions than we have at the present time. In an investigation at Owen Sound a short time ago by the Railway Commission, it was proved beyond a doubt that the millers had flour and the grain buyers had grain to ship, but they could not get cars, while at the same time they saw through traffic from the United States rolling past their doors, both eastward and westward. Notwithstanding that we have subsidized these railroads heavily, many municipalities having paid them large bonuses, we find them to-day carrying through traffic at a much lower rate and just as required, because they have competition. The time has come when the government should step in and see that justice is done to that part of the country. The result of that inquiry by that commission was most alarming. There are the two reports—one the majority report, stating that there was no discrimination; the other, the minority report, showing that beyond doubt there was discrimination. Any man who takes a fair view of the matter must say that there was discrimination. That board, however, was composed of two lawyers and one layman, or, in other words, two lawyers and one man of common sense. If we had more common sense on that board and less legal quibbling, there would have been a unanimous report that there was discrimination and the railway companies would have been compelled to do justice to the farming community, the grain buyers and the millers. No action, however, was taken by the government, and the same condition of things still exists, and the burden of the people has not been lightened the smallest extent.

We are standing to-day on the brink of most dangerous conditions, yet what have the government done? The government must have seen the calamity that was coming on the country. They must have seen the financial clouds that were gathering around. But just as Nero fiddled while Rome was burning, the ministers wasted their time in the old country enjoying themselves and allowed this country to plunge into a financial condition from which it will take a long time to recover. In place of using up their reserves, as they did, they should have gone to the old country and floated a loan and have thus been in a position to leave their bank deposits undisturbed. Had they done this, the banks would have had much more money and this country would have been saved the panic it has experienced. What is the standing of the government at present? True they have in the banks in round numbers about $6,000,000, but they have guaranteed the bonds of the Quebec bridge Company to the extent of $5,896,000, which just balances their account in the banks. To-day therefore they have in reality not one dollar in the banks. What would the result have been had they floated a loan instead of disbursing the revenues as they came in? They would have relieved the disaster which came upon our people. There is another phase of the question. The government have some $60,000,000 in the savings banks. That money has been deposited by people of all classes but more especially

by the day labourer and the mechanic. Ask of any of these men and they will tell you that they have money in the savings bank and that it is in a bank from which they can draw it out at any moment. Would not these men be greatly alarmed if they were to be told that the government had not in the banks $1 of that $60,000,000, that they had used it all on their ordinary expenditure. But suppose the government had that $60,000,000 in the banks to-day, what would the result be ? It would go a long way to bring about confidence and restore our financial standing. If that $60,000,000 were divided among our banks, it would enable them to extend loans to the merchants and manufacturers and the farming community ; and if the government had watched the signs of the times, as they should have done, we would have avoided the calamity which has come upon us. The United States saw the crisis coming and made arrangements to meet it. True they felt the depression as much as we did, but there is this difference between us. The United States have sunk their money to a large extent in buying stocks on margin, but that has been done only to a very small extent in this country. And if the government had floated a loan and kept a good balance in the banks, that would have relieved the situation very much.

I was very much surprised at the attitude taken by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance. In a time of serious depression, when the country was alarmed and anxious to have its financial position thoroughly explained, these two hon. gentlemen, particularly the Minister of Finance, disposed of the subject in a jocular manner and spent their time in explaining away the changes that have been brought about in connection with their business. It does seem to me, that whilst that is a question of importance, it is not of so great importance as the question of the finances of this country. I have no doubt that the people, whether Conservatives or Reformers, with a certain distrust, ask themselves why it was necessary for the government, having behind them such stalwarts as the former member for Centre York, to choose a man outside of the ranks of these men who have fought the battles of the party —not the battles of the country—for many years, and, looking at it from a party standpoint, have done it fairly well. The people naturally ask why it was necessary for this government to go to Toronto, and take from the provincial House the genial leader of their party there, a man so well adapted to fill the position that he lately occupied as leader of the opposition. I do not hesitate to say that he has peculiar fitness for that position, and had the First Minister not brought him into his cabinet, he would have filled the place of leader of the opposition for many years to come. The people ask why it was necessary to take a gentleman who had not won his spurs in the field of Dominion politics. Why was it necessary to pitchfork this hon. gentleman into a position to which many of the older members of this House could show a better title? We can hardly understand why it was necessary that the vacancy should be made. We know the peculiarities or the case. Only last session a member of this House made a charge against the government, naming no minister in particular. And what was the result? The First Minister rose and said: We will not accept a motion for a committee; we will not fight this question out; I have demanded from one of my ministers his resignation. We know that the Emperor Nero, when he found the people in a condition of rebellious unrest because of the burning of Rome, decided that he must find a victim. And he found his victims in the Christians. The Prime Minister, to meet the dissatisfaction in his own ranks, found a victim, and without making any charge against him, without benefit of judge or jury, he turned him out upon the world; and we find the present minister filling his position. But there is another view to take of the case. We can well believe that the Prime Minister saw how well the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Graham) filled the place of leader of the opposition. He remembered also that that hon. gentleman had been taken into the Ross government when that administration was doomed. He saw that this hon. gentleman had really acted as pall-bearer for the Ross government, that he had come in when the death rattle was in the throat of that government and its early demise a certainty. I have every hope—and have reason for my hope —that the time is not far distant when my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) will be free to go back to take in this parliament the place which he so ably filled in the Ontario House, that of leader of the opposition. We read the signs of the time and we know that everything indicates that, in the near future, at the next election, this government will be hurled from power, as the Ross government was. Before that comes to pass, we may expect—as seems to be the custom with hon. gentlemen opposite—that the First Minister will have taken his departure from this House for his rest in the Senate. And, knowing the fitness of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to lead the opposition, I have no doubt that he will be brought forward to lead the forlorn hope which will be all that will be left of that great party after the next election. Seeing the signs of the times, this government might consider with advantage the career of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. The present government came into power under most favourable circumstances. Alexander Mackenzie also assumed office when everything was flourishing. His predecessors had made the contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific

Railway. But the Mackenzie government abrogated that contract, declaring that all the resources of the Dominion of Canada were not sufficient to accomplish the work of building that railway as a complete road. They said they would build it in sections, they would build it by piecemeal; they would use the water stretches between the pieces of road they would build. Hard times came. The country demanded something of the administration. They appealed to them to lift the country out of the slough of despond into which it had been led. But the answer of the Mackenzie government was that they could do nothing, that they were like flies on the wheel, and could neither help nor hinder its turning—that there was nothing to be done but trust to providence. Sir John Macdonald came forward with his national policy, a policy well thought out and clearly defined. The government of that day said it was impossible to carry it out. Ultimately the appeal was made to the country and the Canadian people, recognizing the ability of Sir John Macdonald and those by whom he was surrounded, returned him to power. The new government brought in the national policy, and the result was that every prophecy they had made was more than fulfilled. They had said that the time would soon come when tall chimneys would go up and manufacturing would flourish all over this country; when the balance of trade, instead of being against us—it was $121,000,000 against us last year—would be in our favour. Their expectations were more than realized. For seventeen years, the country went on flourishing as it had never flourished before. The contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway was let—not under as favourable conditions as the first contract, but still it was let. It was carried on and finished in less time than the contract required, and the result was that the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant and all classes of the community were benefited.

Now, this government came into power in 1896 under the most favourable circumstances. Everything was in their favour. They had the wealth accumulated by the former government, they had the tall chimneys, and the smoke was coming out of them. But what do we see to-day? We have the chimneys all over the country, but in a great many cases there is very little smoke coming out of them, nor is there likely to be for some months to come. Will any one tell me what this government has done for the country during the eleven years they have been in power? In the speech from the Throne they have promised us an election law. Well, we hope they will carry that out, and I can assure you that we are prepared to assist them to any extent we can that is for the good of the country. In Ontario we have a very stringent election law, and I want to say that so far as Ontario is concerned, and under the present local government, with the present Attorney General and county attorneys, the election law will be strictly observed at the next election. I believe the next election in Ontario will be pure as the drifted snow, otherwise those men will find themselves behind the bars. On two occasions before we defeated the Ross government, first in 1898 and again in 1902, we carried the province of Ontario by the popular vote, and if the votes had been honestly counted we would have had a fair working majority in the House. But such men as Preston, Jackson and others of that iniquitous band, stuffed the ballot boxes, switched the ballots, burnt the ballots, and the result was that the people were defrauded of their choice. There was a large body of civil servants in the employ of the local government who were scattered through the province, working for the Ross government. They went on with all these iniquities, and they usually succeeded in getting a small majority in the House. We put forth every effort to punish the guilty, but the Ross government succeeded in burking the inquiry, and the investigations came to nothing. It has been stated by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) that Mr. Whitney was cutting the heads off the Reform officials at such a rate that in the very near future none of them would be left. Now I speak of what I know, and I say that Mr. Whitney has not removed one official appointed by the late government except for cause.

When we were in opposition we endeavoured on several occasions to pass a law allowing the salaries of the local officials to be garnisheed for debt. In Toronto, as here in Ottawa, many of these men did not pay their honest debts. We insisted that they should be placed on the same footing as other men, and we took several votes, but were always voted down. Why? Because the government was in the hands of the officials, they were boss of the machine, and the government dared not remove them because they knew too much. The result was that they were allowed to go on. But when Mr. Whitney came into power he said: We will allow the salaries of all these officials to be garnisheed. We think they should be placed in the same position as other men. We think that their salaries should be sufficient with which to keep themselves and their families, but if they live extravagantly, beyond their means, they ought to be punished, and no official in my government will be allowed to get into debt and refuse to pay it; if he does, he will be dismissed. In the county of Dufferin two men have been dismissed, one for cause, and the other for not paying his honest debts, he did not pay his board, and squandered his salary. Conservative officials have been dismissed because they did

not do their duty. I can assure you that Mr. Whitney is not the man to stand by and keep officials in the service who will not do their duty. If that law were applied in Ottawa it would be a good thing for the merchants, and it would be a good thing for the officials themselves. It would teach them that honesty is the best policy, and that they must do their duty like other men. In my riding we find that two men have been dismissed by the Ottawa government, one of them for the sole reason that was a Conservative. Therefore, I say that so far as the Conservative party is concerned, we will hail with delight any election law that will purify the political atmosphere and give us an honest election. We believe it would be very much to the interest of the country. Therefore, we hope that a Bill will be brought down at an early date and that it will receive consideration. It will have the support, I believe, of every member on this side of the House.

We have heard much in the past ten years in connection with immigration. I am sorry to say that in the past we have not been as careful in connection with immigration as we should have been, that we have not done our duty as citizens in permitting a class of immigration to come into this country that we would have been better without. I believe that this fair Dominion should be for the white race and that we should not allow people from China and Japan to come in and take the places of our workmen. It may be that just at the present time we require Italians, Japanese and Chinese, but I believe that in the near future, if not to-day, we have a large enough labouring class of our own to do all our work. I believe that in the stringent state of the market we will find ourselves taxed to our utmost to find work for our own people. We have Canada flooded with a class of immigration from almost every country that is undesirable. We have men from the older countries that we would be better without and the great injustice that I see in the present condition of affairs is that we are giving better terms to-day and have been for the past few years to these foreigners. We are looking after them, but if a citizen from Quebec or Ontario goes west to take up land —and we want to send our sons out there to take up land—he does not receive the same consideration that is accorded to foreigners. Our own people would not be looked after as the government has seen fit to look after these foreigners, and the result is that Canadians are placed at a disadvantage—a state of affairs which should not be permitted. While we have been very unjust during the past year to our own people we have brought in, to a great extent, the worst class of immigrants that could be brought to this country in consequence of which, during the present year, we will be compelled to open soup kitchens in order that we may keep from starvation these men whom we have paid to bring to Canada. We have heard of the good work that has been done by the North Atlantic Trading Company—a company that is as mythical as mythical can be, a company upon which we have spent a large amount of money while knowing nothing about the work that it has done. It has received pay for bringing immigrants to this country who would have come anyway. I believe the time has come when we should cease paying immigrants to come to our own land from the older countries. I believe we have one of the finest countries in the world, a country sufficiently great and powerful to attract immigration not only from the United States—and we know that the people that we get from the United States make the best citizens, and there are hundreds and thousands who are coming in from that country—but from all other countries. Whilst we assist immigration by the payment of money I submit we should be most careful to see that those who come to Canada are of the right class, and if they are not, we should not allow them to remain. We have the example of the United States. They are not paying any money for immigration. They have long ceased to do that, but they are spending large amounts to keep out undesirable immigration from finding a shelter and a home in their country. I believe the time has come when we must give most careful consideration to this question. We know that the jails and poorhouses of our country have been flooded very largely with these immigrants that are coming in, and we find that this is a class which is most undesirable. This government owes it to the House and the country to see that the immigrants coming into this country are of a class who will become good citizens, who will not only be prepared to make an honourable living in this country, but who will be prepared to fight the battles of the country when required.

In connection with the speech from the Throne, I must say there is very little to discuss, but there is one question of vast importance and one which has attracted the attention of the free and independent electors of this fair Dominion to a greater extent probably than any other. I refer to the clause in connection with telegraphs and telephones. It is a very short paragraph. I am sorry that it was not much more extensive, because it has attracted the attention of the people of Canada more than any other clause in the speech from the Throne. It is as follows:—

> The time has arrived when the public interest requires that telegraph and telephone companies holding federal charters should be placed under government control. A Bill will be introduced for that purpose.

That raised the hopes and expectations of many people throughout the country. We

do know that this has become a very important question. We know that three sessions ago when it was brought up in the House the then Postmaster General, Sir Wm. Mulock, saw that it was of so much importance and the country was devoting so much attention to it, that he formed a committee which went into it very extensively, gathered a great deal of information from every province in the Dominion with the result that Sir William said that in the next session he would bring in a Bill for the purpose of regulating telephone and telegraph companies. One of its provisions would be that the government would have control of the long distance telephones. That would have gone a long way; it was not all that the country desired, but half a loaf is better than no bread, and the country would have been very much pleased if the proposed measure had gone to that length. That hon. gentleman was at that committee day after day. It went on for some weeks. It closed its sittings to meet again next session, but what was the result? The monopolists who rule the country and rule the government, said: This will never do; we must shut this off. They said to the government: You must find a place for the Postmaster General; he is moving too fast; we cannot allow him to interfere with our franchises; we are the barons and we demand that we have full possession and control of the long distance telephones, and you must find some place for Sir Wm. Mulock. Sir Wm. Mulock had to step down and out. He obtained a judgeship and we never heard that question discussed in this House by the friends of that hon. gentleman from that time up to the present. When I saw that paragraph I was much pleased, but I must say that my expectations were very much dampened when I heard the answer given to our distinguished leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), when he asked the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), what the Bill would be which he would bring down, and when the right hon. gentleman said that it would be one to give the railway commission greater power.

The right hon. gentleman spent a great deal of valuable time in attempting to prove that the government telegraphs and telephones in the United Kingdom did not pay. But he had to admit that the Rt. Hon. Mr. Buxton, Postmaster General of the United Kingdom, was able to show a net profit of £19,661 over all expenses in connection with the telephone service in England last year. What better showing would one expect than that, considering the very short time that the telephone system has been owned and operated by the British government. It may be a different thing in the case of telegraphs where expert labour is required at each end of the wire, but had the proposal of Sir William Mulock been carried out and had the government taken over the long-distance telephone system in connection with our postal service it would have proven of great advantage to the country and it would to-day be on a paying basis. The telephone is one of the greatest blessings of the present day; it has connected the rural sections of the country with the towns and villages and the large centres of population, and it has contributed a great deal to make the young men of the country content to live on the farm, for they feel that through its instrumentality they are brought into immediate communication with the outside world. It is needless to say that the telephone is of great advantage to medical practitioners and their patients. The Bell Telephone Company, that large corporation, has so handicapped the smaller telephone companies throughout the country by not giving them connection with the long distance system and refusing connection with railway stations, that the smaller companies have had to go out of business or amalgamate with the Bell Company. I believe the time has come when we should take drastic measures, if necessary, to compel the large corporations to give due consideration to the smaller companies. The remedy proposed by the Prime Minister is to increase the Board of Railway Commissioners from three members to five, and to give two of the commissioners the power to give a decision, allowing an appeal to the board. That is the very thing which the larger companies would want and it will be ruinous to the smaller corporations. In my own county I know that a great deal of difficulty has been experienced in getting permission to string telephone wires across the railway tracks. I thought at one time that the railways refused to give this permission out of pure cussedness, but I have discovered that the real reason is that they have been trying to extract money from the people all over the country. They failed in Dufferin county, but they have succeeded in other places. I myself made application to string wires across the Canadian Pacific Railway track and I found a great deal of difficulty in getting leave to do so. Mr. Cole had made application to the railway company for this purpose before I did, and they told him that if he paid $5 they would allow him to string the wires across. Mr. Cole referred the matter to me, and I wrote to Mr Murphy, superintendent of that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a pretty sharp letter to which I received this reply:

> Your letter of September 17 in connection with Mr. Cole's application to string wires across our tracks at Shelburne duly reached me.
>
> I note that Mr. Cole has applied to the Railway Commission for permission to put his wires over our tracks. You of course understand that in connection with such crossings this company is put to considerable expense handling the application, preparing blue-prints, &c., which the amount of $5 really does not cover.

Mr. Cole, who owns a mill on one side of the track and a residence and a business block on the other side, desires to string a telephone wire from his house to his mill. He asked the council for permission, which was readily granted. Why should he be taxed by the railroad company to the extent of $5? The station master and the station hands could see that the wire was properly strung, according to the rules and regulations. I wrote back that the charge of $5 could not be permitted; and it took the Railway Commission one month to decide that question. I admit that it was during the holidays; but Mr. Cole was in the meantime put to the inconvenience of not having the telephone connection which he desired. I have many other letters of the same kind, but I will not trouble the House with them. But I want to ask the government if their policy is to allow the railroads to block the progress of the country in this way. The municipalities surely have some rights. The municipality of Shelburne owns that road jointly with the railroad company. There should be a general law giving power to corporations or individuals to string wires across railroad tracks under proper rules and regulations, and without being subjected to delay. A woman there also desired to string wires across the track in order to put the electric light and telephone into her house. She thought there might be delay if she applied to the local telephone company; therefore she applied to the Bell Telephone Company, which immediately strung a wire across the track and put in a 'phone. On the same day she applied to the Shelburne Electric Company to put in the electric light and to the council to put in a water main. The result was that the Bell Telephone Company put in the telephone without delay, but it was five weeks before she received notice from the Railway Commission that the electric light could be put into her house. The government should see that this state of things is remedied without delay. If the Railway Commission is forced to take up all these little cases, it will have no end of trouble; three or four more commissioners will be required to deal with them. What is the remedy? I do not believe that the extending of the scope of the commission to telegraphs and telephones will be of any advantage. In my opinion the remedy is this: we should have two boards—a board for the purpose of adjusting difficulties in connection with telegraph lines, telephone lines, electric light lines, water mains and probably express rates. The majority of this board, say three, should be business men. We should then have a second board composed largely of legal gentlemen to take up the great questions that are of interest to the whole country. Why should the Bell Telephone Company, because it represents a capital of $30,000,000, have an undue advantage over small telephone companies with a capital of a few thousand dollars? It is another case of oppressing the weak and giving advantages to the strong. There must be a remedy for this state of affairs. I submit, Sir, that the great remedy, the remedy that must come, is public ownership of our public utilities. That is the question which has seized the free and independent electors all over this great Dominion. Other countries, such as New Zealand and Australia, have tried that remedy. There was a time when the people of New Zealand were in a condition or industrial and financial distress; but at the present time, owing to their having control of their public utilities, owing to the fact that their taxes do not go to the corporations but to the treasury of the country, they are less taxed than any other country in the civilized world; and I venture to say that when the election comes on, as it must in the near future, it matters not whether it is a few months or many months hence, a mandate will go from a large majority of the ridings of this fair Dominion, demanding an active and progressive government, a government that will rule the country by the people, for the people, and with the people—a government that will not allow monopolies to rule this country; because we must either rule the corporations, or the corporations will own the country. I venture to say that public ownership of public utilities will be the battle cry at the coming election. Then the government will find a mandate coming from the constituencies demanding that they do justice to the electorate. They will find outside the House, in the people, a power that will not brook any interference with their rights but will hurl from office any administration which attempts to trample on those rights.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). I listened this afternoon with a good deal of attention to the speech of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Roche); because when that hon. gentleman rises to address the House we always expect to hear an able delivery, and I must compliment him on the one he gave this afternoon. But I was rather surprised at some of the language he used, especially when he charged the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) with having been impertinent in introducing the resolution he did. I do not think that that was proper parliamentary language to use towards a fellow member who has introduced a resolution, and especially a resolution that has met with the united support of one of the great parties in this House. He told us that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was going about crying blue ruin and croaking hard times. Well, that should have reminded the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) of those good old times, a few years ago, when Sir Richard Cartwright and the Liberal party were the croakers and travelled up and down

throughout the country crying blue ruin, hard times, and predicting all sorts of calamities.

Another statement which rather surprised me was his disparaging reference to some of the banks of this country. In this debate I did not hear any such reference except from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche). He said that while some of the banking institutions were well managed and had taken care of their customers, others, some of the smaller banks, were not so well managed and did not look after their customers. I do not know of any bank in the country, large or small, that is not taking care of its customers and providing them with funds fully up to their credit. If there are any such banks in the province from which the hon. gentleman comes, there are none in the province of Ontario. While in Ontario the banks are not opening up new accounts, they are certainly taking care of their old customers and providing them with sufficient funds to carry on their business.

A short time ago we noticed throughout the press that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was coming to the aid of the banks by giving them sufficient assistance to enable them to move the grain crop from the west. If I were permitted to describe that statement as it deserves, I would call it a bluff. I am told that two leading politicians of the west came to Ottawa and interviewed the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and advised him that it would be a splendid card to play in the west if he would only say to the farmers : I come to your rescue and furnish the funds to enable the banks to remove your crops. But the banks did not require any assistance from him, or at any rate not such assistance as he offered them, and every one of the banks refused to accept his offer. It remains to be seen whether that political exigency which the Finance Minister thought might assist him in securing the votes of the farmers of the west, will have any such effect. Unless I mistake the sentiment of that country, it will recoil on himself to his discredit and that of his government.

I listened with attention to the speech made by the mover of the address (Mr. Hall). I must say that the hon. gentleman delivered a very able speech, but I was rather surprised at some portions of it. One particularly must have been equally a surprise to the government supporters and especially to the right hon. the First Minister. That was the portion in which he congratulated the country on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and gave the credit for building that road to the late Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party. Times have indeed changed. Only a few years ago, Sir Richard Cartwright was wont to tell us that the Canadian Pacific Railway would never earn enough to pay for the grease on its axles and wheels. Yet to-day we have a prominent supporter of the government, in moving the address in reply to the speech from the Throne congratulate the country on the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and giving to that great statesman, Sir John Macdonald, all the credit for its inception and construction.

That reminds me that this government are likewise trying their hand at building a transcontinental road, the Grand Trunk Pacific. We have been told by the right hon. the First Minister that this road will only cost the country $13,000,000, and we have had that same statement reiterated by Liberal speakers all through the country. In the county from which I come, its former member said on the hustings that the cost of this road would not exceed $13,000,000. I do not blame that young gentleman because he is not a business man, and no doubt simply made the statement on the faith of his leader. But what an evidence have we not of the absurdity of that statement made by the head of this government, when we have already spent in the neighbourhood of $42,000,000 upon this road and when we have every indication that before it is completed it will cost the country $150,000,000 to $200,000,000.

I notice on the Order Paper a motion to be moved by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) calling for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the manufacturing centres and the great lakes, and we have had the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) making in Ontario a similar statement. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is the Conservative policy. The leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Borden) advocated that policy before the last general election, and hon. gentlemen opposite pooh poohed the idea, just as they now attempt to cast ridicule on the Halifax platform. And to-day we have the spectacle of this same government, the present Minister of Railways and the ex-Minister of Railways, taking credit to themselves for the policy of extending the Intercolonial Railway to the great lakes—stealing that idea from the Conservative party, just as they have stolen the other items of their policy that have all been successful. When the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) was speaking, and especially when he was complimenting the Minister of Finance upon his negotiations for better trade relations with France, which meant lower tariff between France and Canada, I wondered if he remembered how, when he was seeking election in the city and county of Peterborough, he visited every one of the manufacturers of that city and promised each one of them that he would advocate in this House adequate protection for the manufacturing industries of Canada. I am told that that is a fact and that it was upon that promise and upon the belief in

his influence with the Minister of Finance and the government that the hon. gentleman was elected. But I fear that the hon. member is like a good many other hon. gentlemen on the other side who pretend to be protectionist Liberals, but who, when they come here, forget their promises and swallow the tariff of the present government.

I quite agree with the arguments of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and with the resolution that he has presented, and I agree with him when he states that he views with alarm the balance of trade against this country—an adverse balance of over $120,000,000. This adverse balance means simply this—that the people of Canada have bought $120,000,000 more than they have sold. I agree with the hon. member for Brantford that the merchant who buys more goods than he sells is facing financial trouble, and that the householder or citizen who buys more than he is able to pay for must look to a condition of finances that is not to his advantage. I think that the balance of trade being against us, as it is, is very much against the interest of Canada, for it simply means that we are sending $120,000,000 out of this country to the United States, to Germany, to France and other countries, to pay for goods. That money will help to carry these countries through the present financial stringency. If we had that $120,000,000 in this country to-day it would be to the advantage of our banking institutions and of our Canadian people generally.

When these hon. gentlemen assumed office they told us that they intended to decrease the expenditure and the taxation. But we find that whereas they objected to an expenditure of $37,000,000 and $38,000,000 in 1895 and 1896, during the last fiscal year we have passed items of expenditure in this House aggregating between $118,000,000 and $128,000,000. So they have enormously increased the expenditure of the country and have set an example of extravagance to the people, and so have assisted in bringing about the financial difficulties which seem to be making themselves felt in this Dominion. And, as to taxation, I find that whereas under Conservative rule, the taxation of this country was about $5 per head, after eleven years of Liberal rule it has increased to $11 per head. These figures give some idea of how these hon. gentleman carry out their promises. The Finance Minister in framing his tariff arranges the duties not in such a way to give ample protection to the manufacturing industries of this country, but in such a way as to extract from the pockets of the people every dollar that is possible, because he must have the money to meet the enormous expenditures that he has incurred. When the Minister of Finance addressed this House the other day he spoke with a great deal of levity. He was very jocular in his remarks. I do not think that the country at this time looked for levity from the Minister of Finance. They expected something different in a speech so important as that of the Minister of Finance on the address. They expected him to satisfy and assure the country as to financial conditions; they expected him to give something more solid and useful than the levity in which he indulged. He twitted others in this House of corruption in elections. He went into ancient history, going over events of twenty or twenty-five years ago to make a point against members on this side of the House. But when he was asked a simple question as to the election trial in which he himself was engaged, he answered only with sarcasm as to the wisdom of others. Well, Mr Speaker, I think we have a right to expect wisdom from a Minister of Finance, even though we do not often get it. And I think he has done as much towards the degradation of public life in this country, in the way of lowering political morality, as any other member of this House. When he was asked as to his replies to questions at his own election trial, he said that he had answered all the questions that the court had asked him. But I find, on looking over 'Hansard" that the hon. gentleman hid himself behind the advice of counsel and refused to answer questions that were put to him. Had he answered these questions as an honest man should have been willing to answer questions, I think we should have had some light on the way the contests were carried on in the last election and why a solid eighteen were returned from the province of Nova Scotia to support this government. I find that after he had shielded himself behind the advice of counsel with regard to many questions, his lordship the judge said he thought it would be perfectly legitimate for the hon. gentleman to answer these questions. But counsel, even after hearing the judge, advised the hon. gentleman to decline to answer, so that we find his answer again: 'On the advice of counsel I decline to answer.' The hon. gentleman told us here what he seemed to regard as an amusing fable. And the hon. gentlemen behind him applauded most uproariously. This story was about a certain John Doe—and he told us that John Doe was an imaginary person—who gave $80 at one time and at another time $20 towards the election fund of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Well, that was surely a very large sum to subscribe for an election, but if the hon. gentlemen opposite would tell about election subscriptions I am sure that they could give instances of much larger amounts being subscribed. I find that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) himself in his election trial was asked some very pertinent questions on this subject. He was asked about Mr. A. M. Farrell, who represents the riding of Queens and Shelburne in the Nova Scotia local assembly, and was the Speaker of that House. Here

are some of the questions and answers with the hon. gentleman's answers:

Q. How much money did you get from him altogether?—A. I cannot tell exactly, somewhere in the neighbourhood of $500, between five and six probably.

Q. Not any more than that?—A. Not any more than that, I don't think.

Q. When did you get it from Farrell?—A. Some time before the election, probably a week or so.

So the hon. gentleman was getting money from the local member in chunks of $500 or $600, and he thought it was a most dreadful thing that the hon. member for North Toronto, twenty or twenty-five years ago, had got subscriptions at one time of $80 and another time of $20 from a friend. The hon. gentleman told us that the County of Colchester in the province of Nova Scotia was a Conservative county, an old Tory county, he said, that always returned a Conservative. Well, the hon. gentleman was down in the town of Truro, and I doubt very much if he told them at that meeting that it was a Conservative county, and that it would return a Conservative. I think it likely he assured the electors that the county of Colchester was sure to return the Liberal candidate. At the last general election the county of Colchester did return a Liberal; and as I have already said, if we could find out the truth regarding the expenditure of money in Nova Scotia, we would probably have some light upon the election in Colchester in 1904.

The Minister of Finance himself has not always had smooth sailing in elections, either. It has not always been easy for the hon. gentleman to find a seat in this House, he has had his troubles as other men have. In 1896 the hon. gentleman travelled over this country preaching the doctrines of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party, and after the election the hon. gentleman found himself without a seat in this House. He wanted to find a seat, and so he went up and down Nova Scotia looking to see where there was one he could secure, in other words, trying to find some man that had the goods to sell. He wanted to get them if he possibly could. So he found in Nova Scotia a gentleman named Forbes. Mr. Forbes says, Well, I will resign my seat, but what am I going to get for it? A short time afterwards Mr. Forbes, who was an obscure young lawyer, I believe, was appointed to a judgeship at a very lucrative salary, and the hon. gentleman secured that seat. That was one of the cases where the judiciary was probably degraded by the appointment for political purposes of a man to represent this country upon the bench. While I do not want to advocate the American system of election of judges by the people, still I believe that just such circumstances as that tend to make people think that it would be better for the country if the judges were elected by the voice of the people instead of appointed by the politicians. There was a time in this country when the judiciary was respected, everybody looked up to it, the country was proud of it; it was composed of independent men who were appointed on account of their ability. All that has been changed since this government came into power, and men are appointed to the bench to-day for political reasons and for political pull.

I am glad to notice that we have in the House a new minister from the province of New Brunswick, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). That gentleman has been doing a good deal of talking throughout this country of late. He has told us about political corruption, he has told us about funds that were raised for certain purposes down in the province of Nova Scotia. Now he seems to be most familiar with that matter. It is strange how he knows so much about it, he seems to have been on the inside where he could know all that was going on. He even seems to know just how much money went into a constituency, he told us the amount that went into the City of St. John. Now, from what I read of this intrigue, it was not a Conservative intrigue. The leader of the Conservative party has repudiated it, and says he knows nothing about it. He even goes so far as to challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the election funds of both parties. But that is not acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite, they do not want their own election funds investigated, they do not want any Royal Commission. The hon. gentleman shields himself by saying: Bring on a libel suit. Well, Sir, we have had lately a little light thrown upon these funds, we have had a little light thrown upon this intrigue. The hon. gentleman, at a meeting in the Opera House in Ottawa the other night, in addressing a Liberal convention, told them that when he was in the city of Woodstock, in the province of New Brunswick, a certain telegram was flashed before him, and that telegram said that Mr. Blair, an old Liberal, an ex-member of the Liberal government, was going out to denounce the government and to take the stump in opposition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government. The hon. gentleman then made a statement that reminded me very much of an occurrence that happened in the local legislature of the province of Ontario some years ago. There was a gentleman there whom many in Ontario will remember, and who was not loath to go from the Conservative side to the Liberal side. There came a certain time in connection with the business of the House when this gentleman was expected to speak, and a note was sent across the House to him on which was written, 'Speak now.' And the Minister of Public Works says that he got a telegram to speak now. He was actually going to assassi-

nate his leader, his bosom friend, that had been helping him all his life, the man who had been associated with him, his intimate friend and adviser, the man who knew him better probably than any other man in this House, selected the Minister of Public Works to assassinate his leader, and wired him that now was the time for him to speak. Well, Sir, that throws all the light that is necessary upon that deal, it throws all the light that is necessary upon this great scandal that the hon. gentleman has been carrying around in his pocket for all this time. It shows that probably he knew himself what was going on in connection with the intriguers who were endeavouring to overthrow the Laurier government. This gentleman probably who sent him the telegram thought that the Minister of Public Works would like to return to his first love, because you know that hon. gentleman was a leading Conservative, I suppose, up to 1896. He was even a candidate in a county in the province of New Brunswick in the Conservative interest. But the Conservatives of the county were not satisfied with him as a candidate, and they requested him to withdraw. Then in 1896 the Liberal party came to power, and nobody could change his politics any quicker than the Minister of Public Works, he changed with the government. Then when it came to the assassination of the leader of the Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the effort to overthrow his government, his bosom friend of a lifetime wired him that it was time to speak.

We have another new minister in this House, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), a most estimable gentleman, I believe. I have not the honour of very much acquaintance with him, but he was selected from the province of Ontario, from the leadership of that forlorn little band of Liberals up in the province of Ontario, and brought down here to be Minister of Railways and Canals of this government. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the other day, in a most jocular way, went over one after another the Conservatives sitting on this side of the House and told why they were not selected as leaders of the party, but let me tell the Finance Minister that the leader of the Conservative party was selected by the party, from the members of the House of Commons and by the gentlemen whose names he mentioned. We did not have to go outside of the House to select a leader. We selected him from among ourselves, but hon. gentlemen opposite, when they wanted a minister either of Public Works or of Railways and Canals had to go outside and bring him in. Why? Because their chief felt that there was not among them a man who measured up to the standard. It is said that the former member for Centre York came down and interviewed the Prime Minister that the Prime Minister shook his head and said: Oh, no, you won't quite do—the former member for Centre York, while the Prime Minister was shaking his head, shook his fist and said: Well, I will either do or you will have to appoint me to some good position. The Finance Minister reminded us of the old fable of Davy Crockett and the Coon, but I do not know of a better illustration of the fable of Davy Crockett and the Coon than when the former member for Centre York made the coon come down and he was appointed to the position of senator in this country. Then, I think, perhaps, in looking over the aspirants for the position of Minister of Railways and Canals the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) pricked up his ears and I have not the slightest doubt but that he thought he had all the ability that was necessary to fill that position. No doubt even now that hon. gentleman is surprised to think that he was not selected for that most important position because he certainly had claims. I do not know of any member sitting on the Liberal benches who has more claims than the hon. member for South Grey. He has delivered more and longer speeches to empty benches in this House than perhaps any other member on the other side of the House. No doubt he reminded his chief of the strong claims which he possessed. But, unfortunately, the Prime Minister could not see it in that light and the great ability of the hon. member for South Grey was passed over. Then I suppose, the chief whip of the Liberal party aspired to the same position but he did not measure quite up to the standard. There is our good friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). There is no doubt that he had claims. There is no doubt that he thought to himself: I have done the chores and errands of the party, I have done all the little things that I have been asked to do and surely I have some right to this office. But, unfortunately for him, the Prime Minister thought he would not quite do. In selecting a Minister of Railways and Canals there is no doubt the Prime Minister looked the whole field over to see whom he could get who would just fill the bill. He said, I want a man who has had some experience in election methods, some one who knows how to organize and carry on elections throughout the Dominion and so he selected the late organizer of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario and a member of that disgraced and discredited Ross government. Now, the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues can feel that they have the fragments of that right arm of the Ross government that the right hon. gentleman spoke of some months ago in the Opera House. The Hon. G. W. Ross is sleeping quietly over in the Senate, a tax upon the people of Canada during the rest of his lifetime to the extent of $2,500 a year and the right hon. gentleman has in his own government the organizer of the Liberal party in Ontario who knew so much about the men employed by the Ross government in their effort to remain in office. He knew some-

thing about election methods in the province of Ontario and if I remember correctly the trick ballot box came from somewhere near Brockville. If I remember correctly there was a certain telephone message reported about that time with which the hon. gentleman was connected. No doubt he looked up the other qualifications that the hon. gentleman has as well. I suppose that he said: Here is a gentleman versed in the mode that was employed by the organizers in carrying elections up there, switching ballots, and he even probably thought that he wanted to get a man who could weather the gale and sail the ship through the storm and so he selected the man who knew how to help him in elections. A seat had to be provided for the new Minister of Railways and Canals and there is no doubt he looked the province over to see where he could find it. He found a gentleman who had the goods for sale and a gentleman who would not give up his position without being well paid. I think, if we knew all there was about it, we would find that perhaps a bargain was made before he resigned. At least rumour has it that there was. It is actually said that there was a letter moving around in connection with the circumstance, but anyway, the hon. gentleman resigned and was placed over in the Senate where he too will be a tax upon the people of Canada for the rest of his natural life. This seems to have caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among members of the Liberal party. Members of this House seemed to be very much dissatisfied and I have very strong evidence that the arrangement was most unpopular, and that they were almost in open rebellion in connection with it. What happened? We have on the Order Paper notices from two hon. members sitting on the Liberal side of the House of motions to abolish the Senate. The hon. member for South Grey moves:

> That the disadvantages connected with and resulting from the maintaining of the Senate greatly outweigh the advantages and benefits derived therefrom, and that the Senate may with advantage and gain be abolished.

All on account of poor Derbyshire. Well, there is one good thing to be said about the Hon. Mr. Derbyshire, he has evidently brought about some little agitation in the party opposite that promised to reform the Senate which may result in carrying their promise into effect. The desk mate of the hon. member for South Grey, the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) also moved a resolution in which he says:

> And in making recommendations in regard to these and other changes calculated to place the Senate in a position of increased usefulness and of increased responsibility to the people.

And even our good old friend who was so long in this House, the Hon. Mr. McMullen, I understand he has a motion on the order paper to reform the Senate; so that even the Senate itself is in revolt because the former member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) is associated with them; I do not know whether it is because of the deal or because they are dissatisfied with his company, and think that the standard has not been raised by his elevation to the upper House.

Now, speaking of the government of the province of Ontario, I say in all sincerity that thank God we have an honest government in that province now, a government that will not stand for anything in the way of electoral crookedness or electoral wrong. We could have no better example of that than the investigation which was carried into the courts in the London election case, and as a result of which four of these gentlemen, poor unfortunate fellows who were only the tools of the Ross government and the Liberal party have been convicted and are now awaiting sentence. The Dominion government has now a duty devolving upon them, and I hope they will face it manfully and provide some kind of lucrative jobs for these four gentlemen as they did for others of their class. We know there was one Luke Wagner in the Northwest who got into trouble and even while he was in jail his salary was raised by the government, so that we may expect the ministers to look after the interests of these four men in Toronto. And not only is there an honest government in Ontario, but also in British Columbia and in Manitoba as well. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point to any act of corruption on the part of these governments since they have been returned to office, and I ask these gentlemen to contrast the governments of British Columbia, Ontario and Manitoba, with the Liberal governments in other provinces. In the province of Quebec we find one Liberal member of this House actually resigning his seat and going down there to try and purify, and uphold the standard of morality and honesty in Quebec.

Mr. TALBOT. What was his success?

Mr. LALOR. It remains to be seen whether he will be successful or not; it is to be hoped that he or some one else may succeed in reforming the provincial government of Quebec and the Dominion government as well. I may remind hon. gentlemen opposite that there was something of the same kind in Quebec in Mr. Mercier's time, but the people reformed that government. Look at the province of Saskatchewan where the Hon. Walter Scott is premier, and you will see that the late election in Prince Albert demonstrated how Liberal methods are carried on in every province where Liberals control. Wherever they happen to be in power there is election crookedness and dishonesty. Ontario got rid of them, British Columbia got rid of them, and thank God when the people of the Dominion get a chance they will get rid of this bunch. I am sorry the

Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat because I want to pay him some compliments. It is suggested by my hon. friend here that he has gone to a five o'clock tea, but it is too late for that function, although it probably may be a pink tea he is attending. The Minister of Agriculture is noted for inspection Acts, he has a weakness for putting on the statute-books inspection Acts which are a farce, but which surround him with an army of inspectors who turn out to be election workers when the time comes. We had a sample of that to-day, and the member for South Essex had to stand up and make excuses for the Minister of Agriculture and promise he would change his regulations. I particularly desire to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the Apple Inspection Act which he passed a few years ago and under which he made certain regulations. I give him the credit that it was a good Bill, and I believe it raised the standard of Canadian apples in the British market. The buyer knew that if he purchased No. 1 Canadian apples he was buying a good apple, and that if he purchased grade No. 2 he was buying a good second quality. But strange to say something has happened this year that has entirely changed the inspection of apples, and if to-day Canadian apples are a drug in the British market, I believe it is because the buyer in England has discovered that he cannot depend on the brand. I know a local shipper at my own station who was honestly grading his apples according to law, and there was another shipper from the same place who was doing very differently indeed; he was branding No. 2 as No. 1. The honest shipper went to the other and said: How do your apples pass inspection? and the answer was: Why this year they are not inspecting them very closely and almost anything goes. Well, I can tell why that change in the system of inspection was made. There was an election in East Northumberland which is an apple growing county, and the people there thought the law was too stringent, and in an endeavour to carry the election, among the many other promises made to the electors of East Northumberland was a promise that the apples would go through this year without very much inspection. The result of that is that the sale of Canadian applies is ruined on the British market.

I want to say a word in connection with our mail service. I am in favour of rural mail delivery. I believe it is not in the interest of the country that the government should come down this session and announce that there is a surplus of $1,000,000 in the postal department. I do not believe there should be any surplus in that department. I believe that every dollar of post office revenue should be used in giving better mail service to the people of Canada. I believe that every dollar of that surplus and more if necessary, should be used in trying the experiment of rural mail delivery. Where rural mail delivery is not possible, we should have at least good mail service. I have received, since I have come to the House, several letters from a township in my constituency, one of the richest and best townships in the province of Ontario, informing me that in several post offices in that township there are only two or three mails a week. I believe there should be a daily mail, not only in every part of the province of Ontario but in every part of every other province. There is no reason why the farmer should not receive proper mail service. He largely pays the bills of this country, and there is no reason why he should not have as good service according to the distance he lives from the railway as the man who lives in the city. I therefore sincerely think that our mail service should be so arranged as to provide a daily mail for every part of this country.

In conclusion, I just want to say, with regard to the Halifax platform, that I am entirely in accord with that platform, as is the united Liberal-Conservative party of this country; and I believe, from the great success which the leader of the Conservative party has had in his tour of the west, that the people of the west are in sympathy with that platform; and, from the result of the recent election in the county of Colchester, I believe that the people of the maritime provinces are also in sympathy with it.

Mr. PETER ELSON (East Middlesex). Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some remarks on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. gentleman who spoke as the mover of the address. He certainly said a good many things which will be of use to the people of this country. He alluded in brilliant terms to the prosperity of this fine Dominion, and he endeavoured to show that the foundation of that prosperity was the good management of this government during the past ten or eleven years. Mr. Speaker, I differ with him in that regard. The hon. gentleman did not give sufficient credit or praise to a kind Providence for the bountiful harvests which this country has enjoyed during the last ten or eleven years. We must acknowledge that the foundation of the prosperity of a country, especially a country so largely agricultural as the Dominion of Canada, is its good crops. Now, Sir, I hold that no government has the power to produce such weather as will bring about good crops. No government has the power to cause the sun to shine for a single moment on the earth's surface and thereby cause the seed to germinate and grow. No government has the power to cause the copious rains to fall which, combined with the sunshine, are so necessary to produce crops to perfection until they yield perhaps thirty or forty fold. It is true, this

government did some time ago grant a large sum of money to the Yukon Territory, and the officials there did use a certain part of that money to shake up the clouds and cause a disturbance in order to bring rain. However, that was a very great failure, proving again that too much credit has been given to the government for the prosperity of the country and not enough to a kind Providence.

There is one question which I desire to bring before the House and which I regard as a very great question, especially to the people who live in rural districts. They feel that the time has now arrived when the government of this country should establish a system of free rural mail delivery. The farmers of the country are anxious, we may say they are hungry, for a daily mail and a daily newspaper. The daily newsapper is the common educator of the people. Then, give the farmer the opportunity of obtaining this great boon without too much effort. It will enable him to see what the federal government is doing, what the legislatures of the different provinces are doing, and something of the doings of the governments of other countries. It will also inform him of any great calamity or great misfortune that happens in any part of the world. It will inform him as to the market value of the different products of his farm that he may have to sell, which will be of great benefit to him. The daily mail certainly does a great deal to make the country home more attractive. It enables men living on the farm to feel that they are living in an up-to-date portion of the world and goes far to content them with their situation. It would seem to give them greater energy to work on the land, resulting in the production of a great deal more of the golden grain which is so large an element in our country's wealth. It also tends to increase the production of those splendid horses, cattle and sheep, for which the farmers of this country have succeeded in taking the champion prizes at the great international show which is going on at the present time in the city of Chicago. Then, Sir, encourage the young men of the farm by giving them free rural mail delivery. It will make them feel more like keeping themselves to the front and pushing along. It is said that the homes build up the nation. I believe that is true ; I believe every hon. gentleman in this House believes that is true, and the greater portion of these homes are in the country districts. We are also informed and believe that the greatest possible asset that a country can have is the people who live in it, so long as they are a contented people. It has been said by some of the most able statesmen of the present day that the permanent and lasting greatness of any country depends more largely upon the character of its rural population than upon any other one thing. If that be the case, the government of the day should endeavour to encourage those people in every possible way they can, and I know of no legislation which the government could enact that would fill up the country more rapidly and permanently than a free rural mail delivery. It may be said that the cost would be very heavy, but what can the government obtain without a great deal of expenditure? Where have they obtained anything valuable without a very heavy outlay? We have been spending millions on other objects which do not give us anything for the money paid out adequate to the return which would result from the expenditure on a free rural mail delivery service. Look at the trouble a farmer is put to in order to obtain his daily mail. Suppose he lives a mile or two or three miles from the post office. Take the average distance as a mile and a half, and just see what inconvenience he is occasioned to-day. He has to travel a mile and a half to the post office and then make his return trip. Thus he has to cover three miles a day or eighteen miles a week, or in the fifty-two weeks of the year between nine hundred and a thousand miles in order to obtain his daily mail. Averaging that at five cents a mile, you will find that it costs $45 to $50 a year to the farmer to get his daily mail. Could not the government, with a wholesale system of rural mail delivery, deliver the mails at one-tenth of the cost which a farmer has now to pay? The hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) said last session in this House that as soon as this country has a population of 20,000,000 we may begin to talk a free rural mail delivery. Well, I think it will be a long time before we have that population; but following out that line of argument, we have now nine provinces beside the territories, and dividing these nine provinces into 20,000,000 we would have two and a quarter millions for each province. Ontario has that population already; Quebec is following very close. Why not then commence the system in the province of Ontario or Quebec, and then after it is in thorough working order gradually extend it over the whole Dominion? Millions of dollars are paid away by the government every year, of which we do not complain very much, for the purpose of subsidizing railways. Millions are also expended on bonuses to the manufacturers of iron, steel and lead, but where is the bonus to the farmers? It is too intangible, too vapoury, too mythical, to be perceived by the naked eye. Just give the farmer rural mail deivery and you will give him a boon which he will thoroughly appreciate. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has told us that this system has cost the United States some $30,000,000 this year, but that is really the very best argument in its favour because it shows that the people demand it and approve of it and the government have acceded to the wish of the

people. I shall take the liberty of reading two or three extracts with regard to this system taken from papers which are certainly very reliable:

If any people are more curtailed to postal privilege than another, it is the farmers of Ontario. Free rural delivery would be an inexpressible boon to them, all the more so as labourers diminish in numbers, obliging them to work on the land for all they are worth. It would be a boon to have mail left at the door or in a box at the garden gate, instead of trudging miles to the post office.

Life on the farm would be vastly improved were a post carrier to pass daily to deliver and receive the letters and papers which are nowadays the appanage of nearly every rural as well as city household. While the city householder has his mail matter left at his door two or three times each day, the rural resident must trudge from one to three miles to get it for himself. How different were a box fixed at his gate into which mail could be left or collected by the official carrier.

As the rural classes pay the greatest share of the country's taxes, as it is upon these that the government depends for public revenue, they are entitled to every boon in the public service that is feasible and in accordance with modern life.

Here is another clipping describing the success of the American system:

Success of free delivery.

A careful investigation has been made by the Postal Department at Washington into the effect of rural free delivery in Carrol county, Maryland, the first county in which the complete mail service was established. The result is such as would be very gratifying to Sir William Mulock, were he still in the mail service of Canada.

The population of the county is thirty-three thousand, seventy-five per cent of which is agricultural. The number of letters delivered in the county the year following the establishment was sixteen per cent in excess of the number delivered the year before any rural routes, were established in the county. Postal cards showed an increase of twenty-one per cent, newspapers and periodicals, nine per cent; circulars, twenty-one per cent; packages, thirty-three per cent, and registered letters, twenty-four per cent.

The increase of revenue would go far to reimburse the government for all the outlay of initiating the rural free delivery service, if it did not leave a substantial balance to the good. As the investigation proceeds it is confidently predicted that similar results will be found to attend the system in other countries.

Think of the accommodation to the farming population by a development of the postal service which has brought to the country parts an increase of 100 per cent in paying mail matter.

Is not such an experiment worthy of trial in Canada? Would not the farmers of western Ontario hail it as a boon?

I fully endorse all that is stated in those clippings. Let me now give you a little conversation which I had not long ago with an American gentleman, who is a farmer on the other side of the line. He bragged about his own country as being the best in the world. I felt it my duty to stand up for my own native land. I held that Canada was second to no other country upon the face of the earth. 'Ah, but,' said he: 'We have something there that you have not; we have rural free mail delivery, which is a great boon to our people, which is building up our homes and building up our nation. The best thing you can do is to sell your farm in Canada and come and settle on a farm in the United States. If you do so, Uncle Sam will see to it that you get your mail delivered right at your garden gate; you will get your mail just easily, almost, as does the resident of the city.' My answer was: 'Of course, you have rural free mail delivery, which we have not in Canada. It is undoubtedly a great advantage that you enjoy. But I believe that the government will see the necessity of commencing that system in the older settled parts of our country, at least. And, if the present government will not do it, we have the assurance of the leader of the opposition, that as soon as he gets into power which no doubt will be very soon—he will commence the establishment of the system of rural free mail delivery in the older settled portions of the country, and will extend it as rapidly as circumstances will allow until it covers the whole Dominion.' It seems to me that, when we send letters to New Zealand, to Japan, to Hong Kong and other places far distant from Canada, for two cents, it is not reasonable that we, as farmers in Canada, should not receive our letters without having to travel eight or nine hundred miles in the course of a year to and from the post office to call for our mails.

There is another question on which I desire to say a few words. The constitution of the Senate. We hear a good deal about the Senate. Many people tell us that it should be abolished altogether. Others say that it should be reformed. We find that, back in the year 1893, the Liberals of this country held a convention here in Ottawa, and laid down the platform for their party. One plank in that platform was the abolition of the Senate. Sir Oliver Mowat, speaking on that occasion, said:

We are agreed as to the necessity of a fundamental reformation of the Senate—if, for any reason, a Senate must be or should be retained. The Senate as now constituted is the weakest point in our constitution.

And Sir Richard Cartwright said:

I think, Sir, we all agree that the constitution of the Senate as it at present exists is a blot upon popular government and free institutions.

While this was the opinion expressed by leading Liberals when they were in opposition, we find that, when they got into power they did not carry out their promises

at all. The Senate still remains as it was. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will pardon me, I desire to give my view with regard to the reform of the Senate. I am not like the Liberal leaders of those days, who believed that the Senate should be abolished. I am free to say, speaking for myself, that I believe that there should be an upper chamber. But I believe also that the Senate as it is to-day destroys its own usefulness by being so strongly partisan. It is for that reason that so many people believe that the Senate should be abolished as not being worth what it costs to the country. The question will naturally be asked: If you are going to retain the Senate, how will you prevent it from being partisan? My view is that senators should be chosen alternately from the two sides of politics. Of course, it would not do to commence that way now, because the Senate is one-sided, and to fill vacancies in the way I have suggested would leave it one sided still. My contention is that the Senate should be levelled up at the start. The weaker side, whether Liberal or Conservative, should be strengthened so as to level up the two sides, and then the system of alternate appointments should be inaugurated. I believe that if this rule were followed, the Senate would become a useful body as a part of our system of government.

There is another question which agitates the minds of many people at this time, and concerning which I wish to say a word or two. I had expected that the speech from the Throne would foreshadow some legislation on the subject concerning which I wish to say a few words—that manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes to the boys of our country. I hold that the government should take that matter in hand and remove this temptation from the path of the youth of this Dominion. If I remember correctly, when this question was discussed last session upon the motion of my old friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) to abolish the cigarette, some members of the cabinet said that if the matter were laid over to the present session, they would propose legislation to deal with this evil. I had a little experience only a few weeks ago. On my way home, I met, in the train, a youth of about thirteen years of age. He was on his way to Chicago. His wonderfully pale countenance and the far-off, dreamy look in his eyes attracted my attention. I thought he was nearly gone with tuberculosis. I drew him out in conversation in order to find out what was the matter with him. He told me that he was an inveterate smoker of cigarettes, and, apparently, not knowing the injury they were doing him, he actually bragged of the number he could smoke in twenty-four hours. That young man was going down hill as fast as he could, and it was the cigarette that was ruining him. Consider the fearful increase in the number of cigarettes smoked in the last ten years—ninety millions then and three hundred millions now. These are largely consumed by our boys. I have nothing to say against a cigar or a pipe, for I do not suppose they hurt any one. I must say I did hear of one person who was killed by smoking, but she died at eighty-five years of age, and had commenced smoking when quite young. But let me give a case, quoted from the 'Boston Post,' showing the effect of cigarette smoking:

> With his windpipe nearly closed from a contraction of the muscles, due, the doctors say, to his smoking too many cigarettes, John E. Wilson, eighteen, of 140 Castle street south end, was found in a semi-conscious and almost dying condition on the commons last night. That he did not strangle, the surgeons say, is due to the prompt action of the police, who, after finding him, made a record trip to the hospital with their charge.
>
> Yesterday, the doctors declare, Wilson admits having smoked cigarettes almost incessantly, with the result that the nicotine partially paralyzed the muscles of his throat. At the hospital the doctors applied restoratives, and later he was able to go to his home. Before he left, however, he was admonished to be more careful about the use of cigarettes if he wanted to continue to live.

Now that is one of the great evils we have to meet, and I think the government should try and cure it. I want now to say a word or two on another question which is still more serious, it is an evil that kills people right straight along without any warning, and that is the deadly level crossing on our railways. We learn from official information that forty-two persons were killed on our Canadian railways, and some twenty-four more were injured during nine months of last year. In my own neighbourhood there are two railways and five level crossings, and on every one of these crossings some person has been killed and under most melancholy circumstances. It seems to me most important that this government, or the Railway Commission, or both together should devise some plan to give better protection at these deadly level crossings. I believe the danger is greater on a country crossing than it is on a city crossing, because in cities the trains are slowing down a little, and there are people who see the trains coming and give warning to those passing over the road. But that is not so in the country, the trains rush through at a rapid rate, and there is no one to warn travellers of the approaching train. You will remember, perhaps, a sad case that happened a few months ago on a level crossing, where a young couple who had recently been married in Goderich were going to Hespeler. They were driving out on pleasure and happened to come up to a level crossing as a train was approaching. The train was coming rapidly, the horse became unmanageable and rushed ahead on to the level crossing, just

in time for the train to strike the carriage and the young couple were killed. Here is what the jury said at the coroner's inquest:

Your jury finds from the evidence submitted that the late Frederick Reid, of Goderich, came to his death by being struck by a Grand Trunk train while crossing the Waterloo road on Friday, September 20, 1907. Also that on account of the great number of accidents at level crossings would recommend that the Railway Commission do consider the advisability of having them abolished.

This is certainly a very serious question, I do not know whether our new Minister of Railways and Canals will be able to solve it or not. At any rate, it is one that deserves the most earnest consideration on the part of the government and of the officials who have to do with the roads. My own view is that in the country perhaps an electric bell would save a great many lives, but not in all cases. In the case just mentioned where these two young people were killed, it would not have saved their lives, because the horse became unmanageable. It seems to me that the only remedy is either a subway or an overhead bridge. The state of Massachusetts is forcing the railways to provide either a subway or a bridge at every level crossing. It is too bad that people who are not employed on the railways at all, and who are travelling roads which they themselves perhaps have built, should be struck down and killed. I close, Mr. Speaker, by summarizing the points I have made. I hope that the government will take into consideration the establishment of free rural mail delivery; I hope they will level up the Senate and make things right there; I hope they will pass a measure to abolish the cigarette evil; and I hope they will take steps to make the level crossings safe upon our railways.

On motion of Mr. Crawford, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 6, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

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

That the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report, laid on the table last session, be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. ELSON.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a special motion last year, Mr. Speaker, that referred to the Public Accounts Committee the sub-target matter which was gone on with but was not concluded. Will this motion include that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This motion includes everything that was in the Public Accounts or the Auditor General's Report last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but there was a special reference of the papers that were brought down on the sub-target business, and a special resolution was passed by parliament referring them to the Public Accounts Committee. They went back further than last year's Public Accounts and last year's Auditor General's Report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say as to that. I will have to look into it. I made this motion in consequence of an understanding with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have that included in this motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I will have to look into it.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

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

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House has appointed Messieurs Aylesworth, Bergeron, Bristol, Brodeur, Calvert, Daniel, Foster, Grant, Knowles, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Monk, Pardee, Pugsley, Smith, (Nanaimo), a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned as memon behalf of the House of Commons as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

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

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messieurs Bergeron, Bristol, Cyr, Dyment, Gervais, Henderson, Hughes (Victoria), Johnston, Lavergne (Drummond & Arthabaska), Logan, Maclean (South York), Macpherson, McColl, Martin (Montreal, St.

Mary's), Oliver, Pardee, Parmelee, Roche (Marquette), Ross (Yale--Cariboo), Smith (Oxford), Smith (Wentworth), Taylor, Tisdale and Verville, will act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) to amend the Act respecting Shipping in Canada. He said : Mr. Speaker, I may say that the purpose of this amendment is, first, to increase the limits of what is defined as our coast trade and, secondly, to increase the tonnage of vessels on which certificated masters and mates are required in the home or coasting trade. The amendments proposed, I admit, are debatable and perhaps open to some specific objection. On the second reading of the Bill I will move that it be referred to a select committee unless in the meantime the motion of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) for the appointment of a select standing committee on fisheries is passed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

LOANS AND OVERDRAFTS, 1906-1907.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What disposition was made of the Dominion loan, $9,376,386, falling due May 1, 1907?
2. What amounts have been borrowed by the government since July 1, 1906, from what sources, and upon what terms?
3. What overdrafts, if any, have been current since July 1, 1906, at what banks and at what rates ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. Renewed at same rate of interest for four years to 1st May, 1911, with option until 30th April, 1910, of converting into Dominion government three per cent's due 1938 at the rate of £105 of three per cent for each £100 of four per cent.

2. £250,000 1st November, 1906, on security of treasury bills at four and five-eight per cent for six months through the Bank of Montreal, London. These bills were redeemed 1st May, 1907.

£500,000 17th August, 1907, on security of treasury Bills at four and a half per cent for one year through the Bank of Montreal, London.

3. There were no overdrafts in the banks in Canada. The Dominion government account with the Bank of Montreal, London, their financial agents, has been overdrawn on current account from time to time as has been usual, and such overdrafts have been covered in course by remittances from this side or by treasury bills where such have been issued. According to the last account received our overdraft in London is £301,619-5-1. The arrangement respecting such overdrafts is that they bear the current Bank of England rate, whatever it may be.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount of the temporary loans of the government at present ?
2. What rate of interest do these loans bear ?
3. What temporary loans have been entered into by the government since July 1, 1907?
4. From what banks or bankers have the temporary loans made by the government since July 1, 1907, been obtained, and what rate of interest do they bear?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. £500,000.
2. On the security of treasury bills for one year at 4½ per cent.
3. The above £500,000.
4. The loan has been obtained through the Bank of Montreal in London. On that portion which the bank itself holds the rate is as above stated. On that portion which is discounted outside of the Bank of Montreal the discount is at the same rate with the addition of ⅛ per cent to the Bank of Montreal in accordance with the agreement respecting the management of our financial business in London.

TEMPORARY LOANS SINCE OCTOBER, 1906.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. What temporary loans have been made by the government since October 31, 1906, and at what rate of interest?
2. Which, if any, of said loans are still outstanding and unpaid?
3. What rate of interest has been paid, or payable, on each of said loans, since they were made respectively?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. £250,000 1st November, 1906, on security of treasury bills at 4⅝ per cent for six months through the Bank of Montreal. London, these bills were redeemed May 1, 1907.

£500,000 17th August, 1907, on security of treasury bills at 4½ per cent for one year through the Bank of Montreal, London.

2. The above £500,000 is outstanding and will not mature until August 17th, 1908.

3. No other temporary loan has been made.

DEBTS FALLING DUE SINCE OCTOBER, 1906.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. What portions of the debt of Canada have fallen due since October 31, 1906, and how has such maturing indebtedness been met?

2. Have they been renewed temporarily? If so, at what rate of interest and under what arrangements ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1-2. Four per cent loan of 1876 due November 1st, 1906, for £2,500,000 against which Sinking Fund to the amount of £658,867-8-4 was held leaving a balance of £1,841,132-11-8 to be provided for. The whole was redeemed.

Three and a half per cent currency debentures for $500,000 originally issued on 1st December, 1891, matured 1st December, 1906. and were paid off on presentation.

Four per cent loan of 1874, extended to 1st May, 1907, for £1,926,654-15-11 was renewed through underwriting, as in the case of the previous extension, at the same rate of interest for a period of four years with the option until 30th April, 1910, of converting into Dominion government 3 per cent stock due 1938 at the rate of £105 of 3 per cent for each £100 of 4 per cent.

DEBT MATURING, 1908.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. What portion or portions of the debt of Canada will fall due during the year 1908?

2. What arrangement or provision has been made for payment of such indebtedness ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. Four per cent Intercolonial Railway Guaranteed Loan of £1,500,000 maturing 1st April, 1908, against which we hold sinking fund of £1,197,915-4-4 leaving a balance of £302,085-16-8 to be provided.

Four per cent loan of 1878-9 of £4,500,000 maturing 1st November, 1908, against which we hold sinking fund of £1,090,979-5-5 leaving a balance of £3,409,020-14-7 to be provided.

2. The matter has been the subject of communication from time to time with our financial agents in London. In view of the unfavourable condition of the money market, it has not been deemed expedient to make any definite arrangement at present. The subject, however, is receiving every consideration.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

What amount is paid each province under the present agreement, and the amounts paid previously?

Mr. FIELDING.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

Half yearly grants and allowances payable to each province *prior* to the coming into force of the B. N. A. Act, 1907.	Province.	Half yearly grants and allowances payable to each province *after* the coming into force of the B. N. A. Act, 1907.
$ cts.		$ cts.
669,643 64	Ontario	1,064,386 04
543,356 74	Quebec	843,289 54
245,680 48	New Brunswick	310,680 48
216,402 18	Nova Scotia	305,232 38
153,538 33	British Columbia	261,038 33
125,525 99	P. E. Island	160,525 99
565,167 70	Saskatchewan	630,167 70
562,062 50	Alberta	627,062 50
310,748 73	Manitoba	375,748 73

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in being able to congratulate at least one member of the opposition for the manner in which he has addressed this House, and I therefore tender my congratulations to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Elson) who has preceded me in this debate. In his presentation of his case the hon. gentleman Mr. Elson) was calm and dignified, and I think it would add to the dignity of the House if some other gentlemen on his side followed his example. I also have much pleasure in congratulating the mover and seconder of the address who spoke with such eloquence and such ability. The hon. gentleman from East Middlesex (Mr. Elson) admits that we have prosperity in this country, but he would try to make us believe that the government of the day has nothing to do with the prosperity which surrounds us. The hon. gentleman thinks that Providence has had more to do with our success than any thing else, but in my experience I have found that Providence was of very little use to me or to the people I have had to deal with. Providence is of course all right in a way, but my experience is that where success and prosperity exists, it is to be found among the people who help themselves, and unless people help themselves and use energy and effort, Providence I think plays a very little part. Our Conservative friends were in control of the affairs of this country for eighteen years, during which time they had just as

many favours from Providence as the Liberal party have had. They had as good conditions in respect of climate, soil and everything else that our Liberal friends have had since they came into power; but owing to their lack of energy, foresight and business ability, they failed to realize the result for which the party in power to-day deserves so much credit, that is, prosperity on every hand. Some of the speakers who have preceded me have taken exception to the speech from the Throne on the ground that it is an empty basket. I do not agree with these hon. gentlemen in that regard; I think it is a most full basket, and it contains a great deal that suggests thought. Every clause in it contains something that is worthy of consideration by the people of this country. In this connection, I think it would not be out of place to refer to some of the speeches from the Throne delivered to parliament on previous occasions when our Conservative friends were in power; and the people of this country would do well to compare the conditions described in those speeches with the conditions described in the speech from the Throne which is before this House to-day. If our present bill of fare is an empty basket, or not a very full one, the bills of fare that were presented to us in 1895 and 1896 were perfectly empty baskets. The speech from the Throne delivered to parliament in the session of 1895—I will read only the most important feature of that speech—after referring to the depression of trade that existed in the country, said:

> Although this has not resulted in any considerable decrease in the volume of our trade, yet, owing to low prices and recent reductions in and removal of taxation, it has been followed by a serious decrease in revenue derived from customs and excise. In order to produce equilibrium between revenue and expenditure for the coming year, it will be necessary to observe the greatest possible economy in the appropriations for the various branches of the public service.

I think you will find in that, Mr. Speaker, an entirely different tone from that of the speech now before the House. In 1896, with practically the same conditions of trade existing, and with the revenue of the country entirely inadequate, the Conservative government tried to excuse themselves with a statement of this kind in the speech from the Throne:

> You will be pleased to learn that the revenues of the country show a gradual and con-continuous increase, and that the promised equilibrium between income and expenditure on Consolidated Fund account for the current year bids fair to be realized.

In the speech now before the House, we find an entirely different condition of affairs described. It reads as follows:

> It gives me great pleasure to be able to congratulate you on the remarkable expansion of the trade of Canada with other countries, the total trade of the past year far exceeding that of any of its predecessors. A gratifying result of this expansion was that the revenue of the last fiscal period of nine months was more than sufficient to meet expenses on Consolidated Fund, National Transcontinental Railway, Capital and special outlays, all expenses of the Dominion of every kind, and leave a balance of over three million dollars to be applied in reduction of the public debt.

This describes an entirely different condition of affairs from that of the later years of the administration of our Conservative friends, and a condition of things that I am sure the people of Canada are proud of and desire to see continued. Now, Sir, I claim that this condition of affairs exists under decreased taxation. Our friends on the opposite side of this House claim that taxation in this country has increased. They claim that because the revenue in this country far exceeds that of previous years, that means an increase of taxation. Now, Sir, it is no more an increase of taxation than it would be for me, if I had one farm this year and another farm next year and another farm the year after that, to pay an increased tax on account of my increased holdings. Because of the increased business I was doing, I would naturally have an increased tax to pay. The same principle applies to the business of a country as to a man's own private business. We do not find any expressions in the speeches from the Throne, under the late government regarding the flood of immigration into this country. But we do find in the speech of to-day the following clause:

> The stream of immigrants coming to Canada continues to increase in volume, the year now drawing to a close showing a larger number than any preceding year. It is gratifying to observe the many coming from the British Isles.

In that connection there is no expression of opinion by our Conservative friends when they were in office regarding the inflow of immigration. It is very satisfactory indeed that we should be at present enjoying that influx of immigrants which we have been witnessing for some time, but I regret to notice that some of our hon. friends opposite are taking the position that the aid we are giving immigration should be lessened or discontinued. The position I take is that we should continue a vigorous immigration policy, if we are going to build up and increase the trade of this country. To do this we must get people into the country, for nothing has done so much for our development as the immigration policy of this government. That policy must be continued, and possibly, owing to the little stringency now being experienced, it will be wise for this government to use greater efforts in that direction. It would be wise for the government to double their energies in that respect. We have a vast country to develop. We have millions of acres which

will be without any value until they are populated, and I would advise the government to use still greater energy than ever before in the direction of bringing in immigrants to fill up our untilled acres. In order to give you a little idea of the value of immigration, let me quote an estimate which was prepared and which I believe is authentic. We have had a considerable immigration from the United States, which possibly is the most valuable that comes to this country. In the year 1906, some 61,252 people came from the United States. To show you the value that they brought into the country, it is estimated that the value per capita of these 61,252 people was $809. Thus in cash and effects those people brought into Canada the sum of $49,586,138. That is the actual value in cash and effects brought in by American immigrants in one year. That is only the value for one year, but what must be the value of all the people who are settled on the lands of this country? That value cannot be figured out; it is untold. And what kind of people are they? I have a few extracts from an American official who was sent to this country to look into the immigration situation. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Americans have been getting a little alarmed about the exodus to Canada. They consequently sent a gentleman, Mr. Charles N. Pepper, as special agent to look into the question. Here is what he said :—

The most important immigration to the Canadian Northwest is that from the United States. The movement began in 1898-9 when 12,000 persons crossed the border.

This was after our Liberal friends came into power.

During the early years of the movement the larger proportion of the settlers were native born Canadians——

What does that mean? It means that the Canadians, who were going from the country when our Conservative friends were in office, began to return.

—who had been living in the United States and who repatriated themselves, resumed their allegiance as British subjects if they had been naturalized in this country. Then followed groups of colonists such as the Mormons, who engaged in raising beet sugar in Southern Alberta, Russian Mennonites and other sects. European immigrants to the United States who had not yet become naturalized though in some instances they had taken out their first papers and finally all classes of American citizens, the majority of whom were native born. At present the trend of population to Canada may be said to be a general one based on individual rather than on collective association, though many groups are formed to establish themselves in a selected locality.

Then he goes on to describe the work our Canadian government is doing throughout the United States. The business way they advertise our country and establish agencies throughout the United States and other lands has created this flowing tide which has brought us such prosperity. Mr. Pepper goes on to say :—

According to the statistics of the Canadian customs houses, settlers' effects to the amount of $5,500,000 are annually admitted free. These include household goods, farm animals and agricultural implements of almost every description. In view of the liberal construction of the customs officials in interpreting the tariff revision, the probability is that the total valuation of goods thus withdrawn from the United States is nearer $10,000,000 than $5,000,000.

It is not only the value they actually bring into our country but the value they give us from year to year. As Mr. Pepper says in his report :—

Their superior knowledge and experience in practical farming. They not only do not have to be taught by official agents but their methods are valuable in showing the raw immigrants from Europe the best way to get results from the wheat lands.

The cash capital that they bring with them. Every arrival from the States is well supplied with money to buy land and to purchase the means of improving it. This creates an unusualy active market condition for pioneer communities. The majority of the American settlers insist on acquiring a full section instead of being content with a quarter-section which is allotted to homesteaders and which is more than the ordinary European immigrant is capable of handling.

You observe that Mr. Pepper considers that an American is practically equal to four European immigrants. A quarter-section is all that the ordinary European can farm, but an American can farm a whole section of land, educating, training and directing the European labour necessary to carry on his operations. I will not go into the details of his estimate, but I may say, generally, that he arrives at the conclusion that this western country is capable of producing 400,000,000 bushels of wheat annually in the near future, besides other products of various kinds. Now, I must say that, so far as the bill of fare for the present session is concerned, it is, beyond all comparison, better than that of twelve years ago. The next clause of the speech, to which I would refer, says :

The Dominion has been blessed by a long series of prosperous years,——

That is something that never happened while our Tory friends were in power—

—and, though at the present moment its business is being restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel assured that this unfavourable condition will be temporary and that the illimitable resources of Canada and the world-wide recognition of them give us ample guarantee of continued material progress.

As to this alleged money stringency, I hold that, owing to the solidity of our Can-

adian banking and financial institutions, and owing to our general conditions, we need not be afraid for the financial future of our country. I am satisfied that there is no real stringency in the money market. There may be some tightness for different reasons ; there may not be the free money for extravagant speculation that there was in the past few years ; but, according to my experience, there is enough money for all legitimate business. I am interested in two or three concerns that use more or less money every year, and I can say that, in our relations with the banks, we have never had as liberal treatment or as easy money as during the present year. In one case, we asked for certain lines of accommodation. But, owing to the increased trade, we were forced to overdraw the lines that we were allowed ; and, without any hesitation, the banks provided us with all the money we wanted.

There is more or less discussion in the country on the movement of the wheat crop of the west. There seems to be an impression abroad that there has not been sufficient funds for the moving of the western crop. That may be right in a certain sense. On the other hand, I think there is an easy explanation of the situation. In conversation, I have learned the opinion of some of our western grain men who ought to know what they are talking about. They told me they were satisfied there was plenty of money in Canada, but it was not in the proper channels. In Winnipeg, the financial centre of the western country and the headquarters of the grain trade, the condition prevailing up to recently was that two or three banks have had all the grain accounts. But the Dominion bank, which is the principal institution of this group, and the others, seem to have found themselves not quite in a situation to handle the trade this year as readily as before. One reason for this may have been that it took more money by half to handle the same quantity of grain this year than last year, owing to the increase of value. Whatever may have been the reason, these two or three banking institutions found that they were not able to meet the situation. And, when our grain companies went to the other banks to seek relief and to secure the means of handling their business, these other banks told them : We have not had any of your business in the past ; we have not had any profits from you ; and we have other demands for all the money that we have available ; consequently, we do not want any of your business at present. So they practically sat back in their chairs, and laughed at the situation. It was not a question of the quantity of money at all. The whole question, so far as Canada is concerned, I believe, is to get the money into the proper channels.

Take, for example, the district in which I live—and the conditions with us, I believe are the same as for two-thirds of the province of Manitoba. Judging from these conditions, I see no reason whatever to agree with the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt who declared that we had before us only blue ruin and soup kitchens. In my district, and in the province of Manitoba generally, the conditions are the very opposite to this. I venture to say that this year has been the most prosperous and profitable year Manitoba has ever known. I have been in that country about thirty years—I think I have grown something over thirty crops myself—and I know that this year's crop is the most profitable we ever produced. Just let me show you where we are at. I know a farmer living close to where I live, who received for a carload of oats, delivered about a mile and a half from his own door, $1,050. I know farmer after farmer who has produced stuff this year which, counted at current prices, would represent a larger sum than the value he puts on his whole farm. Under these conditions, what can we have but prosperity ?

I propose to give you a few facts showing the production of at least some portions of this country and the possibilities. This year was an exceptional year, and for a long time we were apparently up against the worst conditions. Nevertheless, the farmers of that country have never got better returns than they did this year. The poor farmer had reasonable returns, and the good farmers had the best returns they ever had in their history. Land values there today are better than they ever were before. I can mention a number of sales in the last few days that I know of personally where the farmers sold their farms and quarter sections at very high prices. A farm I had cropped myself this year, without any improvements except the breaking, sold for $4,500 in cash, that is a quarter-section of land. Another farm I was interested in jointly with another party, that produced some 2,500 bushels of wheat worth $1 a bushel, 800 bushels of barley, and I do not remember how many oats and other feeds, after these crops were taken off, sold for $3,300. Another quarter-section a few miles from where I live was sold for $6,000; another one for $4,000. These were after the crops were taken off and with just a few farm buildings. This shows, I think, a very prosperous condition of affairs. I have here a few particulars as to what was produced on some of the quarter-sections, and I will give a few instances. The clipping is from the Gladstone 'Age' :

Albert Clayton, two miles south of Gladstone, has taken in $3,800 for the wheat that grew on a quarter-section this year. So nobody can find fault with the natural richness of Westbourne soil.

J. C., 18, 16, 15 w. 1st, 2,500 wheat number two grade, besides oats and barley, also sheaves.

Wm. Greentree, 30, 15, 15, w. 1st, 110 acres at 23 bushels sold at 96 cents.

H. H. Riley, 15, 16 w. 1st, 21 bushels over 225 acres sold at $1.06½ to $1.02 at Eden station.

T. C. Harris, 35, 15, 16 w. 1st, 16 bushels to acre, over 340 acres, 5,200 bushels; sold at $1. Had 3,000 bushels of barley from 80 acres sown last week in June.

G. F. Elsey, 10, 14, 15 w. 1st, 215 acres wheat threshed, 3,680 bushels wheat, 1,700 bushels to acre, sold three cars at $1 a bushel.

Smith Brothers, Eden, 300 acres, 23 bushels to acre, 6,900 bushels, sold three cars at 95 cents, $1.01 to $1.02.

These facts show that in that section of country, at least, there is no immediate prospect of soup kitchens. That condition of affairs applies to two-thirds of the province of Manitoba and to the whole of my division, which is in the centre of Manitoba, I might say the hub of Canada. I have another clipping here from a paper showing that a short time ago a parcel of land bought for $1,000, was afterwards sold for $1,500, and the most recent sale of that tract of land was $20,000. These facts show that the western part of the country is in a very prosperous condition. If we continue the present vigorous immigration policy and bring people into this country who will develop the undeveloped portions of it, the prosperous conditions of the present will continue and expand. Of course it is not all milk and honey. We have our little troubles and our little grievances in that western country. We have had these big yields, and we have had, as I said, sufficient money for all purposes. So far as the purchasing of grain was concerned in that country, there has never been any money stringency at all. When farmers came on the streets of Portage la Prairie, Neepawa or Gladstone, so far as I have heard, and were prepared to sell their wheat and get their cash tickets, they could get the cash for it right on the spot. Any man who loaded his wheat in a car, which hundreds of them did, if he was wise enough to keep control of his own position, and keep the bill of lading and have it made out shipped to his own order, could get an advance of 75 cents per bushel on that wheat; on a thousand bushel car he could get $750 of an advance, and the balance when the return was received from Fort William.

But we have had a stringency, in a sense, and we have a grievance, I think, to-day, and a complaint to make. Some of our farmers perhaps were not as wise as they might have been, and were not up to business deals as much as they ought to have been. We had a short time ago very high prices offered for wheat. I think that within twelve or fifteen miles from the town in which I live there was possibly three or four, or five hundred thousand bushels sold under contract at $1, $1.01, $1.03, $1.05 or $1.06 a bushel. The farmer making his deal for that wheat seemingly never thought of anything else but getting a big price. The contracts read that he would be paid along the lines of his return from Fort William when the wheat was shipped to Fort William at a certain time, possibly in November or December. He never thought where he would be in so far as finances were concerned and these contracts did not provide for any advances or anything of that kind in connection with his wheat. Therefore we find that we are up against this situation; we find to-day that there are hundreds of farmers who sold their wheat in that way who have not received a dollar for that wheat up to the present time for the reason that our transportation is in such an outrageous condition that the wheat has not arrived at Fort William yet. I have proof of that condition in my pocket here to-day. I have shipped wheat myself; I have a number of cars in transit at the present moment. I shipped wheat in my own district on the 21st October and up to Tuesday—the last report I had from home—that wheat had not arrived at Fort William and until the wheat arrives at Fort William people who sell under these contracts are not able to realize a dollar on it. On that account we are tied up in a way we ought not to be in so far as money is concerned. Those people are simply hard up; they are up against it, not because money is tight, but because of the conditions of transportation in that country. Just imagine it taking a month to move wheat one hundred and sixteen miles. That does not apply to one car only, but to hundreds of cars and that is the position we are up against to-day. Talk about rural mail delivery, talk about what you like, but there is nothing which so affects the welfare of the western farmer to-day as does the question of transportation. We remember the situation which existed last winter but there are parts of the country which are in as bad a condition to-day as we were a year ago with regard to transportation. Last winter there was the excuse that the snow fall was so great as to interfere with the movement of freight, but there has been no snow this year. I will mention a few facts which illustrate the situation. In the town from which I come a buyer told me that he believed there were sixty cars of wheat standing at our own station, some of which had stood there for a month and had never been moved. The siding next to our town was filled with loaded cars of wheat and barley. At one time there was not a car moved in three weeks. I have four cars of wheat at one point and I am at the expense of storing it in the elevator. I intended to ship it direct, but I could not get cars to load it and I could not get it moved. At another point I had two cars of wheat in the elevator for over a month and not a car to be had. Hundreds of cars are on order but no cars available and, seemingly, even if they do get cars, they do not move the wheat out—a terrible condi-

tion. That is one of the great factors in making money tight in our part of the country. I think that some stringent means should be resorted to in order to remedy that situation. I hope some action will be taken but there is nothing at the present time that has impeded our progress so much as the question of transportation. That will be an important factor, no doubt, for some time in that western country.

We have, in the speech from the Throne references to several other matters that possibly deserve some consideration. There is the labour question. The declaration is contained in the speech that there is a difficulty in obtaining labour and material at a time of great business activity. Some of the hon. members opposite have taken the position that there is a surplus of labour in this country at the present time. I must take exception to that statement. I am satisfied that, in so far as this whole country is concerned, there is no surplus of labour. There may be a surplus at this little point or that little point, but throughout the whole country, if the labour is properly distributed, I am sure there is no surplus. Our farmers out in the west, during the whole season, have been short of help. In the fall the threshing outfits in our part of the country could not get half enough help. Threshing outfits that could thresh 3,000 or 2,500 bushels a day, for want of help, were running short handed and they were only threshing 1,000 or 1,500 bushels a day. The day before I left there was not one available man in the district from which I come that could be hired for love or money and hundreds of men wanted to go back into the bush to chop wood. North of where I live there is a great quantity of timber. The people were going into the bush there to take out wood, and it is very necessary in the west that there should be a fair supply of wood. They pay from $1 to $1.50 a day for men to go out and cut wood and there is not a man to be had for other work. With respect to the city of Winnipeg I noticed a statement in a paper the other day—and I have the clipping here—that every man who was willing to go out and work was being employed as fast as he would agree and he could leave the city of Winnipeg at almost a moment's notice if he were prepared to go. They were paying from $20 to $30 a month and board which represents possibly about $2 a day. Seemingly, in so far as that report is concerned, there was not a sufficient supply to meet the demand; in fact, in some lines of axemen there was a great shortage. With regard to the supply of tie makers or good axemen the situation was this:

> Two hundred tie makers are wanted in the worst way by the companies interested, but up to the present the demand has not been met. An examination of the situation scarcely bore out the statement literally——

—that were made that there were more men than there was employment for.

In all the local offices where contracts were being made for labour, men were being hired in large numbers and it was clear that any able-bodied man could make a contract within a few minutes, and could leave the city for the place of his work at any time. In order to secure employment, however, the applicant must be willing to leave the city and he must be ready to accept smaller wages than have prevailed during the past few years.

There are some slight reductions in the wages of bush men, but there is any amount of employment and the wages are still good.

In the speech from the Throne I find that there is a reference made to the Japanese agitation. As to that question I am quite satisfied. This is another indication of the progress and advantages of Canada. These Japanese are anxious to come here and make money as they possibly think they can make it here more quickly than in other places. I am satisfied that the Japanese difficulty will be adjusted satisfactorily to all. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which has received so much from Canada is as loyal as it ought to be to the interests of the Dominion, then they can do a great deal to settle the Japanese question because they stand charged with being a party to making contracts for bringing the Japanese into this country by thousands. I have a great respect for the Japanese people; they are one of the progressive nations of the world to-day. I believe they are a reasonable and a clever people and their reasonableness combined with the ability and integrity and foresight of the leader of the government will bring about a happy solution of the difficulty. But where do we find the Conservative party on this question? I have before me a report of the Vancouver speech of the leader of the opposition and in it we see the same indefiniteness in regard to this matter as with regard to other questions of public policy. I have before me the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' one of the strongest Conservative papers of Canada, and it reports the speech of the leader of the opposition under big head lines:

> Mr. Borden's emphatic demand for a white Canada.

Let us see what his demand is. He says:

> I am willing to agree with the people of the west that if present conditions continue the immigration from China and Japan will mean the driving out of the white people from British Columbia. The question is whether British Columbia in future shall be dominated by the subjects of the Mikado or by Canadians. But——

The word 'but' comes in.

> But Britain has made a treaty with Japan, a powerful nation, and the spirit of this treaty must be carried out.

I would like to appeal to our British Columbia friends who are here; I would ask

the people of British Columbia what encouragement they may hope for from such a speech by the leader of the opposition. The hon. gentleman is always ready to make people believe that he is going to do something great and grand but in the end he has nothing to offer but indefiniteness. The hon. gentleman continued to say :

So let us have a due sense of the imperial as well as the Canadian rights.

Well, perhaps that is a very wise statement. A great many people in Canada have got cold feet in connection with this yellow scare and they have gone beyond all reasonable limits and have jumped at a conclusion before giving the question due consideration. And to these people I would commend the language of the leader of the opposition who says that in the end we must submit to the imperial authorities, which is of course sound constitutional doctrine. Mr. Borden continued to say :

Let us consider the rights of a great nation like Japan and her relation to trade and commerce, and while recognizing our duty to the empire we maintain that Canada must be accorded free judgment; just as free as that enjoyed by the other dependencies of the empire.

I think the people of British Columbia will see from this language that if ever the Conservatives got into power, so far as the leader of that party is concerned their position with respect to the Japanese immigration would not be any better. But let us compare the language of the leader of the opposition with the words of his ablest lieutenant in this House. The Hon. George E. Foster spoke in Toronto on November 7, and the 'Mail and Empire' says :

Dealing with the immigration question, Mr. Foster advocated the admission of all those with the elements of good citizenship and expressed hope that the day would never come when Canada would shut her doors to desirable citizens, because their hair was of a certain colour or because they held certain beliefs or had certain blood in their veins.

Here we have the great lieutenant of the leader of the opposition taking different ground from his leader. In view of that difference of opinion among the members of the Conservative party what hope can our friends in British Columbia have that even if the Conservative party came to power there would be any consolation to them in that event.

The speech from the Throne refers to one regrettable incident, namely the collapse of the Quebec bridge. That sad event is to be regretted for many reasons not only because of the loss of life and the loss of money, but the great delay that will be entailed to the progress of transportation. It is gratifying to know that in connection with our postal system there has been a surplus in the Post Office Department, and that is so different from anything that ever happened during the Conservative regime that it forms a striking contrast. As to telegraphs and telephones and railways, I have my own particular ideas, which may not agree with the opinions of some other people.

In the town from which I come we have a certain amount of municipal ownership and operation, but I have never seen yet where the people were making any great profit out of their municipal undertakings. Under the conditions that exist in this country at the present time I do not think that the question of the government ownership and operation of railways, and possibly I might say also telegraphs and telephones, is worthy of consideration. I believe that a better system can be worked out. If we can couple private enterprise with government control, I am satisfied that the results will be much more satisfactory and profitable to the people of this country than any other system. Our friends opposite accuse us of graft and corruption. I am satisfied that if the railway business and the telephone business of this country were under the control of the government, the opportunities for making charges of that kind would be a thousand times greater than they are to-day. If we have the right to control private enterprise and to require a certain kind of service to be given at a certain price, I think that is the best arrangement that can be worked out. If it is not possible for us through a commission to work out that arrangement to the advantage of the people, I am sure that it will be impossible for us to manage the whole machine to the advantage of the people. The great opportunity of making a success of government ownership and operation of railways in this country was lost when our Conservative friends handed over the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

In the bill of fare presented to the House we are promised some amendments to our election law. If there is one thing that is pleasing to me more than another, it is the promise of some legislation along that line. Every session since I have had the pleasure of being in this House, I have spoken on the subject of the election law and its application of the province of Manitoba. We in that province are up against a condition of things that should not be allowed to exist one day longer than is possible. We hear that Whitney is going to purify elections in Ontario, that the Roblin government in the province of Manitoba is a pure government, and that the Tory party is going to purify elections throughout Canada. Any person who takes any stock in declarations of that kind cannot be in his right senses. The idea that the government of Manitoba will purify elections is so far from the fact, in so far as my experience

is concerned—and I have been mixed up in elections in the province of Manitoba for the last twenty years—that I cannot possibly understand it. The only people I know of who have been convicted by the courts of election offences are Tories; the only members of parliament who have been unseated for corruption in Manitoba are Tories; the only ballot-boxes ever burned in the province of Manitoba were burned by Tories; the only ballot stuffing I ever heard of in the province of Manitoba was done by Tories. Then what can we expect from the Roblin government in the way of purifying elections? I leave you, Mr. Speaker, to form your own opinion. In what position do we stand in the province of Manitoba to-day? We are in this position, that if a Liberal appeals to a justice of the peace with certain information in regard to elections, the partisan justice of the peace refuses to receive the information. That has been done. Now, what is going to happen in Ontario? Whitney, I understand, has dismissed every justice of the peace who was in existence when he came to office, and he has no doubt appointed in their places partisans, who will not in my opinion give any Liberal any quarter, but will act in the same way as the partisan justices of the peace in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. W. JACKSON (West Elgin). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Did I understand him to say that the present government of Ontario had dismissed every justice of the peace in that province?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is my information.

Mr. W. JACKSON. I have to say that that is not correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement in that regard, but I am still of the belief that every justice of the peace who would not submit to the dictates of Whitney in Ontario was dismissed.

Mr. W. JACKSON. The strongest Liberals in Ontario were left on the magisterial bench.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, that does not make much difference. We have had an experience in Manitoba of the operation of our election laws during the past few years that we will not go through again, and I wish to tell the hon. the leader of the House to-day that unless there is a change in the election laws he need not expect a Liberal candidate in that province. It is all right for a Tory there to do almost anything, but it is all wrong for a Liberal to do the slightest thing. I have here the voters' list of the polling division near where I live. There are two lines on it, a red and a black line. If a Liberal draws a red line on that list he is persecuted and prosecuted by the Manitoba authorities. All the judicial power in the province has been used against Liberals for using that red line. There is a black line right through the list for the same purpose. The Tories used the black line. They struck a hundred names off the list under instructions, I am told, of the Attorney General of Manitoba, and every one of them goes scot free, but if a Liberal does it he is persecuted and prosecuted to the limit. That is the condition we are up against in Manitoba. We have to use the provincial voters' list in that province, and owing to the fact that the polling divisions and boundaries do not coincide with those of the Dominion districts, it is necessary to make some changes in the voters' list. In the list I have in my hand there is a polling division and there are about sixty names on the list who do not belong to my division. To get a list of that poling division it is necessary to do that kind of work because the polling divisions arranged for by the provincial authorities overlapped. The provincial authorities in Manitoba have undertaken to go after the Liberals for doing just what they did themselves. If they had any excuse for doing what they did in their own voters' list, it would be different. Here is a list of voters certified to by a judge. Those were entirely taken off the list, I understand, through instruction of the attorney general of that province. And under the certificate of Judge Walker there is a list of voters in a certain polling division in Manitoba put on the list and certified to by Judge Walker, of Winnipeg, but under the instructions of the Attorney General, Mr. Campbell, they were all taken off and every one disfranchised.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the reason?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We will come to that.

Mr. BENNETT. Then there was no reason?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, no valid reason. They were just simply disfranchised. Here is an official list of the district of Rockwood in Manitoba. On that first polling division they struck off with this black line 90 names and only left on some 45. If a Grit had done that he would have been put in the penitentiary, if the Tories could have convicted him, but because it is done under instructions of the Tory party, every man goes scot free. If you apply to a justice of the peace the chances are you are turned down and have no recourse.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why do you not lay an information against some of the people and have them prosecuted?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I know of men who went to a justice of the peace and he would not take the information.

Mr. LANCASTER. In those cases?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not in those, but in others.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then lay the information in those cases.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If there was any excuse for the authorities in Manitoba resorting to these means, I would possibly not consider it so much of a grievance. But take their Acts of Parliament and what do you find? We find that they rearranged the polling divisions. In chapter II. of the statutes of 1907, the Election Division Act of 1907, they provide for a redistribution of certain electoral divisions. They take from one electoral division and add to another, but they failed to make the necessary provisions for the correction of the voters' list. On this voters' list before me, certified to as an official list, they struck off some 200 names and added, after the certificate of the revising judge, some 235 names. That is a sample of how things are conducted in Manitoba.

Mr. BENNETT. Were they struck off in open court?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No court; they simply did it on the side and it was all right.

Mr. BENNETT. Has there been a session of the local legislature in Manitoba since this so-called outrage was committed and was it brought up in the House by the hon. gentleman's friends?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This was done since the last session of the local House, but they had just a few days before redistributed the province and they made special provisions for taking care of the list in the city of Winnipeg. But in the rural district they failed to take any notice and took no power to themselves for this kind of work. To show how far they go, let me point out that in order to let some of their friends down easy they passed a special Act, chapter 13, which placed the names of certain persons on the list of electors:

> Whereas the persons hereinafter named were on the thirtieth day of May, 1906, entitled to be registered, under the Manitoba Election Act and its amendments, as electors of the Electoral Division of Kildonan and St. Andrews, on the list of polling subdivision No. 13 of said electoral division, and personal applications by each of them were made to the registration clerk acting at said polling subdivision on said date for such registration, which applications were refused.

Here is a registration clerk who violated his oath of office by refusing to put in this one polling division a certain number of electors on the list, and to let him down easy, instead of prosecuting him, as they would have done were he a Liberal, they went to work, and to satisfy a few electors, passed this special Act. That is quite a different procedure altogether to anything we have ever heard of before, and, of course, quite contrary to any treatment that has been extended to the Liberals of Manitoba by our provincial authorities in the revision of the Dominion lists. So far as right election methods are concerned, possibly we are as pure as the people of the east. But let me tell my Liberal friends here that we have known individuals to be imported from the province of Ontario to instruct our people in the west. One individual particularly came up and organized a school to teach our men how to do their work. And what kind of work? Ballot-switching and ballot-box stuffing. And you have this kind of people to-day, and, in the Tory party you must expect more or less work of that kind. I think they still have the people in Ontario who do that kind of work. Look out for them. Do not think that under Whitney or anybody else the Tories are going to give you clean election. They do not expect to run pure elections. A few of them may, on the side, dispute that position, but that does not matter. I speak according to what my experience has been. This man who organized the school in our country to instruct our innocent western people—and some of them got caught—he was recommended to my opponent in the late election as having been 'a good man in North Bruce.'

Now, I notice something else in the speech from the Throne that is very pleasing to me. We are promised a Bill in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. From what I know of the government, and of the liberal treatment they have given the new provinces in the west, I have every confidence that Manitoba will be liberally dealt with. There is not only the question of extension of boundaries but also the question of subsidies. Of course, as we grow bigger, our need of money grows greater. I am glad to be able to say that we expect to get matters of that kind adjusted, and that in the near future. One of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me in this debate, advocated certain railway legislation. I would agree with him, except that I think he does not go quite far enough. There are some matters in connection with our railways that require consideration at an early day. One of these is the question of the cattle-guards and fencing of the railways. Many cattle have been killed in our western country as a result of the poor cattle-guards—they are simply no guards at all. Losses are caused by the railways in other ways also, yet the laws seem to be in such shape that it is almost impossible for an individual to get justice from a corporation. I have had some personal experience and I believe that the general conclusion is that it is better for the private individual who has not a large amount at stake to allow losses of this kind to go rather than fight the matter in the courts. I think that legislation should be passed which would

make it cheaper and easier for people to demand and secure fair treatment from the corporations.

I believe that some legislation is required also in connection with our financial institutions. While I have found the banks quite liberal at most times, at other times it has been unsafe for business men to have anything to do with them. I have known bank managers to actually canvass for business. They have been ready to carry their accounts along for a certain length of time, but, as soon as some little panic arose, or there was a change of policy at the head office, the money was called in, and men in good business standing were closed out without due consideration. Oftentimes, business men with assets double their liabilities have been closed out just because of some special crazy move on the part of the bank. In the city of Winnipeg the other day a business man with a surplus of good mercantile assets, just because he could not raise at once a certain sum of money, had his stock sold out at twenty-five cents on the dollar. That is something that the people of this country should not have to submit to. When a man's assets are sufficient he should be given a reasonable time to gather himself together, and not forced to sacrifice his holdings. I have been up against it myself in some of my dealings. The bank is most liberal at the start, perhaps even canvassing and encouraging a man to go into a certain line of business. But, just at the time when the assistance of the bank is most needed, the business is closed down upon without reason. A law should be passed which will prevent the banks from taking advantage in that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up more time than I intended——

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAWFORD. However, most of the subjects I have discussed will come up later in the session, and then if our friends opposite want another dose we may be able to give it to them. And we may go even further than we have gone to-day in showing up the inconsistencies of the Tory party.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speech of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). Judging by his remarks, he seems to be one of the most self-satisfied men I have heard recently. He talks about the financial condition of affairs in this country as perfectly satisfactory, I suppose from his own point of view; then he turns round and winds up his speech by telling us about some large manufacturing or other interests in his county having been sacrified, and are only able to pay 25 cents on the dollar. If you can make anything out of these two statements satisfactory to the country, I cannot. He talks about pure elections in Manitoba, and warns the people of Ontario against the machinations of Tory politicians. Why did he not tell us about 700 names that were struck off by the thin red line? Why did he not tell us about the Prince Albert frauds? Instead of warning the Conservative people of Ontario, he would do well to warn the people on his own side of politics, because when you come to investigate corruption in the province of Ontario, you will find that it has been almost entirely practised by the Liberal party, while within the past number of years, not one action of corruption has been brought home against the Conservative party. He tells us that there are no men out of work in the Northwest, that men are wanted all over. Well, I pick up the Manitoba 'Free Press,' and when I look down the want advertisements what do I find? You would expect to see advertisements of men wanted, but instead of that I see 'Wanted, husbands for marriageable ladies,' 'wanted, young men to assist in a dining-room,' wanted for an amateur production of a leading Scotch play.' I look down column after column, but I do not find any want advertisements. Turning over to the situations wanted, the hon. gentleman can find column after column in that paper where men are anxiously asking for employment.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper is that?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Manitoba 'Free Press' of December 4. Of course, the hon. gentleman took a great deal of time to tell us about the wonderful prosperity, but he cannot point to a single piece of legislation this government has placed upon the statute-books that has had anything to do with bringing about this prosperity. Time and again the leader of the opposition has asked the Prime Minister to mention one piece of legislation placed upon the statute-books since this government came into power, that has been instrumental in bringing about the present prosperity. It cannot be done. The hon. gentleman says he is satisfied with the American immigrants coming into this country. No man is more pleased and glad than I am to know that a great many intelligent Americans are coming over from the United States to become citizens of our Dominion. But when you come to look at the immigrants being brought in from foreign countries across the water, and the careless manner in which they are being let in, you cannot help feeling that things are going wrong, and it is time a stop was put to it. I would like the hon. gentleman to go to the frontier at Niagara, or come with me up to Port Huron, and he will see hundreds of immigrants turned back each year because the United States will not allow them into that country. Those immigrants come with their passages paid and their tickets practically all mark-

ed through to the United States, but they are turned back at the frontier because they are unfit, and so become citizens of this country. What we want in Canada to-day is quality, not quantity. He tells us about postal arrangements and says he is perfectly satisfied with them, that he has no need for rural free delivery. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman sits in his office in Portage la Prairie and has his mail brought into him every morning, judging from the easy street in which he gives us to understand that he lives on at the present time. He talks about public ownership. Why did not the hon. gentleman tell us that right in the town where he lives the electric light plant and telephone system are owned and controlled by the city of Portage la Prairie, and is one of the most successful public ownership concerns that you will find in the country? I have no time to take up any further subjects touched by the hon. gentleman.

I listened attentively to the speech from the Throne in recent years, it contains very little progressive legislation. Each successive speech from the Throne contains more and more indications of a dead and dying parliament. It is the same old story of a government dying at the top and drying up, becoming time servers instead of live and progressive men introducing legislation to meet the needs of the people and the demands of a clamouring public. I only intend to-day to deal with one important piece of legislation mentioned in the speech from the Throne, and which has been before this government for the past five years, though the proposition has received nothing but abuse and discouragement from them. I refer to rural free mail delivery to farmers in the rural districts, coupled with government control and management of telephone and telegraphs. I put these three services together, because I believe that the day is at hand when no progressive government will allow either the telephone or the telegraph to hamper trade and compel persons, professional men, to subscribe for two telephones where one would do the work more expeditiously and more economically. Were the telephone and telegraph under government control and management, and conducted in a businesslike manner under such civil service reform as the leader of the opposition has proposed, a twenty-five cent business message would be delivered in Canada for twelve cents, as t is delivered in Great Britain; and a fifty cent message would be delivered for half the present price, and telephone and telegraph messages would be delivered throughout this land to the people for half what they have to pay to-day. I will not give statistics with regard to these two services. Those of us who have read and heard the evidence given before the Telephone Committee some years ago must admit that it was sufficient to prove to any sane man that the nationalization of these two important services would be one of the greatest boons to the people of Canada. Let me give you one illustration. In the township of Bosanquet, in the county I have the honour to represent, we have two telephone systems. One of them is the people's telephone system, with some hundreds of subscribers. These people had been paying only $3 per annum for the use of the telephone. Last year they were asked for $6 per annum, $3 of the $6 to be set aside as a fund for emergencies. They have only used some 9 per cent out of that fund. But on the other hand, I will take you to that same township and show you where the Bell Telephone Company have gone in and where the farmers are paying $20 for the use of the Bell telephone system. They are inconvenienced in the same way by local calls and rings as the People's Telephone. This is only one of the thousands of instances which might be given in different parts of our country. This is not as it should be and the remedy is in the hands of this government. Now, just the other day we had a speech from the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and I am sorry he is not in his seat because I wish to refer directly to him and to the statements which he made in regard to the ownership of telegraph and telephone systems. In his speech on December 2 in this House he said that the last report of the Postmaster General of Great Britain, Mr. Buxton, has shown conclusively that the telephone and telegraph systems of the United Kingdom are not paying concerns.

He went on to say:

> I have the report in my hand. I will not quote it—it is very extensive.

But he quoted an editorial from the Montreal 'Gazette' and in quoting that editorial I think he was most unfair to the people of Canada in passing over some of the important items that he must have had in the book which he claimed to have in his hand. I have here the book, which I imagine, he held at that time. It is a statement of the Post Office Department of the United Kingdom. According to the Montreal 'Gazette' the net deficit in working the telegraph system for the year was £652,000. The total revenue from the telegraphs of the United Kingdom amounted to £4,369,230, but the total expenditures were £5,021,285. That does show a difference of £652,055. But, had the right hon. First Minister taken the pains to have looked at the different expenditures that made up that £5,021,285, he would have found that a large portion of it should be charged to capital account. For instance, in the expenditures on page 96 of the report he would have found items such as these:

Sites and buildings,—purchase of same	£ 11,774
Erection of buildings	80,122
Extension of the system of telegraphs	305,253
Terminable annuities for advances under telegraph accounts—Acts	351,246

Now Sir, there is a total of £748,395 which no common sense man would place in any other position than capital account, and I am surprised at the right hon. First Minister of this Dominion taking the position that he did in regard to that article and I feel confident that in so far as the Montreal 'Gazette' is concerned it will right the wrong when it comes to investigate the matter.

Let us go a little farther with this. On the same page of the expenditure account he would have found this as well: The percentage of salaries to total revenue is 62·31, the percentage of maintenance to total revenue is 21·93, a total of 84·24, leaving over 15 per cent of a profit in the running of the telegraphs of the United Kingdom. My attention was called to it by reading the right hon. gentleman's speech and having visited the telegraph and telephone systems of the United Kingdom and having made some investigation in regard to them I was surprised to see the statement that he quoted from the Montreal 'Gazette.' Upon looking it up I found the facts to be exactly as I have stated them here. When you come to think that a business telegram in the United Kingdom is sent for 12 cents when it would cost in this country 25 cents you can readily see the great advantage there is in the operation of the government telegraph system. Let us have a little more investigation into the telegraphs since the hon. gentleman has brought the question before the House. As we have seen there is an expenditure of £748,395 which should have gone to capital account. This does not include further sums such as interest, £118,642, and superannuations, £125,823, making a total of £244,465 that might be added to capital account. The gross expenditure of £5,021,285, less capital charges of £748,395, leaves £4,272,890. The net revenue after deducting expenditure in the nature of capital is £96,340 leaving a balance of £468,212. If the £118,642 represents interest at 3 per cent on the amount invested then the capital invested in telegraphs is £3,954,700. If, in 1907, the statement shows that after setting aside, out of gross revenue, for interest, £118,642 there is a profit remaining of £96,340, this means earnings of £214,982 or more than 5 per cent on the outlay.

Now, there were 89,493,000 telegrams sent in 1907 on which there was a profit of £96,340 or $468,212 which means about half a cent on each telegram. There are now in the United Kingdom 10,587 telegraph offices at post offices, and if the right hon. gentleman had investigated that report he would have found that hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of telegraph offices had been abandoned and that the telegraph instruments have been taken into the post offices for economy's sake. Had he examined the telegraph system of the old land he would have found that while two years ago they had a crude system to-day it is being wonderfully improved and a large amount of money is being expended upon it. There are 2,406 telegraph offices at railway stations.

A word or two in regard to the telephone system in Great Britain. At page 97 of the same report I find the financial statement regarding telephones as follows:

Telephones, 1907.

Income	£908,246
Working expenses	456,459
Apparent credit balance	£ 451,787
Capital authorized by statute	7,300,000
Of which amount there remains unexpended	257,558
Actual capital expenditure	£7,042,442
3 per cent on capital invested	£211,273
Leaving for depreciation	245,186 3½%

(One-fifth of total expenditure new, having been purchased in 1907) which would be four and a half per cent on the other four-fifths.

Expenses made up as follows:

a. London exchange	£330,512
b. Provincial exchange system	116,973
c. Trunk line system	460,761
Total expenses	£908,246

Balances available for depreciation, interest, &c.:

a. London exchange	£187,861
b. Provincial exchange system	38,227
c. Trunk line system	225,699
Balance	£451,789

I merely place these figures before the House to show that the statements of the First Minister are wide of the mark, and I sincerely hope he will give the House and the country some more definite knowledge of his position with regard to the telephone and telegraph systems of this country.

If there is one thing more than another which I am interested in, it is rural free mail delivery. I believe that not only should the cities of our land have free mail delivery, but that the rural districts should have much more consideration than is given to them at the present time. Back of our industries, back of our mines and timber lands, back of our railways and telegraphs and telephones, back of our schools and colleges stand the farmers, the back bone of them all; the foundation from which flows that mighty stream of products to feed the cities and towns, the source from which in past years has gone our surplus to feed the millions beyond the sea. Remember that in 1905 we sent out some $25,000,000 worth of cheese, $7,000,000 worth of butter, $35,000,000 worth of wheat, $50,000,000 worth of

meats and perishable products, or $114,000,000 worth in all. Were it not for this large amount of money coming into our country year after year we would find that so far as Canada is concerned she would be practically in a bankrupt condition. As was rightly said by the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) the relations between this country and foreign countries showing a balance of trade of $121,000,000 against us, is a thing to be regretted. That money goes out to maintain industries in foreign lands, to not only build up their industries and pay their workmen but in turn to consume the products of the farmers of these foreign lands, and instead of this Canadian government cultivating and developing a home market and the home trade in our own land we find them ready and willing to develop the industries of foreign nations. We have to-day 600,000 farmers in the Dominion of Canada producing as they did in 1906, an estimated product of $700,000,000 worth. Surely this is an important industry. Is it not an industry worthy of more attention than it has received during the past ten years from this government? The agricultural interests of Canada are the coming source of her greatness; that interest will grow and expand to just the extent that our people and our government afford opportunities for its development. I want to state to the House some of the benefits of free rural mail delivery as I see them. It brings the post office practically to the door of the great mass of the people. Instead of these people having to go or send to the post office for their mail, a government official delivers it daily. It is a great benefit to the business man who has connections with the rural districts. It increases the revenue of the Post Office Department; it increases the circulation of the press of our country which is an educator; it delivers parcels for a few cents from the merchant at the nearest town to the farmer thereby saving the farmer time and expense; it connects the farmer with the latest current reports; it has been the means, where tried of improving the roads in the country districts; it is estimated in the United States reports that it increases the value of the farms, where it is in operation, twenty-five per cent. It is easier for one man to deliver the mail to one hundred farmers than it is for one hundred farmers to drive or walk miles to a post office, and when you come to think of the scarcity of labour in farming districts and the expense it is to them you can readily see the force of that statement where one hundred farmers are compelled to go and get their mail, when by rural free delivery one man could deliver the mail for them. The mail carrier receives money for transmission through the mail and gives receipts for same at the farmer's door; the money is then taken to the office and the postmaster's receipt given to the carrier who delivers it also to the farmer. Registered letters are received and receipts given in return. Money order blanks are also carried and given at the usual charges. The rural man does not pay any more and receives the same accommodation that he would if a general post office were at his gate. The mail carrier is compelled to take with him stamps, post cards, stamped envelopes, sufficient change so that a farmer who only requires a two cent stamp, if he puts five cents or more in the box with a letter unstamped he would find the correct change in his box and his letter promptly delivered. Rural free delivery has been the greatest kind of a success in Great Britain and the United States. I feel safe in saying that no intelligent man can go into the rural districts of the United States or the Post Office Department at Washington with an unprejudiced mind, and make a thorough investigation of this subject, and come out of it without being a most ardent admirer and an enthusiastic supporter of the Post Office Department at Washington. Free delivery of mail to rural districts is not a new or an untried thing. In 1843, the government of Sir Robert Peel in Great Britain desired that all places where the letters for which exceed one hundred per week should be deemed entitled to the privilege of a receiving office and a free delivery of their letters. This principle was followed until 1850, when a service was made quite general throughout the British Isles. In some cases only tri-weekly or bi-weekly, and the result proved very satisfactory to the department. This continued up to the Queen's Jubilee and July 22, 1897, was made the occasion of a universal rural free delivery service within the United Kingdom, and which has not only proved a great boon to the people, but been the means of increasing the revenue and increasing the surplus which amounts for the past year to over £26,000,000. In France, Belgium and Switzerland a regular delivery to the rural districts prevails and was established previous to 1897. In Germany and Austria-Hungary, in addition to France, Belgium and Switzerland there is a system of rural free delivery.

The Postmaster General of the United States commenced operations in 1896, recognizing as he did that rural free delivery should be a service for the people and by the people. As the United States is our nearest neighbour, and a country with vast territories unsettled, with sparsely settled districts similar to our own, the material that I will largely use in my remarks to-day is gathered from frequent visits to the rural districts of that country during the past five years, and considerable time spent in the Post Office Department at Washington within the past two

months. The statements have been gathered from the reports of the United States Post Office Department and from the courteous officers in the Postmaster General's employ. I am safe in making the statement at the outset that no more enthusiastic supporters of rural free delivery and no more confident men as regards its successful operation can be found than those in closest touch with its operation in the Post Office Department of the United States, and to them I owe most generous praise and commendation for the very kind and courteous treatment they afforded to me during my stay. This service has passed the experimental period in that country, and if we are to benefit from the experience of the United States, this is the time to act. I have with me a book filled with letters and statements from men in all walks of life, situated in the rural districts of different parts of the United States, whose words of praise and commendation would be sufficient to enthuse even our own Postmaster General were he to consider them worthy of his perusal. I have here the remarks of President Roosevelt in his annual message of December, 1901. I can only take time to read one paragraph, which is as follows :

Among recent postal advances, the success of rural free delivery wherever established, has been so marked, and actual experience has made its benefits so plain that the demand for its extension is general and urgent. It is just that the great agricultural population should share in the improvement of the postal service.

Charles Emery Smith, Postmaster General of the United States, November 25, 1901 :

The policy of rural free delivery is no longer a subject of serious dispute. It has unmistakably vindicated itself by its fruits. It has been made plain that this service is a potent, educational force, that it brings agricultural life into far closer relations with the active business world, that it keeps the farmer in daily touch with markets and prices that it advances general intelligence through the increased circulation of the journals and periodicals, stimulates correspondence, quickens all interchanges, promotes good roads, enhances farm values, makes farm life less isolated and more attractive, and unites with other wholesome influences in checking and changing the hitherto prevailing current from country to city.

He states that on an average there were 125 families on a route. Under the old system they travelled from 2 to 4 miles in going to the post office. If the cost in time and other factors be reckoned at 10 cents a day for each family, it is clearly a moderate estimate. That made an aggregate of $12.50 a day. The government can deliver the mail at the doors of all for $2 per day. Why shouldn't it do so and save them the larger burden? It is demonstrated that the establishment of rural delivery in invariably followed by a large increase of postal receipts, and analysis of the returns for the last fiscal year show that in the free delivery offices the increase of receipts average 11 per cent, in the non-delivery presidential offices 3½, and in the strictly rural sections 2½ per cent. Long experience has made it clear that under the old conditions, the annual rate of growth of postal revenue in country communities is about 2 per cent, but wherever rural delivery has been established, this annual gain has risen to 8 or 10 per cent. The ratio of increase on the rural routes is substantially equal to that of the free delivery in cities.

That is the statement of Charles Emery Smith, Postmaster General to the United States in 1901. Let us come to Postmaster General Cortelyou, on June 30, 1906. He says :

The rural delivery has undoubtedly increased the bulk of the first-class mail matter. . . . The giving of additional facilities, within reasonable limits, is almost invariably followed by an increased use of the mails, and consequently additions to the revenue.

The following statement is by Mr. Meyers, the present Postmaster General of the United States, taken from the New York 'Times' of August 15, 1907 :

As regards the criticisms that have been made of the rural free delivery system, I want to say this: The service was started in 1898 and the deficit in that year in the department was $8,000,000. In 1906 the rural delivery cost $25,000,000, but the department's deficit was only $10,000,000. So the rural service, like a branch railroad, while it may not make money itself, acts as a feeder and greatly increases the business of the department. This year the cost of the service will be $35,000,000. In the first quarter ending March 31, there was no deficit at all. I cannot give the figures for the second quarter until October. It is just a straw but it is a strong straw and it shows the tremendous amount of business being done in the country.

Yet you will find the Minister of Agriculture and our present Postmaster General stating that the deficit in the United States on rural free delivery is anywhere from 10,000,000 to $20,000,000, while here is the statement of the Postmaster General of the United States that in the first quarter of 1907 there was no deficit at all. Let me quote the same Postmaster General in a speech delivered in Philadelphia while I was there, in regard to rural parcel post ('Public Ledger,' October 27, 1907) :

Heretofore the opposition to the extension of the parcel post has come in the first instance from the express companies, and then from the retail merchant and the country storekeeper, the fear in his case being that the mail order house would derive a benefit to his own disadvantage. Now, I can disarm the criticism of the retail country merchant and storekeeper by the fact that I shall recommend a parcel post system on the rural delivery routes, a special rate to be charged on packages for delivery from the distributing office of the rural route, or if mailed by a patron of any rural route for delivery to a patron on the same route, or at the distribut-

ing office of said route. The rate would be five cents for the first pound and two cents for each additional pound up to 11 pounds. This will be a great boon to the farmers and others on the rural routes, because when they are able to order their goods by telephone or postal card it will relieve them of the inconvenience of going to town to obtain the necessaries of life.

It will facilitate the consumption and increase the business of the country merchant, who necessarily obtains his goods from the wholesale dealer. Therefore, all will be benefited. The result of this service will be an increased cancellation of stamps which, in turn, means an increase of salary to the fourth-class postmaster, as well as a larger revenue for the postal service, which could be credited to the rural delivery routes, as it would be practically all pure gain over and above the commission to the postmasters.

They are some interesting figures in connection with the rural delivery which are not yet appreciated by the general public. Often we hear criticisms of the enormous expenditures required in order to maintain the rural delivery service, which at first blush seem to be justified, when we recall that 10 years ago the amount expended was only about $15,000 for the year, whereas the cost for the year ended June 30, 1907, a decade later, was about $27,000,000. On the other hand, the deficit 10 years ago was $11,500,000, while for the year ended June 30, 1907, the deficit will be $6,692,000, so that notwithstanding this increase of nearly $27,000,000 the deficit decreased nearly $5,000,000, showing that the rural delivery has added to the general revenue of the postal service.

We find the hon. gentlemen opposite condemning the system because of the wonderful deficit that is rolling up from year to year. Remember that in 1896, before rural free delivery was established in the United States, the deficit in that country was $11,500,000. This last year it only amounts to $6,692,000, so that noting this increased expense of $27,000,000 there is a decrease in the deficit of nearly $5,000,000, showing that the rural free delivery has added to the general revenue of the department. The chief officers connected with the rural delivery service distinctly state that to-day the rural mail service is practically on a self-sustaining basis. We have listened to men who know what they are talking about. Let us now listen for a few moments to some who do not. Sir William Mulock, when Postmaster General, on June 28, 1904, said, in reply to a question I put to him in Committee of Supply, regarding the rural free delivery in the United States :—

> The United States people were rather dragooned into the establishment of a rural free mail delivery, and it has raised serious difficulties in that country.

When asked by Mr. Clarke to explain how the United States were dragooned into the system, Sir William Mulock replied that false returns had been made to the Postmaster General of the United States and he added :—

> The unfortunate administration is evidently at its wits end to know what to do with this monster which has been raised up and has apparently no way of controlling the thing.

He also said :—

> Fancy the establishment of a rural delivery system within an area the size of all Europe. That is what is involved in proposing to adopt rural delivery in Canada, and the first step of the Postmaster General would be to ask the House to vote $5,000,000 or $10,000,000, perhaps not the first year, but in a very short time. The first year perhaps $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 would be sufficient, but it would go on so that in five years the Postmaster General would have to ask the House to give $10,600,000 or $15,000,000 to establish rural delivery. Parliament would not be in favour of voting that sum of money. I doubt if the country could afford that amount of money. It might be that in a few years we would be called upon to vote an item of probably not less than $25,000,000.

Just imagine the Dominion being asked to vote $25,000,000 when our postal expenditure during that year amounted to less than $5,000,000 and is but little over that to-day. That certainly was a misstatement by the then minister. Is it any wonder that remarks of this kind have frightened the people in Canada with regard to rural mail delivery ? He repeated that statement and said:—

> The United States have taken hold of a problem which is alarming, and one which no prudent government would think of adopting in Canada at the present time.

In 1905, the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), moved for a return of all papers in the post office department regarding rural mail delivery and supported his motion with a splendid speech. In reply, Sir William Mulock ridiculed the idea. He said it was one of the wildest schemes the United States had ever embarked on. I asked him if the deficit in the United States postal department was due to rural mail delivery and he said it was. Had he studied the information in his own department, he would have seen that the rural delivery could not have contributed more than $8,000,000 towards the deficit, because the increase in the appropriation for rural mail delivery in that year was only $5,000,000. On that occasion I urged the then Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) to have a thorough investigation into the matter. In his reply he spoke of our northern latitude and the difficulties of keeping the roads open, but he said he would have an investigation made and all papers connected with that system, and among those brought down I found a copy of a report from Washington, giving the information obtained by our officials whom we sent to Washington. A copy of this report I have before me, and a greater misrepresentation of the whole subject could not be imagined. The gentleman sent either did not try to

obtain the information or deliberately prepared a report in direct opposition to the facts. On the first page of that report I find the following :—

In the matter of obtaining positive information as to the eventual scope and cost of the service and the statistics which would enable us to arrive at conclusions as to the increase in postal business consequent upon the establishment of rural free delivery, our visit was not specially successful. The Postmaster General, and the fourth assistant, who has this service under his jurisdiction, have just assumed office, and have not had time to inform themselves on the subject sufficiently to formulate the future policy which would be pursued by the department; and in the absence of instructions from his superior, the superintendent of the service was unable to speak with authority on the matter.

Yet these gentlemen were able to bring in a lengthy report and wind it up with these words :—

In view of the facts herein set forth we are of the opinion that the time has not arrived for this department to enter upon a rural free delivery service.

Let us look a little further into that report :—

The rural free delivery service has been in operation several years, but we were assured by the superintendent that it was only since January 1 that statistics had been compiled for which they would be prepared to vouch.

I feel confident that if those men had used reasonable diligence they could have gathered from the post office department of the United States statistics previous to 1903. If they had gone to the records in the library they could have found sufficient to prove that, so far as rural mail delivery is concerned in the United States, the Postmaster General and his officials have made report after report of the most enthusiastic character in support of that service. These gentlemen continued further :—

You desire that information be obtained as to the extent of territory still uncovered by this service and as to how far the plans on which the department has been working would carry the country in the way of expense. On neither point could information of a specific character be obtained.

Again referring further to the United States they say :—

They do not contemplate extending the service to the very sparsely settled districts, until population increased to a point which will enable the department to serve them under their rules.

In reply to a question asked as to the measure of accommodation, the department felt bound to furnish in establishing free service in a district, no definite answers were given. And so I might go on practically through the whole report. You will find that, so far as definite information is concerned, they were unable, apparently, to secure any of it. Here is a little more referring to percentage of the expenditure :—

At the same percentage of loss that took place on the new service established during the year ending June 30, 1904, the loss on this $14,141,025 will be $9,686,600, and the total deficit on rural free delivery at the end of June 30, 1906, will be $17,839,581. The amount of the deficit will, as a matter of fact, be much larger, from the fact that the more remunerative areas must have been already covered, and the new services will necessarily go into districts which cannot yield as large returns as those now covered. We could not, however, come closer to actual results, and with this explanation the figures given will perhaps serve. When the 45,000 or 60,000 services are put on, to complete the present plans, the deficit will, on the same favourable estimate, be from $21,659,195 to $29,057,195.

Now, compare these figures and the previous deficit of $10,000,000 before rural free delivery was established in the United States with the condition to-day when we see a deficit of only $6,000,000. The report says also:

It must also be observed that there is no finality about the present plans of the department, however liberal they may be.

And they close with the statement :

In view of these facts, the time has not yet arrived for the department to enter upon rural free delivery.

And in this conclusion they declare against rural free delivery without any facts, of any great value. I cannot help feeling that on this question, the people of Canada have been humbugged by the Postmasters Generals of this country during the last four years. Let me refer to a statement made by the present Postmaster General on February 15, 1907, page 3149 of 'Hansard.' I asked what had been done with regard to rural free mail delivery. I am sorry that the Postmaster General is not now in the House, but I feel that this is an important matter of legislation and should be brought before the House as early as possible, so that hon. members may become thoroughly acquainted with it. The Postmaster General, in reply to my question, said:

This question was a more live one three or four years ago than it is to-day. When it was first suggested that we should adopt in Canada the rural free delivery system which they have in the United States, officials of the department were despatched to Washington to study that system. The result of their investigation can be summed up in two words. In the United States it has not been a great success, and it has involved the Post Office Department in a succession of annual deficits ranging from $15,000,000 to $16,000,000.

You can readily see, Mr. Speaker, by the statement I have given that these figures are not correct. Taking that statement of the Postmaster General that rural free delivery has involved the United States

Post Office Department in a succession of deficits ranging from $15,000,000 to $16,000,000, and comparing that with the annual deficits that I will give to the House, you can see how wild and reckless have been his statements. The hon. gentleman called rural free delivery a luxury, and at present it must not be thought of except as an ideal. Let me give to the House a statement of the fourth assistant Postmaster General of the United States, showing the expenditures, appropriations and deficits of the Post Office Department since 1897. I realize that in making so many quotations and using so many figures I am in danger of wearying hon. members, but I trust the importance of the subject and the need that exists of placing the facts before the House, will be regarded as a justification for the course I am pursuing. Let me preface the statement I am about to give by saying that in 1890 the deficit of the United States post office was $5,377,449. This was before there was any rural free delivery. In 1895, the year before rural free delivery was established, the deficit was $10,196,423. The following statement shows the number of rural free delivery carriers, the appropriation and the expenditure on rural free delivery and the total postal deficit:

Fiscal Year.	Carriers.	Appropriation.	Expenditures.	Postal Deficit.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1897	83	40,000 00	14,840 00	11,411,790 00
1898	148	50,250 00	50,241 00	9,020,905 00
1899	391	150,032 00	150,012 00	6,610,776 00
1900	1,276	450,000 00	420,433 00	5,385,688 00
1901	4,301	1,750,796 00	1,750,321 00	3,923,727 00
1902	8,466	4,089,075 00	4,089,041 00	2,937,649 00
1903	15,119	8,580,364 00	8,051,599 00	4,560,044 00
1904	24,566	12,926,905 00	12,645,275 00	8,779,492 00
1905	32,055	21,116,600 00	20,864,885 00	14,572,584 00
1906	35,666	25,228,300 00	25,011,625 00	10,516,995 00
1907	37,582	28,350,000 00	26,755,524 00	6,692,000 00

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the deficit shown is the total deficit of the department. It is impossible, as the accounts are kept, to state separately the expenditure and the balance on account of rural free delivery.

It is evident that, so far as the present government is concerned, there is no intention to take action in this matter, but I am proud and glad to know that the leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition in this House is taking up the question, and is ready to investigate it thoroughly and to put it in operation when he takes the reins of power, as he will do at no distant day. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), speaking in this House on April 18 last, said:

While I was in Washington recently I studied with some of the post office officials there the question of rural delivery, and, unfortunately for my hon. friend, I found that instead of it being a boon to the public it was a great deficit producer to the department, in fact, to-day at Washington, among the officials, the question is seriously considered whether they shall not have to restrict the rural mail delivery instead of expanding it. My hon. friend——

Referring to myself.

—will admit that we are not ready to spend millions to establish all over Canada a rural mail delivery system. But we are doing the next best thing. During this session and within a few hours probably hon. members will see in the supplementary estimates a sum of money to be applied to the establishment of the free delivery system in cities and towns whose population shall justify it; that is to say, in towns having a revenue of $10,000 or $20,000 a year.

In passing, I want to call the present acting Postmaster General's attention to the fact that in the United States all cities of 10,000 inhabitants and a revenue of $10,000, receive free delivery, and it has been tried in several of the smaller places of from 1,500 to 2,500 inhabitants, and has been found to be a considerable success. The hon. gentleman goes on:

This is a move in the right direction. In the United States the rural mail delivery system has caused a deficit in the Post Office Department of something like $17,000,000 or $18,000,000 a year.

After the statement I have read, Mr. Speaker, you can see how wild and reckless were the figures he used in that regard. He goes on to say:

With the experience of the United States before us we cannot think of giving this country rural free delivery.

He read an article from a paper in the western states, supporting the Canadian system of mail delivery, and ceased reading it by stating that it was almost too flattering to his department to permit him to read it. A school boy reading the same

article could see at a glance that it was a fictitious article, based upon imperfect knowledge of our system. It referred to a rural free delivery in different parts of the country sparsely settled when we have not such a system in operation in our country. On page 3152 he said that the deficiency in the United States for 1906, was $16,000,000 when the annual report of the Postmaster General for the United States distinctly shows that it was only $10,000,000 instead of $16,000,000. I tried my best last year to show the Postmaster General that his figures were wrong, but he still clung to his first statement, and ended up his remarks by saying :

When we reach a population of twenty millions—which I hope we may under this good government—if I am still Postmaster General I can promise a free rural mail delivery.

A remarkably radical idea, but I really believe he never intends to grant the country free rural mail delivery. This is too important a subject to treat in the light manner in which he discussed it. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have a number of other important figures to give to the House in regard to this question, and as it is now six o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 9, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said : This Bill purposes to amend the Canada Shipping Act with reference to the inspection of steamboats. It is a question which I have brought to the attention of the House in former sessions. The Bill simply affects the right of engineers to operate steamboats with or without certificates. My amendment asks that the exceptions to the employment of certificated engineers be confined to steamboats used exclusively for pleasure ; and boats whose engines have a nominal power of 10 horse-power single cylinder or 18 horse-power double cylinder.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend section 298 of the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is a Bill which I brought before the House last year but which did not reach its second reading. The Bill asks to strike out of section 298 of the Railway Act the words ' crops, lands, fences, plantations, buildings and their contents.' The section then will read:

Whenever damage is caused by fire, caused by a railway locomotive the company making use of such locomotive, &c., shall be responsible, &c.

By striking out the words I have mentioned the section will cover everything that may be destroyed by fire caused by a railway locomotive instead of confining it to crops, lands, fences, plantations, buildings and their contents as at present.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

Bill (No. 16) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

QUESTIONS.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Are not questions to be taken to-day ? I understood the motion was that the debate on the address should take precedence over everything except questions.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I so understood the motion. We will take questions, but we may not be able to answer them all, because, according to the order we did not expect they would be called to-day.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What is the amount of imports of merchandise entered for home consumption and of exports of home products, respectively, for the twelve months ending September 30 and October 30, 1907?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The total amount of imported merchandise entered for consumption during the twelve months ended September 30, 1907, was $362,460,007. The total amount of imported merchandise entered for con-

sumption during the twelve months ended October 30, 1907, was $360,550,105. The total value of Canadian products exported from Canada during the twelve months ended September 30, 1907, was $244,180,922. The total value of Canadian products exported from Canada during the twelve months ended October 31, 1907, was $238,638,747.

SASKATCHEWAN FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM asked :

1. Has the government issued any fishing licenses for any of the lakes in the province of Saskatchewan?
2. If so, in which lakes?
3. To whom have licenses been issued and on what lakes?
4. If no licenses have been issued is it the intention of the government to issue fishing licenses in any lakes in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Fisheries). As the answer will be somewhat voluminous, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow it to stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion.

SACCHARINE STANDARDS.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. In the manufacture of sugar in Canada, is any saccharine standard prescribed by government regulation?
2. If so, what is the standard, and how long has it been in force; and what methods are employed to see that such standards are adhered to?
3. Is the government aware what standards are required in such manufacture by the governments of Great Britain and the United States, respectively? If so, what are such standards?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. No.
2. No standard.
3. The government understands that no standards have yet been fixed in Great Britain but the United States Department of Agriculture in June, 1906, provided as follows :

'Granulated, loaf, cut, milled and powdered sugars are different forms of sugar and contain at least 99½ per cent of sucrose.'

All analyses made by the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments of this class of sugar whether manufactured in, or imported into Canada, has shown it to contain 99 per cent or over of sucrose.

COLD STORAGE IN EAST ELGIN.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

Has the government been asked for any assistance by any person in East Elgin to establish cold storage?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Such request has been received.

OVERDUE ACCOUNTS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. How many accounts or sums due and payable by the government has remained unpaid during the present year for three months or more after the same fell due?
2. What is the total amount of such accounts?
3. Has payment of any accounts or sums payable by the government been delayed or postponed during the present year for lack of funds? If so, in how many cases, and to what total amount?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). So far as the Finance Department is aware, none.

POSTAL SERVICE COMPLAINTS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. How many complaints respecting the inadequacy of postal service or delays therein, or respecting lack of or defects in postal facilities or means of communications, have been received by the Post Office Department since January 1, 1907?
2. What was the general nature of such complaints?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General). The answer will be too voluminous to give in the form of an answer to a question. The hon. gentleman will have to leave it as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion.

MILITIA PROMOTIONS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. What promotions have been made to the rank of colonel in the active militia during the past year, with names?
2. Was this promotion for merit or seniority? If for the former, what was the nature of such service?
3. What is the record of war services of such officers?
4. Previous to the gazetting of such promotion what position did such officers hold on the seniority list of the colonels?
5. How many lieut.-colonels were outranked or superseded by such promotion, and what are their names and services?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I will ask the hon. gentleman to put this question in the form of a notice of motion and I will undertake to have the information ready as soon as the motion is moved.

INSPECTORS FOR FOOD PRODUCTS.

Mr. LALOR asked :

1. How many meat and canned fish and vegetable inspectors have been appointed for the whole Dominion?

2. How many seed inspectors have been appointed in the Dominion?

3. How many apple inspectors have been appointed to enforce the Act relating to the inspection of apples at the different ports of the Dominion, and at what ports are they located?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 72.

2. Seven of the permanent employees of the department have been appointed inspectors to enforce the Seed Control Act in addition to their other duties. Also, a temporary employee of the department acts as an inspector for a few months each year in addition to his other duties.

3. Nine fruit inspectors stationed at different ports of the Dominion as folows:

Montreal, Que.	4
Quebec, Que.	1
Halifax, N.S.	1
St. John, N.B.	1
Charlottetown, P.E.I.	1
Vancouver, B.C.	1
	9

ALL-RED LINE NEGOTIATIONS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked:

1. Is there any person at present in England specially accredited by the Canadian government in connection with the proposed All-Red Line, to treat with the British government, or for any other purpose in reference to said subject?

2. Has the government received any proposal in connection with the said All-Red Line? If so, what is the nature of such proposal and from whom has it been received?

3. Has the government caused estimates to be made of the probable cost to Canada of said All-Red Line?

4. Has the government asked tenders from any one for the said All-Red Line or any part thereof?

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

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

SALE OF GARRRISON COMMONS.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Kemp—asked:

1. At what date did the government agree with the city of Toronto to sell to the city the property known as the Garrison Common?

2. At what date did the government acquire the site for the erection of the proposed new barracks on the Humber river, and what did the government pay for the said new site?

3. Has the city of Toronto asked for possession of the Garrison Common or part of it, and what is the cause of the delay in handing it over to the city?

4. Are the old barracks adequate for the requirements of the service; and is the government at present required to find quarters and accommodation elsewhere in the city of Toronto for officers' quarters or other purposes?

5. What is the cause of the delay in proceeding with the construction of the new barracks?

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

1. The negotiations were concluded by order in council of May 16, 1904.

2. On November 17, 1903, the city of Toronto bought the Baby farm from Mr. Cohen for $20,000, with a view to conveying it to the Crown. This conveyance has not yet been consummated.

3 (a). Yes. (b) On account of non-payment by the city of Toronto of the purchase price agreed upon.

4. No; the government has to provide outside quarters for a large number of officers and non-commissioned officers.

5. Plans were prepared, but were considered too elaborate. They are being redrafted, with a view to reducing the initial cost of the buildings, and adding to them from time to time as may be necessary.

DREDGING AT TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Ames—asked:

1. What amount of dredging or other work was done at the entrance to the eastern gap at Toronto during the last season?

2. What amount of work still requires to be done in order to make this entrance and the approaches safe and adequate for the purpose of navigation?

3. (a) Was the work during the past season done by the government or by contract? (b) If the latter, were tenders called for, who did the work? (c) What were the prices therefor, and (d) what contractors or other persons were invited to submit prices therefor?

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

1. The channel has been dredged to a minimum depth of 18 feet, and the approaches thereto from Lake Ontario to a minimum depth of 20 feet, the width being 400 feet out to the 20-foot water line.

2. 35,000 cubic yards still require to be removed.

3 (a) By contract. (b) Yes. (c) The Windsor Dredging Company at 13½ cents per cubic yard, scow measurement. (d) Manley Company; The Randolph Macdonald Company, Limited; The Windsor Dredging Company; W. E. Phin; Frank Simpson; The Dominion Dredging Company, Limited.

NEW WESTERN ENTRANCE TO TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Kemp—asked:

1. Has the government definitely decided to construct the proposed new western entrance to Toronto harbour?

2. If so, when is it proposed that the work shall be commenced, and how long will it take in construction?
3. What is the estimated cost of the work?
4. When will tenders be asked for to do the work?
5. Has the government engineer at Toronto completed his report on the said work?
6. Has the government conferred with the municipal authorities of Toronto or the Toronto Board of Trade regarding the location, character or other details of the said work?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Owing to the illness of the chief engineer of my department, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow this question to stand; probably until to-morrow will be sufficient.

GATINEAU POINT BRIDGE.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. What amount of money was contributed by the Dominion government towards the construction of the bridge between Hull and Gatineau Point?
2. To whom was the money paid?

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

1. Nothing was contributed by the Dominion government toward construction of bridge. In the year 1900 the structure was damaged by logs escaping from the government boom, and the sum of $5,000 was paid by this department as a contribution toward repair.
2. It was paid to the municipalities of the city of Hull and the village of Gatineau Point jointly.

POST OFFICES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. How many post offices in Queens county, Prince Edward Island, receive, (a) a daily mail, (b) a bi-weekly mail, and (c) a tri-weekly mail?
2. Is it the intention of the government to give a daily mail service to any or all of those sections now only receiving a bi-weekly or tri-weekly mail? If the former, which?
3. Has the government received complaints in reference to the present unsatisfactory mail service along the route of the Belfast and Murray Harbour Branch Railway?
4. Does the government propose to take any steps to place that service in a more satisfactory condition?

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

1. (a) 79 daily mail offices; (b) 12 bi-weekly offices; (c) 52 tri-weekly offices—143. There are also 11 offices served daily in summer and tri-weekly in winter.
2. It is the intention of the government to improve the mail service there, as elsewhere, if and when possible.
3. No. Postal car service established in October, 1906, and no complaints received since that date. There is only one train daily, except Sunday, each way on this branch and each of these trains is used by the department.
4. It is already as satisfactory as the department can make it with the present train service.

PATENT MEDICINES BILL.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

Is it the intention of this government to re-introduce Bill of last session concerning drugs and patent medicines during the present session and to carry the measure through to make it law?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The matter is under consideration.

VICKERS MAXIM COMPANY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

In the purchase of guns, munitions of war, or armament of any kind, from the Vickers Maxim Company, who acted as purchasing and selling agents of the government and company, respectively, either in Canada or England?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). In the purchase of all guns, munitions of war, or armaments of any kind, from the Vickers Maxim Company, or other manufacturers or firms in England, all negotiations are conducted by the Militia Department, solely through the High Commissioner for Canada or the War Office, directly with the firm or firms interested without the intervention of an agent or agents, or other intermediary. All such purchases are made with the condition that the types, patterns, specifications, &c., governing construction and manufacture have been approved and adopted by the War Office; and all materials so purchased are subject to War Office inspection and are paid for at prices fixed by the War Office.

INTERCOLONIAL BOUNDARY LINE.

Mr. R. N. WALSH asked:

1. Have any representations been made to the government regarding the stores or buildings placed on the Intercolonial boundary line?
2. If so, what was the nature of such representations?
3. Does the government intend taking any action in regard to their regulations?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government have received no representations on this subject.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC SECURITIES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What securities are now held by the government, as security from the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry out its contracts for the construction of the western section, and the equipment of the whole road?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

Description.	Rate.	Par Value.
Central Vermont Ry. 1st mortgage gold bonds...	4 p.c.	$1,500,000
Chicago and Western Indiana Ry. 1st mortgage gold bonds..	4. p.c	1,000,000
Grand Trunk Ry. perpetual debenture stock....	4 p.c.	1,506,600
Grand Trunk Ry. guaranteed stock..	4 p.c.	1,506,600
or in all amounting to.. ..		$5,513,200

REVISED STATUTES—FRENCH VERSION.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE—by Mr. Johnston—asked :

1. When will the French version of the Revised Statutes be ready?
2. Are there any volumes of such statutes published?
3. If so, how many?
4. Are there any yet to be published, how many, and what has been the cause of the delay?
5. How many employees are at work to finish that work?
6. When will they have completed their work?
7. Who are those employees, and have any special ones been appointed to press the work to a finish?
8. Has the government been informed that such delay causes grave inconvenience to the French-Canadian population of this country?

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Solicitor General) :

1. It is ready and was published and came into force on the 15th of November last.

2 and 3. Yes, volumes one. two and three have been issued.

4. The fourth volume containing the explanatory tables, the index and reprints of the constitutional Acts and orders in council is yet to be published. The cause of the delay is the preparation of the index.

5 and 7. Mr. St. Louis who is specially engaged preparing the index.

6. At a very early date.

8. The government has received no communication on the subject.

SUPREME COURT JUDGES.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE—by Mr. Johnston—asked :

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware that two judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec have been appointed as chairmen of a royal commission, by the Lieutenant Governor, for the purpose of inquiring into the administrative acts of the government of that province and to examine into certain accusations brought against that government in regard to its administration?

2. If so, does the law permit judges of the Superior Court to take part in such a commission?

3. If not, is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to intervene?

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Solicitor General). There is no information in this department upon the subject.

HURONA-MONGOLIAN COLLISION.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Was any investigation held into the collision which occurred in the Straits of Belle Isle on September 25, 1907, between the Hurona and the Mongolian?
2. Where was such investigation held, and by whom?
3. In what waters did the collision occur?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)) :

1. Investigation now being held.
2. Board of Trade, England.
3. Off Newfoundland coast in the gulf of St. Lawrence.

LIGHTHOUSE SUPPLIES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens) asked :

1. What was the total amount expended in transferring supplies to lighthouses in Prince Edward Island during the last fiscal year?
2. By what means were the supplies distributed to the lighthouses during the past season?
3. How often during the season is it necessary to visit lighthouses with supplies?
4. How much time was expended by the conveying vessel in such distribution?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Maintenance and repairs lighthouse steamer 'Brant,' fiscal year 1906-7, $7,-937.86.
2. By the lighthouse steamer 'Brant.'
3. Once during the season.
4. From 17th June to 25th July.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—ENGINEERING STAFF.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Who has been appointed district engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway at Kenora, Ontario, to succeed Major Hodgins, resigned?
2. Who is now district engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway at North Bay, Ontario?
3. Has C. O. Foss, of the National Transcontinental Railway engineering staff, been transferred from St. John, New Brunswick, to Kenora, Ontario? If so, what is his present position?
4. If Mr. Foss has been transferred, as mentioned in the previous question, who has been appointed to succeed him at St. John, New Brunswick, and what is his successor's position?
5. What changes, if any, other than those referred to in the previous questions, have been made in the National Transcontinental Railway Commission's engineering staff during the current calendar year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways) :

1. S. R. Poulin has been appointed acting district engineer for district 'F.'
2. John Aylen is acting district engineer at North Bay.
3. No.
4. Answered by number three.
5. It will take some time to prepare the answer to this question as it calls for a list of all changes in the engineering staff of the National Transcontinental Railway Department, for the current calendar year, 1907.

TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Are the conditions and forms exactly the same in all the timber licenses at present in force, including renewals and new licenses, in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?
2. Are the words in section 2: 'provided, however, that such renewal shall be granted subject to any change which may have been made in the regulations increasing or altering the rental or dues to be paid, or otherwise varying the terms or conditions under which the licenses are granted,' included in all licenses at present in force in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

COBOURG HARBOUR.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. What amount has been expended on the Harbour at Cobourg during the past session, up to this date (a) for construction (b) for dredging?
2. Is it true that in the process of dredging at Cobourg a quicksand has been discovered either in the harbour or at the mouth, which will add materially to the cost?
3. To what extent will this add to cost of dredging?

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

1. Construction, $4,051.76 ; dredging, $19,509.45.
2 and 3. No.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FISHERY PROTECTION.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What boats were employed in the fishery protection service in Prince Edward Island during the past season?
2. Was the fishery protection steamer 'Brant' employed in this service? If not, why not?
3. What is the annual cost of running steamer 'Brant' when employed in this service?

Mr. MACDONELL.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The fisheries protection cuiser 'Petrel' patrol boat No. 1 and the 'Brant.'
2. Yes. She was also employed in connection with the lighthouse service.
3. The cost of the 'Brant' is charged to maintenance of lights.

MR. PRESTON.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. When did Mr. Preston leave the immigration work in England?
2. What has he since been engaged at and where, and what amounts have been paid him in salary and travelling expenses to date?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. October 26, 1906.
2. Was appointed Canadian Trade Commissioner to China, Japan and Corea on August 31, 1906 ; but owing to matters requiring his attention in the Department of the Interior he did not assume office as a trade commissioner until October 27, 1906, when he left England for China and Japan via Cape Town to investigate matters relating to commercial agent's office there, and remained at Cape Town until April 8, 1907, in charge of office. He then proceeded to China and Japan via Australia, and is at present in Yokohama studying commercial conditions for the purpose of extending Canadian trade.

Amounts paid him for salary—$3,948.39 ; and for travelling expenses, $2,702.48, including $1,034.70 living expenses at Cape Town.

POWER LICENSES.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Have any licenses been issued by this government for the export of any power or fluid or gas under the statute of last session, chapter 16?
2. If so, what are the respective dates, amounts, or quantities, and terms of such licenses, and the kinds of power or fluid so licensed for export, and from what places, and the names of the licensees?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes.
2. On the 9th of November licenses were issued as follows :

To the Maine and New Brunswick Electrical Power Company, Limited, of Aroostook Falls, N.B., to export electrical energy at a rate not to exceed one thousand (1,000) kilowatts.

To the Electrical Development Company of Ontario, Limited, of Niagara Falls, Ont., to export energy at a rate not to exceed thirty-four thousand three hundred and sixteen (34,316) kilowatts.

To the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls, Ont., to export electrical energy at a rate not to exceed forty-five thousand (45,000) kilowatts; and to the Canadian Niagara Power Company of Niagara Falls Ont., to export electrical energy at a rate not to exceed thirty-nine thousand one hundred and sixty-five (39,165) kilowatts.

All the licenses are for a period terminating on the 31st March, 1908, and are subject to regulations approved by the Governor General in Council, a copy of which is attached hereto.

Ottawa, November 7, 1907.

Sir,—I beg to inform you that in virtue of the provisions of the Act, 6-7 Edward VII., chapter 16, 'The Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act,' an order in council has been passed, dated November 4, 1907, establishing the following regulations for the governance of the exportation of electrical power, petroleum, natural gas, water or other fluid capable of being exported through pipe lines or other like contrivances, and the same are hereby made and established accordingly:

Regulations.

1. These regulations are to be construed as subject in all respects to the provisions of the Act and the several words, terms and expressions to which by the Act meanings are assigned shall have therein the same respective meanings:—

(a) 'Minister' means the Minister of Inland Revenue;

(b) 'Department' means the Department of Inland Revenue;

(c) 'Contractor' means any person or company undertaking to generate electrical energy, gas or fluid for exportation from Canada;

(d) 'Purchaser' means any person or company to whom electrical energy, gas or fluid is furnished by the contractor;

(e) The expression 'Unit of supply of electrical energy' means one kilowatt hour, i.e., 1,000 watts passing for one hour;

(f) The expression 'electrical horse-power year' means the passing of 746 watts of electrical energy for one year.

2. Before commencing to supply any electrical energy, gas or fluid for exportation, the contractor shall obtain from the department a license in respect of such exportation, the application for which license shall contain full and exact information as to the quantities proposed to be exported from Canada.

3. The contractor, shall, on or before April 1, of each year, make application for the license referred to in the previous paragraph and shall pay therefor the following fee, namely:—

(a) In the case of an electrical plant generating not more than 10,000 horse-power, twenty-five dollars;

(b) In the case of an electrical plant generating over 10,000 horse-power, fifty dollars.

(c) In the case of a natural gas plant, fifty dollars.

4. Any license issued hereunder shall be revocable at will by the Governor in Council if the licensee refuses or neglects to comply with any of the conditions from time to time imposed by the Governor in Council with regard to the supply and distribution of electrical energy, gas or fluid in Canada and, moreover, whenever such electrical energy, gas or fluid is required for the use of purchasers in Canada any such license shall be revocable upon such notice to the licensee as the Governor in Council deems reasonable in each case.

5. Monthly reports shall be made to the department by the contractor containing full particulars as to the output of the generating plants or wells of production, showing separately the total number of units generated for export and for consumption in Canada.

6. For the measurement of electrical energy integrating watt-meters of approved design shall be installed in such a manner as to show the total number of units generated for export and for consumption in Canada, respectively.

7. Before commencing to construct, subsequent to the issuance of the license, transmission lines of wire for the exportation of electrical energy, or lines of pipe for the exportation of gas or fluid, the contractor shall obtain from the department a license for such construction.

The contractor shall furnish a drawing or map showing the proposed location of the transmission lines or any extension thereof, also:—

(a) The gauge of the wire conductors for the transmission of electrical energy;

(b) The diameter in inches of the pipe lines for gas or fluids, and

(c) The number of conductors or pipe lines that it is proposed to build or construct.

8. Where a supply of electrical energy, gas or fluid is provided in any part of Canada by the contractor for export and home consumption then the price charged to any person or company in Canada by the contractor shall not exceed the prices at which electrical energy, gas or fluid is sold by the contractor for export in like quantities under similar circumstances.

9. Any officer authorized by the minister for the purposes of the Act may at all reasonable times, and not less frequently than once in every year, enter any premises in which electrical energy, gas or fluid is generated or produced in order:—

(a) To inspect the generating plant, to test any wires, pipes, meters or other measuring devices through which electrical energy, gas or fluid may be supplied to any purchaser, or

(b) To inspect the contractor's books for the purpose of ascertaining the quantities and prices of the commodities sold and such other information as may be deemed necessary for the proper administration of the Act, and

(c) To inspect all contracts entered into between the contractor and the purchaser for a supply of electrical energy, gas or fluid.

10. The accuracy of any meter or other measuring device through which electrical energy, gas or fluid may be sold, either for export or home consumption, shall be determined by the department in accordance with the provisions of the Electricity and Gas Inspection Acts, chapters 14, 1907, and 87 Revised Statutes, 1906, respectively, and the regulations made thereunder.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS PASSED.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. What is the total amount of the accounts and claims payable by the Government which had been passed for payment in or previous

to March, 1907, and which remained unpaid on 1st December, 1907?

2. What is the total amount of the accounts and claims payable by the Government which had been passed for payment in the months of April, May, June, July, August, September, October and November, 1907, respectively, and which remained unpaid on 1st December, 1907?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1 and 2. The Finance Department is not aware of any such accounts.

Accounts can only be deemed to be due where there is appropriation to cover them. It occasionally happens towards the end of the fiscal year that the appropriation for a given public work or service proves insufficient, for example, a contractor on a given work might do a larger amount of work than was expected and the appropriation might be exhausted. In such cases accounts would have to wait until an appropriation could be obtained from parliament by a supplementary estimate. In the case of the Public Works Department this is particularly provided for in the terms of their contracts.

TOBACCO MANUFACTURER'S FINES.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Were any fines or penalities imposed upon any manufacturer of tobacco in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, since the 1st of January, 1907, for infraction of the Inland Revenue Act, or of any regulation thereunder?

2. If so, what are (a) the names and residences of the person or persons fined, (b) the nature of the infraction or infractions of the Act or regulations, (c) the date or dates of infractions and fines, (d) the name or names of the official or officials who tried the cases, (e) the amount of fine imposed in each case, and whether paid or not, and when?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. A sum was voluntarily deposited as a penalty.

2. Daniel J. Riley, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

(b) For having sent out of his factory caddies of tobacco with only one-half of a revenue stamp attached thereto.

(c) Dates not definitely known.

(d) Deputy collector Caven of Montreal investigated the charge.

(e) A voluntary deposit of $200, as a penalty, was, under the provisions of section 136 of the Inland Revenue Act, made on October 10, 1907.

TIMBER BERTH No. 1168.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What is the area of timber berth No. 1168?

2. Was it put up to public competition? If so, when?

3. What offers were received and what bonus paid?

4. Who is the present owner?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The area included in this berth is 329·80 square miles, but the licensees were to make a selection therein. Up to the present time they have selected 6·75 square miles.

2. It was not put up to public competition. It includes timber berth No. 106 granted to Thomas Wells by Order in Council of October 3, 1882, timber berth No. 199 granted to E. H. Le Baron by Order in Council of March 6, 1883, timber berth No. 200 granted to G. C. Hanson by Order in Council of March 19, 1883, timber berth No. 203 granted to C. E. Kennedy by Order in Council of March 27, 1883, timber berth No. 204 granted to John Martin by Order in Council of March 23, 1883, timber berth No. 242a granted to T. F. Jones by Order in Council of May 4, 1883, timber berth No. 425 granted to The Alberta Lumber Company by Order in Council of May 2, 1884. These berths, except No. 425, were assigned to The Alberta Lumber Company, and in a re-adjustment of the company's berths made in 1904, all were included in one berth designated as timber berth No. 1168.

3. None.

4. J. S. McEwan and O. P. Carter, assignees of The Alberta Lumber Company.

HOUGH, CAMPBELL AND FERGUSSON—SALES OF LANDS.

Mr. AMES asked:

What lands were sold by the government to J. S. Hough and to Hough, Campbell and Fergusson, during the nine months ending March 31, 1907?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). None.

TIMBER BERTH No. 1100.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What is the area of timber berth No. 1100?

2. Was it put up to public competition? If so, when?

3. What offers were received and what bonus paid?

4. Who is the present holder?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 143·45 square miles.

2. It was not put up to public competition. It includes timber berth No. 105 granted to John Taylor by Order in Council of October 3, 1882, timber berth No. 185 granted to Joseph Dawes by Order in Council of August 4, 1883, and timber berth No. 186 granted to Wm. Mackenzie by Order in Council of August 4, 1883. These berths were assigned to The Alberta Lumber Company, and in a re-adjustment of the company's berths made in 1904, were included

in one berth designated timber berth No. 1100.

3. None.

4. J. S. McEwan and O. P. Carter, assignees of The Alberta Lumber Company.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES asked:

1. What progress has been made in regard to the construction of the new ice-breaking steamer for the winter navigation of the Northumberland Straits?

2. Have the plans for her construction been completed?

3. If so, what will be her passenger and freight capacity, and what her tonnage and horse-power?

4. When is she expected to be ready for service and what steps have been taken to ensure that she will be able to overcome the difficulties with which she will have to contend?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The plans and specifications which were prepared by Mr. Duguid after his visit to the island, were submitted by the minister when in England to the largest shipbuilders in Europe for their advice and suggestions.

2. The plans have been completed on those suggestions and the High Commissioner has been able to secure the good services of experts of the admiralty to examine and report, and this is expected shortly.

3. The passenger and freight capacity will be much larger than on the existing steamers, with six thousand horse-power.

4. The government will call for tenders without any delay and will exact from the contractors a guarantee that the ice breaker will successfully meet all the difficulties of winter navigation.

ROSS RIFLE—SERVICES OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. How many officials of the government, civil or military, or officers of the active militia, perform services in any way connected with the manufacture of rifles for the government by the Ross Rifle Company?

2. What are their names, ranks and duties, and the amount of their individual salary or remuneration?

3. What is the total amount (apart from contract cost of rifle), or expenditure by the government with the Ross Rifle Company, including any bonus, loans, inspections, cost of testing, commissions, or expenditure of any kind, with individual amounts?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence.) I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) to be good enough to present that in the form of a motion, as I find that the answer is very voluminous and would take a good many minutes to read. I am having it prepared, and the moment it is moved for, I will lay the return on the table.

Mr. SPEAKER. Question 15 stands as notice of motion for return.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL—ENGINEERING STAFF.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask whether any investigation has been made into the reasons for the retirement of Mr. Hodgins from the service of the National Transcontinenal Railway commission?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot answer that question offhand. Could my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) put it on the notice paper? I will have to ask the Commissioners about it.

THE ALL-RED ROUTE.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto.) Will the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) please take occasion, say to-morrow or as soon as convenient, to make a statement to the House with reference to the proposed fast line, or all-red route service. I see in the newspapers repeated statements concerning sundry and various parties engaged in communication and negotiations on the subject. I think it would be well that the First Minister should state to the House and the country what is being done, and especially what is being done so far as the government itself is concerned in reference to this route.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can answer immediately. At present, nothing is being done. Certain parties are trying to organize a company for the purpose of this service, but no official action has been taken in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. And no one authorized it for the government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No one authorized it.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. JOS. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton.) Mr. Speaker: When this debate was adjourned on Friday last, I was dealing with the statements of the present Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux.) I will now take up some of the statements made by the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher.) I think that the farmers and the people living in the rural districts of this country will see that the present Minister of Agriculture is not in favour of granting them rural free delivery. And, after reading his remarks and statements on that subject, I think they will agree with me that he is deserving, perhaps of even more serious censure than he received in Chatham on account of his inspection re-

gulations. I have here a statement made by the hon. gentleman. It appears in the Ottawa 'Free Press' of Saturday, November 10, 1907, in the report of a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at Mansonville, Que. These are some of the words he used:—

The experience in the United States is not such as to warrant our following their example in the matter of rural mail delivery. They began spending $14,000 on this in 1897, and raised it gradually until they spent $420,000 in 1900. The United States post office showed a deficit last year of over $10,000,000, but if it had not been for their rural mail delivery they would certainly have had a surplus of at least $10,000,000.

I would like the hon. gentleman, when he is making a reply to the statements I am making, to be good enough to give the report of the United States Post Office Department, or any statement made by prominent officials of that country, in which such figures are used. The hon. gentleman went on:—

These are fearful figures, and when you remember that our country, while its population is only six millions, as compared to the eighty millions of the United States has an area almost as large to serve, with a scattered population it would mean that we would be overburdened by an expenditure of rural mail delivery which the population of this country would never submit to and which they could not stand.

And he winds up his speech by saying :

But when it comes to adopting rural mail delivery, that at the present time is an impossible policy, for it would involve us in financial disaster from a post office point of view.

Now, as against this, let me read one sentence from the words of the Postmaster General of the United States, published in 'Collier's Weekly' of August 31:—

He has already begun an investigation to find out where the blame for the deficit lies——

Referring to the deficit of 1906——

--and has satisfied himself that the rural free delivery system is not responsible for it, but rather the reverse.

Now we find the Minister of Agriculture in this House, on December 4th, making use of this statement. When asked by Mr. McIntyre (South Perth) in regard to the cost of the service in the United States for the year 1907, $35,000,000, the Minister of Agriculture said :

Practically it is the whole cost. It is true that by reason of the adoption of rural mail delivery they have been able to cut off a few country post offices. I am informed, however, that the amount thus saved is trifling in comparison with the amount spent.

Let me give the House some figures for the last six years regarding post offices in the United States :

In 1901	there were	77,000	post offices.
In 1902	"	76,000	"
In 1903	"	74,150	"
In 1904	"	71,130	"
In 1905	"	68,130	"
In 1906	"	65,600	"

There is a saving practically in six years of 12,000 post offices to the United States postal department, owing to the establishment of rural free delivery in that country. When you consider that the average increase in the number of post offices in the United States is 2,500 a year, instead of there being 65,600 post offices in that country to-day, you would have, were it not for rural delivery about 90,000. So you can see that instead of the saving being trifling, as the minister would have the people of this country believe, there is an enormous saving. In Canada we have a little over 11,000 post offices. Last year the revenue was $5,940,000, and the expenditure $4,922,000, leaving a surplus of a little over $1,000,000. This year's surplus is over a million and a half. Let me show the hon. gentleman another saving that is effected in the United States by the adoption of this system. In 1903 there was saved by way of the discontinuance of stage routes, as follows : In 1903, $303,000 ; in 1904, $579,000 ; 1905, $535,000 ; 1906, $383,000. The hon. gentleman refers to the wonderful post office facilities in the Dominion of Canada, and boasts that the present government have extended the system to towns of 12,000 population, and with a revenue of $20,000. If that hon. gentleman would examine the reports of the United States he would find that for years people living in cities and towns of 10,000 inhabitants and with a revenue of $10,000, have been receiving their mail free, and in towns much smaller than that, a free delivery system has been attended with a great deal of success. The government have to-day under contemplation extending rural free delivery to very small towns and villages in that country. Let me quote again on page 237 from the remarks of the minister :

I confess that the United States statistics have staggered me and made me feel that we must not plunge lightly even into a discussion of the question.

Well, Sir, I cannot think that the hon. gentleman has thoroughly investigated the reports of the United States, or he would not make so timid a statement. In 1896, before rural free delivery was established in the United States, the deficit in the post office department amounted to over $11,000,000, while to-day with an expenditure of nearly $35,000,000 under rural free delivery, the deficit last year only amounted to a little over $6,000,000. To-day the Postmaster General has distinctly stated that for the first three months of this year there is no deficit at all. Yet these gentlemen would try to lead the people of Canada to under-

stand that it is one of the most reckless and extravagant ideas to be conceived of. I asked the hon. gentleman this question.

What is the difference between the cost of rural free delivery as established in the States and a system of postal expenditure such as he referred to ?

He was unable to tell, he had no estimate of the cost. He went further and made this statement :

I have no hesitation in saying that people who live in isolated districts have more need for such postal facilities than those who live in thickly populated parts of the country, because with the good roads in these settled localities the people go frequently to the local centres and they can call at the post office to get their mail with very little trouble.

From that I understand that in thickly settled portions of the rural district the government have no intention whatever of giving them any better service than they have to-day. Those are strange statements for the Minister of Agriculture to make, the man whom the farmers in the rural districts look to for legislation that will benefit their interests. Indeed, look over the last ten years since the hon. gentleman assumed his present office, and examine the legislation he has put on the statute-books that has been of any great benefit to the farmer, and you will need a searchlight to find anything. You can well remember his measure in regard to chicken fattening stations that he established throughout the country, where he was going to fatten chickens with a squirt gun method. Then he invented a scissors to cut peaches without stems off the trees. Investigate his Seed Bill, and you will find that as it is at present administered, it is a detriment rather than a help to the farmers of this country. If you go down into the city offices, where those seeds are examined and ask where they come from, they will tell you that they do not come from the farmer, very few come from the farmer, but they come from the wholesale man. The wholesale man gets his seed from the farmer or the retail man, and sends it on to the government for examination, and the outcome is that he farmer must expect by the time he gets a record of his samples to receive a much smaller amount than he would otherwise. What about his cold storage proposition ? You investigate the cold storage apparatus that he is paying for across the Atlantic and on the railways, and you will find that instead of his having control over the regulations on the boats and on the cars, the companies are practically carrying goods as they please, and he has no control over them whatever. The same with his Cold Storage Bill. He tells us that during the past year three cold storages have been established under this present Bill. Mr. Speaker, you would naturally expect that that many cold storages would have been established ad there never been such a Bill. What about the Fruit Marks Act ? If you investigate that you will find that it is a nice thing to have it said in the old country that our fruit is sent there in good condition. But what about the large crop of fruit produced in this country that cannot be sent over there because of the Fruit Marks Act ? If you go into different districts of this country you will find that the bulk of the apples and a great deal of fruit is going into the canning factories or going to the evaporating works. Cross the line, and you will find that the United States send their fruit into Great Britain on the same footing as we send ours. You will find that they have a wonderful advantage over us in getting into the German market on the minimum tariff whereas we are compelled to get our goods in there not only under the maximum tariff but under the surtax in addition.

And what about his position on the preference? When you come to look at the hon. gentleman's position in that regard you cannot help feeling that far from being a help to the farmers he has been a hinderance. The Minister of Agriculture has placed himself on record time and again as being opposed to a preference in the British market to the Canadian farmer. That hon. gentleman knows that if a preference were granted to the Canadian farmer in the British market the farmer would receive more money for the products of his farm; that his farm would be of greater value and that it would have a most beneficial effect in securing for this country the best kind of immigration. Take the hon. gentleman's position on the cattle embargo question. Ten years ago he promised that he was going to revolutionize conditions and that he was going to remove the stigma that had been cast upon the reputation of our Canadian cattle. How has he done it? Two years ago it was my privilege to place before the Committee on Agriculture a resolution whereby we asked that the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion and the Ministers of Agriculture of the different provinces constitute a committee to go as a body to the British parliament and see if something could not be done. It was left to the Minister of Agriculture to call that committee together. The Committee on Agriculture passed that resolution unanimously; it came to this House; it was passed through this House, but as far as I can learn the Minister of Agriculture has paid no attention to it.

How about his position in regard to our goods going into Germany ? What is his position in that regard? If you will investigate what he has said and done in regard to Canadian farmers' products going into Germany you will feel that it is high time for a change in that department. When

you think that Germany, with her 60,000,000 of people, imported last year over $1,800,000,000 worth of products, that $200,000,000 of these goods were agricultural products, $66,000,000 worth of wheat, $34,000,000 worth of barley, $17,000,000 worth of rye, and millions worth of fruit and perishable products and that Canada was only able to send her a few thousand dollars worth of such products you will realize how necessary it is that a change in the present conditions should take place. The Minister of Agriculture, in so far as we can learn, has not raised a finger to throw open that market, but instead of that his government have done the very opposite. When, in 1896, they came into power the farmer of Canada was able to send his goods into the markets of Germany under the minimum tariff, but to-day every pound of goods that he exports to that country goes into that market not only in the face of the maximum tariff of Germany, but the surtax which has been imposed against Canadian products. You find that the little Argentine Republic sent in 1906, $48,000,000, Brazil, $27,000,000; Chili, $21,000,000, and Australia $28,000,000 worth of goods to Germany; that Germany is importing over $200,000,000 worth of the very goods that the farmers of this country produce and want to export in large quantities, and yet they are not able to get a profitable market for those products owing to the bungling mess that this government has made of the tariff regulations between Canada and Germany. Talk about your French treaty! We sent to France some $420,000 worth of farm products last year, but what do we import from France? The hon. gentleman is a temperance man, a great temperance worker, but if he looks into the Trade and Navigation returns he will find that we imported over $1,000,000 worth of wines, whiskies, brandies and spirituous liquors. He is in favour of letting down the wall and allowing these goods to come into our country and to take advantage of our people in that regard. I might tell you also about his Meat Inspection Act; how he was practically driven out of Chatham, in the western district, but I will pass on from that to the question of rural free delivery. We find him to-day taking a stand against free rural delivery. I say, Sir, and I say it most emphatically, that the stand he has taken in that regard is one certainly not in the interest of the farmer. He is ready to give away anything to the monopolist or to the North Atlantic Trading Company or to the middleman. He can defend charges of the most wholesale bribery and corruption that are proved on the floor of this House and give his energy and vote in defence of his party against these charges, but the farmer who pays two-thirds of the taxes must be satisfied with his policy. How much longer will our people stand it? The only advice I can give the farmers of this country is to turn out this dying, time-serving, reckless government and place men in office who will give the country advanced legislation and promote their welfare by offering all legitimate encouragement to their industry.

This government say to the farmer: Stand by ye solid yeomanry, pay into the coffers of this country two-thirds of the running expenses, but we cannot give you any legislation that will assist you in the establishment of rural free delivery. Do not grumble about rural free delivery. It is a luxury, says one, or it is a monster, says another. It has staggered me, says the Minister of Agriculture, and do not let it stagger you, Mr. Farmer. The minister has his mail delivered on his desk and he has the envelopes taken off for fear that he will soil his fingers, while the poor farmer has to plough through the snow and ice for miles to get his mail. He gives the advice to the farmer that was given some years ago by Sir Richard Cartwright when he tells them to work a little harder and eat less. Sail on ye grand old Liberal party, spend millions for your docks and your wharfs and North Atlantic Trading Company, while you have not a penny to contribute towards the development of rural free delivery for the benefit of the farmers. Pound the desks for me, ye men at the back, says the minister; no hope for promotion can you expect unless it is to the rest cure, the political charnel house of this Dominion. But the farmer is doing some thinking in regard to this question and when he comes to cast his ballot at the next general election he will see to it that the men whom he sends to represent him in parliament will be men in favour of rural free delivery.

I have tried to show that as far as rural free delivery is concerned this government has no intention of introducing it in our land. Let us examine it a little further. Between 1896 and 1897, rural delivery service, in its inception, was started over seven states with divergent conditions; it rapidly increased in popularity and is now in operation, giving a conservative estimate, in two-thirds of the United States where conditions will permit its establishment. There are instances of men 55 miles from a railroad station now receiving their mail delivered and also a number of instances along the Canadian border where Canadians have purchased boxes from Uncle Sam and receive their daily mail through the kindness of the United States Post Office Department. Some even cross the river St. Clair in a row-boat to connect with the rural delivery men on the other side. Since the establishment of rural free delivery star routes, or routes that formally carried the mail to other post offices, have been discontinued, thus showing a saving between two and three million of dollars annually by the substitution of rural free delivery. The improvement in road building is very marked, and in states such as Indiana

and Pennsylvania the people have passed laws declaring that a route traversed by a rural free delivery carrier is a public road and providing penalities against those in charge of it for failure to keep it in order. The United States have now nearly reached the limit of cost of the delivery system. As the service becomes systematized they will be able to cut off almost as many routes by centralization as the number of new routes to be opened. This is being rapidly done by country service in counties with a sufficient population and roads suitable for covering the whole territory by rural delivery.

They are all carefully mapped out, all minor post offices are discontinued, along with each star route supplying them. On the 30th of June, 1907, there were 653 counties in the United States completely covered by rural delivery. In North Dakota routes have to be thirty miles long, as it is a sparsely settled country. The discontinuance of minor post offices in the United States is increasing yearly, in the year 1906 there were over 3,000 of these offices which receive $1,000 per annum, the discontinuance showing a saving to the department of $300,000 per annum. There were 37,525 routes in operation on April 16 of this year. The length of the standard route is twenty-four miles and a reduction of $18 pre mile in carrier's salary is made on routes shorter than that amount. I wish to place on record the salaries and the length of the routes of the rural free delivery, which is as follows:—

Routes.	Per annum.
24 or more miles	$900
22 to 24 miles	864
20 to 22 miles	810
19 to 20 miles	720
16 to 18 miles	630
14 to 16 miles	540
12 to 14 miles	504
10 to 12 miles	468
8 to 10 miles	432
6 to 8 miles	395

It will be perceived that the length of the standard route is 24 miles.

In 1904 the extension of the rural free delivery resulted in the discontinuance of 3,750 post offices, making in the years 1904 and 1906 (I have not 1905) 6,750 post offices discontinued in these two years. During the year 1904 the salaries of the postmasters at these offices aggregated $171,121. In Dubuque county, Iowa, the service entirely covers the country. Forty routes now cover an area of 738 square miles, furnishing daily services to 15,000 people. More than 2,000 daily papers have been subscribed for as the result of the establishment of this service, which starts from fifteen post offices. As a result of its inauguration, sixteen post offices, ten star routes, one messenger service have been discontinued. The cost of this superseded service is saved to the post office department and goes into its general account, but cannot be credited on the auditor's books to rural free delivery. I have taken Dubuque county merely as an illustration. The officials in the department at Washington assure me that with the completion of a rural service, the volume of mail will reach such proportions as to insure sufficient additional revenue to support the service. Take for instance, Carrol county, Md. It is, strictly speaking, an agricultural country. Seventy-five per cent of the population, 33,000 in all, residing outside the small cities and villages, the largest of which is Westminster, the county seat with a population of about 3,200. The number of letters delivered in Carrol county during 1902 increased almost 16 per cent, postcard delivery showing an increase of 21 per cent, newspapers and periodicals 9 per cent. circulars 120 per cent, packages a little less than 35 per cent, and registered letters delivered 23½ per cent; an average increase of 21 per cent. The total number of pieces of all classes of mail delivered during the year tells of the steady stream of mail pouring into the country from outside sources. It is apparent then, that rural free delivery not only stimulates the use of the mail service in the locality in which it is directly opened, but also throughout the country. Regarding the amount of mail delivered in Carrol county after the establishment of rural free delivery had been in operation for three years, during the year 1902, carriers collected 496,742 letters, an increase of 14·2 per cent over the number collected the year before. About the same rate of increase was maintained in the number of postal cards collected, while the number of newspapers and periodicals gathered on route show only an increase of 1½ per cent, showing that the farmer seldom mails newspapers or periodicals. The aggregate number of pieces of mail collected throughout the county reached 725,703, as against 605,886 in 1902, or an increase of 20 per cent. 95 per cent of the mail despatched by the farmers of this country was first-class matter, letters, and post-cards. The farmer is the constant user of the two-cent stamp. If he mails a newspaper it is not at one cent a pound, the rate enjoyed by newspaper publishers, but he must pay 1 cent on the ordinary size newspaper, or on a package of papers at the rate of 4 cents a pound. The country merchant too is a profitable customer of the rural free delivery service for the circular or third-class matter which he sends out, and which in Carrol county, increased 157 per cent in that year, at the rate of 1 cent for each piece. That is a profitable rate of postage. During the year 1901 the rural letter carriers of Carrol county received applications for 1,776 money orders. During 1902 they supplied their patrons with 2,994 money orders, an increase of 1,228 or 70 per cent. Every money order delivered to a patron on route means a saving of a ride from

five to ten miles for the farmer who purchased it. Many other counties could be quoted giving equally as favourable a report as Carrol county. I will not deal further with it, than to say that sufficient proof has been given to show that rural free delivery causes a healthy and steady increase in the gross receipts of the post office in the locality or county in which free delivery is general. It is responsible for a large portion of the increasing revenue of the large offices accruing from the stimulated use of the mails by merchants and others who are now able to reach patrons of rural delivery throughout the country. Fully 70 per cent of the mail delivered in that county originated outside its limits, and the proceeds of the postage on this portion of the mail helps to make up the revenue of the post offices from which it is despatched. The United States report of 1902 (page 30) says : Money orders increased 50 per cent in that year where rural free delivery was in operation and 114,959 letters and packages were registered by rural carriers in isolated farming communities when in 1902 the United States had only 6,400 carriers. What must it be to-day? Under our system this privilege can only be obtained by taking a day off and making a long drive to the nearest village or post office. There is hardly a limit to the good work to be done through the medium of rural delivery. The weather bureau, for instance, finds the service a valuable aid in the distribution of weather forecasts. At many post offices where the proper information can be obtained early enough, display signals are carried by each carrier and in this way the farmer by a glance at the passing wagon knows just what the weather probabilities are, and this information is received anxiously by the farmer. Blue prints are made of all routes, and roads are measured with bicycle wheel with cyclometer on it by a government official, who is sent to investigate the route. He also reports whether it is advisable to lay out route. The petition asking for rural free delivery must have eighty-five signatures of people willing to put up a government box and receive mail delivery. There must also be 100 residents on a route of twenty-four miles, before application can be made or a proportionate number if route is shorter. Patrons are required at their own cost to put up boxes for the reception of mail. These boxes must comply with certain specifications as to size, shape, and workmanship, and be of a galvanized sheet-iron or steel, and approved of by the department. Each box must have a signal attached by which a carrier may know whether there is mail in the box, or the patron know that mail has been delivered. 142 styles of boxes have been approved of by the department, which are sold at prices ranging from 50 cents to $3.50 each. Registered matter and special delivery letters must be delivered by the carrier in person at the patron's door, if within one mile of the route.

I wish to make an explanation in regard to the scattered districts. It is generally understood that in Canada we have a great deal of sparsely settled country, but when you come to investigate many of the farming districts of the United States you will find that they have a much vaster area of sparsely settled country than we have in Canada. It is distinctly and plainly laid down by the department that the standard route must be twenty-four miles long, that there must be one hundred families on that route and that eighty-five of those families must not only put up boxes but agree to take rural free delivery if the route is shorter than twenty-four miles. There must be a proportionate number of people on route and the pay to carrier proportionately less. Thus the rural free delivery system can only be installed in a district where it can be successfully carried on, and if these requirements are not fulfilled, the system cannot be installed until the population increases.

Of the 35,666 carriers employed June 30, 1906, 13,365 were serving routes twenty-five to thirty miles in length, and 7,540 routes of twenty-four miles in length, showing that considerably over one-half of the carriers travel from twenty-four to thirty miles. Of the remaining carriers, 7,536 are performing service on routes from twenty to twenty-four miles in length. It is expected that 45,000 carriers will be employed in this service in the United States in 1908. Assuming that these men travel an average of twenty-three miles per day, it will be seen that 1,035,000 miles will be covered daily in serving the rural districts of the United States. At a low estimate the people thus served would have to travel an average of two miles each time they visited the post office, and as on the average route there are one hundred families, this means the traversing of four hundred miles on each route, or a total for the 45,000 routes of 18,000,000 miles per day, or 5,400,000,000 miles each year. These figures should keep the Minister of Agriculture staggering for some years to come. The saving of time and labour to the farmers of the United States from this service is simply incalculable. The carriers travelling of four miles per hour, so that the average route of twenty-four miles is covered in five or six hours. The average time required for a rural carrier to serve one mile of route, as deduced from a comparative table of eleven representative states, is a few seconds over sixteen minutes, and the cost of such delivery to the government for 1903 was a trifle over 8·1 cents. Surely the cost is not exorbitant ; compared with our mail transportation to country post offices it is entirely reasonable.

After this year rural carriers will deliver books and merchandise not exceeding eleven

pounds in weight, mailed at the distributing post office of any rural delivery route for delivery to a patron thereon or if mailed by a patron of any rural delivery route for delivery to a patron thereon or at the distributing post office of said route. This applies to small packages of merchandise, such as foodstuffs, tobacco, dry goods, drugs, &c., and an order to the local merchant by post card, telephone or message will bring the goods to the farmer's door.

The rate of 5 cents for the first pound and 2 cents for each additional pound up to the limit of eleven pounds is considered ample remuneration for the department, as there is no railway transportation and the packages are delivered by means of a system already established. In this way the rural mail delivery service gives the farmer a parcel post system without interfering with the country merchant, and the large central store, such as Eaton's, in Toronto, would not be able to deliver goods for free delivery on such a route as I have explained.

The total number of pieces of mail delivered in the United States by rural free delivery in 1904, was 906,424,121.

Examinations for the position of rural carriers are held under instructions from the rural carrier Examination Board, and Local Civil Service Examiners and Postmasters. Each mail carrier must give security for $1,000 and the carriers receive all national holidays and Sundays except Christmas. If Uncle Sam can do this work and do it successfully, why cannot we?

I have received communications from farmers in different parts of Canada, some offering to pay any reasonable tax that the government would levy, in return for delivery of mail; others pleading for its establishment. I will quote a few words from one of the letters. This farmer says:

> I lived in Michigan three or four years and had the advantage of rural free delivery while there. Since my return to Canada I have had to travel about 800 miles a year and my farm is closer to the post office than thousands of others. I only lived one and a quarter miles from the post office. The time and energy I have taken going for the mail could be used to great advantage in other directions on my farm.

The statements I have made, from outside sources, should at least be sufficient to call to the attention of the House the importance of this subject. The farmer works from sun to sun. Why should he be compelled to be his own mail carrier? If farmers had rural free delivery, they would write more letters, read more papers, do more business, have more enterprise. For years there has been a rush of population from country to town and city. The glamour and hurry of city life have attracted many to our clouded, smoky and restless cities. Railways, electric wires, telephone, telegraph and rural free delivery and good roads will distribute the population, and the loneliness and isolation of farm life will be banished for ever. The farmer feels the need of communication with the outside world, he cannot get it with the means at his disposal. He must get it through the mail and the government must provide the means. Surely a government with a vote of $135,000,000, as was voted last year, might provide some consideration to the men who pay the bulk of the taxes. The Post Office Department boasts of a surplus of one and a half million last year. What are they going to do with it? Is it asking too much that more generous treatment be given to the farmer, who makes possible through the development of our country the present increased revenue. If the farming community were as well organized as other classes in this country, they would soon force the government's hand. Are they to wait until we have 20,000,000 of a population? Will 20,000,000 of people fill up the sparsely settled and remote districts of Canada ? No, nor twice 20,000,000 ; we will always have a scattered population. Therefore I ask in how much better position the department will be to undertake such a service when we have a population of 20,000,000 than it is to-day?

Are the farming interests to be for ever sacrificed, so that the railroads, canals and public works of this country may be constructed, and the useless expenditure in regard to many of them be continued?

Remember that the farmer of to-day is not the illiterate, non-reading, non-writing non-thinking man that some delight to paint him. The men who are objecting to this service to-day are men who live near a post office and who can get their mail with little effort. The townsman who has his mail delivered three times daily should not object to the farmer receiving his once each day. The mail delivered in this way makes up for lectures, entertainments, libraries and intercourses with the outside world. No class more carefully read and digest all they receive than does the farmer. Rural mail delivery is a child of modern development and you might as well try to turn Niagara back as to stop it. It may be hindered but it will ultimately come.

Sending news and getting news, receiving newspapers, telegrams and periodicals is the greatest medium of an advanced civilization. The newspaper receives the telegrams and telephones from the different parts of the world, and in a few hours the printed sheet is ready for the public.

It starts out on its mission, the wagon at the door is ready to take it to the train, the express carries it seventy-five miles in two hours, on a track that has cut the farmers lands into triangles, and for which they pay, generally speaking, for its maintenance and support and in many instances its building. The paper is taken to the local office in a few moments and ready to deliver to the farmer. Within two hours and a half

from the time the press receives the message it is in the town post office. If you have not the rural free delivery, it may remain for days until the farmer calls, after a hard week's work. The newspaper has its money, the railroad its money, the post office or government that rush it on with neatness and despatch will have nothing more to do with it, and after all this outlay of money, brains and care, hurry and bustle, it is left dejected and undone, dumped into a pigeon-hole in a country post office, there to rest for four or five days, and by the time the farmer gets it, he has already sold his hogs and lost $15 on account of not having the latest market reports; it is not worth to him hardly the paper it is printed on. One thousand copies of this old paper would not sell for a copper on Ottawa streets and if a newsboy were found guilty of selling such, except for waste paper, he would be fined. But the farmer must be satisfied with his lot and wait for generations yet unborn to bring him the happy day when rural free delivery will become an established fact in Canada. Let this government do something to take this mail package out of the pigeon hole and do it now. Why give a benefit to cities and towns and not to the rural men?

One may send a letter from Ottawa to Hong Kong, to Australia, to New Zealand, to Ceylon, the Straits Settlement and other far off outposts of the British empire at the same postal charge as it would cost to send a letter home in Ontario. Last year, in 1906, the mail subsidies and steamship subventions amounted to $1,227,000. There is no talk about this system not paying. But when it comes to serving the toiling farmers, the men who pay the large revenues on which the government presume to extend postal arrangements to outside nations, they are told by the Postmaster General it is a luxury and they must wait. They are told by another minister that rural free delivery is a monster. They are told by another that he is staggering now from the thought of it and he does not want the question discussed in the House at all. We pay subsidies to steamships to carry mail to foreign shores and no one objects, but why not give a little consideration to our rural men. If you mail a letter in Canada to a farmer in the United States, he receives it at his door, while if an American farmer mails a letter back to his Canadian farmer, the Canadian has to walk miles to obtain it.

We owe much to the pioneer farmers of this country, the men who have hewn their way into the woods and broken up their homesteads in our great west. We are proud of their achievements, proud of their deeds of valour and heroism, proud of that patriotic spirit that has made them willing at all times to defend the flag. It is their love of this country and their abiding faith in its resources that has brought us up to the prominent position as a nation we hold to-day. Let us be fair with these men. Let us be reasonable. Let us deal out justice to them and I feel confident that if such is done, the nation will be rewarded a thousand fold.

Let us probe the matter of rural free delivery to its fullest extent. It will bear investigation. Let us devote time and attention to solving its merits and I feel confident that if honest and reasonable research is given it that we will find it one of the greatest boons that ever became the property of our nation, and we will hand down to posterity an elevating, refining and intelligent piece of legislation that will ever redown to the honour of the men who established it.

Waiting until we have 20,000,000 of people is a humbug. Life is too short. Let us pin the words 'rural free delivery' to the mast and below it 'Do it now.' I beg to move in amendment:

That the said motion be amended by adding to the proposed address to His Excellency the Governor General the following paragraphs at the end thereof.

We desire to express our respectful regret that more adequate reference has not been made to matters of public interest alluded to in Your Excellency's gracious speech and that other matters of grave public concern have altogether escaped mention therein.

We also humbly desire to express our regret that Your Excellency's gracious speech contains no allusion to the importance of inaugurating a system of rural free mail delivery under which our rural population may enjoy so far as Canada's resources will permit the great advantages in that respect which have been secured to the rural communities of other countries.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). I shall occupy, Mr. Speaker, the time of the House but a very few minutes and shall devote myself mainly to one question of the many which have been raised during this debate. That question is the much discussed but in my judgment the very much misapprehended question of the balance of trade. As regards the plea made by my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Armstrong) for rural mail delivery, his arguments are disposed of by a leading article in one of the leading organs of his party, the Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day. I shall therefore not take up the time of the House in discussing that matter.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) took up the greater part of his speech with discussing the balance of trade. He informed us that because our imports largely exceeded our exports, this country was on the eve of financial ruin. We were on the high road, he said, to national bankruptcy, and if he were Minister of Finance, he would quickly change that deplorable condition of affairs. It was bad enough for a member occupying the position in the Conservative ranks which the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) does, to take that stand, but I notice that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) gave expression to the same opinion. I notice also that the hon.

the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) dwelt at some length upon what he called the adverse balance of trade and pointed to it as proof of the business incapacity of this government and particularly of the Finance Minister. Nor was that all. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) moved an amendment in reply to the address to the speech from the Throne, embodying this idea and calling His Excellency's attention to the fact that our imports exceed our exports and that consequently a financial crisis was impending and inevitable. And every member of the opposition voted for that amendment. Well, Mr. Speaker, there could not possibly be a more erroneous opinion or more fallacious reasoning. When the imports of a country exceed its exports, that is proof positive that its foreign trade is healthy and is conducted on profitable lines, and the excess of imports over the exports is a measure—perhaps not a full measure—of the profits made upon its foreign trade. One would have thought that the fact that the imports of all the leading, progressive, commercial nations of the world exceed their exports would be sufficient to show these hon. gentlemen the untenableness of their position, or at all events, would cause them to seriously examine the grounds of their belief.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the case with the United States ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will listen to me——

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) to say that his statement applied to every leading country in the world. Does it apply to the United States ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I made that statement. The hon. member for East Grey, (Mr. Sproule) was not present the other evening when the Minister of Agriculture adduced figures, which were not controverted, to show that all the leading nations of Europe and America—all with the exception, so far as Europe was concerned, of Russia, had imports exceeding their exports. And it is only reasonable to suppose that that would be the condition of affairs. Now, I say that that fact ought to be sufficient to cause these hon. gentlemen to, at all events, seriously examine the grounds of their belief.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me if I give the figures quoted by the Minister of Agriculture with regard to one nation ? That hon. gentleman said :

> I find that the imports of the United States for 116 years amounted to $37,000,000,000, and the exports to $42,000,000,000, or $5,000,000,000 more than the imports.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I would ask the hon. gentleman for East Grey to listen to my statement, and if I do not convince him that he is wrong, I will be surprised. I say again that the statements and the statistics made and quoted by the Minister of Agriculture were unanswerable. But I will submit one or two concrete illustrations, and I think that, possibly, these will have more effect than a prepared and elaborate argument. I lay down this proposition—that when the imports of a nation exceed its exports that it is trading at a profit, and that the excess of imports ever exports is a measure of the profits of its trade, though, perhaps not a complete measure. I hold myself prepared to prove that statement. Suppose I buy a cargo of wheat in this country, say 100,000 bushels, and for easy computation, let us say that the cost is $1 per bushel, or a total of $100,000. I send that cargo to Great Britain and sell it at a profit of, say 50 cents per bushel. That means that I receive $150,000 for what cost me $100,000. I reinvest that sum in merchandise which I bring to this country. The export entry was $100,000, the import entry will be $150,000. I have made a profitable transaction, and what is profitable to me is profitable to my country. The imports exceed the exports by fifty per cent. That transaction in wheat will hold good as illustrative of the principle in every conceivable commercial transaction and for every commercial commodity and the reverse of that is true; If I sell at a loss, say of 50 cents per bushel, and reinvest what I receive in merchandise and bring it to this country, the import entry will be only one-half of the export entry and I am trading at a loss and the country is trading at a loss. Does the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) find any fault with that statement or that reasoning ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) had better convince the former Finance Minister, Sir Richard Cartwright, a much abler man in finance than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I understand that my hon. friend Mr. Sproule, finds no fault with what I have stated. Now the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) speaking upon this question a few days ago, stated that if a merchant's purchases were greater than his sales, he was doing business at a loss. I think I see what was in the mind of the hon. member when he made that statement. He considered that a merchant's purchases would be analogous to the imports of a nation, and that what he sold analogous to a nation's exports. In that he was quite right. But the hon. member took the second step in his argument before he finished the first, and he ended by finishing neither. But let us finish the step. The goods and money that the merchant gives in exchange for the goods he buys are his exports. Manifestly, then, the less he gives and the more he receives, the more profitable the transaction. Now, take the next step—and I address my remarks on this point particularly to the hon. mem-

ber for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt)—the merchant's sales are, properly speaking, his exports ; the money and goods he receives in exchange for the goods sold are his imports. Here, again, the more he receives and the less he gives out, the more profitable the transaction. All trade is, in its last analysis, barter ; and it makes no difference whatever whether money is used to facilitate the transaction or not—it does not change the essential nature of the transaction. Some, perhaps, may object to my first illustration by saying that the exporter is not necessarily the importer. Suppose I bring back payments for my cargo in coin or bullion, or—what is more likely—a bill of exchange, it is said that that will make a difference. It makes no difference whatever. For, if I bring in my receipts by a bill of exchange, it will go to my credit with my banker here and to his credit in London, and will enable some other man who is an importer to import a larger bill of goods than he otherwise would if that transaction had not taken place for the simple reason that the country will have the exchange to pay for it. It will enable me, because of my trading profitably, to purchase more of the necessaries and luxuries of life from the man who did import them. If I do not use all the profit on my transaction in buying the necessaries and luxuries of life, the balance will go to swell the accumulated capital of the country. That is the reason I said that the excess of imports over exports might not be the full measure of our profit on our foreign trade, because a portion of it may go to swell the accumulated capital of the country. All profit in trade is made by taking things from where they are relatively cheap to where they are relatively dear. Hence it follows that all the nations of the earth might trade with one another, and the imports of all be greater than the exports of all, paradoxical as that statement might appear at first sight. The weight, the colour, the size of the things transported do not change, but the price changes, and that is the whole cause of the trade. If that were not so, there would be no trade. Does any hon. gentleman find any flaw in these statements, or in the reasons deduced therefrom, and if there is none, I have proved my case. If I have proved it, then I have a right to say that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and supported by the opposition, was crude and silly, and upon examination of it, the members of the opposition must come to that conclusion themselves.

Mr. WM. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). It was not my intention to make any remarks on this subject, but after listening to the speech of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), and his very extravagant statements. I feel it is my duty to say at least a word or two. Hon. members on this side of the House have been paying but little attention to the speeches made by the member for Portage la Prairie because we did not consider they were worthy of reply. But the hon. gentleman has become so bold that I think it is now necessary to take some notice of his remarks.

The hon. member for Portage la Prairie, in his opening remarks, paid a compliment to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for the calm, sincere and dignified manner in which they have conducted this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. Sir, I do not think it is necessary for the hon. gentleman to call attention to that fact, because it has long been known, both in this House and out of it, that when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House rise to speak to any of the issues before it, they do so with calmness, sincerity and dignity. I notice that the hon. gentleman was unable to extend the same congratulations to his own leader and to the ministers who have spoken upon this question. Why did he not congratulate them ? Because the Prime Minister who leads this government, though he had prepared a text, had to revise it ; and he had prepared a brief, I suppose, in order that he might be able to develop that text. But instead of doing what the people of this country would expect him and his colleagues to do, he threw his text aside, and took for his subject the platform of the Liberal Conservative party which was constructed by the leader of the Liberal Conservatives of this country, and the men who sit beside him. This platform, as I say, was constructed by the leader of the opposition, and it was announced upon the platform at Halifax in August last, as the platform upon which the leader of the opposition would speak from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. That platform has been endorsed by every Conservative organization in the Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Not one organization, not one Conservative, and I may say not one honest-thinking Liberal, have found fault with the platform upon which the leader of the opposition is at present appealing to the country.

The hon. member for Portage la Prairie had a great deal to say about prosperity. He claimed that this administration deserved the credit for all the prosperity we have been enjoying for the past ten years. He was not willing to attribute to Providence the least credit for any degree of that great prosperity. Replying to the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Elson) the hon. member for Portage la Prairie said :

> The hon. gentleman thinks that Providence has had more to do with our success than anything else. But in my experience I have found that Providence was of very little use to me, or to the people I represent.

Now, Sir, is there any dignity in such a speech as that? Do you find that proper sense of dignity and reverence that should characterize an hon. member in speaking of Providence in this House? The hon. gentleman had a great deal to say about the prosperity that exists in his own particular locality. Well, we are all glad to know that they have good crops there, and that that locality is prosperous. But, I think he should at least give a little credit to Providence for the climatic conditions which have helped to grow and mature the crop, and enable the farmers to harvest and sell them. Since the hon. member would not give credit to Providence, possibly he was able to bring down from the Yukon that great rainmaker we have heard so much about. I have only this to say to the hon. member, that if he had power to bring the great rainmaker from the Yukon to give them the moisture necessary to mature their crops, he should not have been so selfish, he should have been willing to let that rainmaker come a little further south in the province of Manitoba and give a little more moisture to the locality which I have the honour to represent. But the hon. gentleman was not good enough to allow other people in that great western country to get the benefit of the rainmaker that has been employed by this government. The hon. gentleman has no doubt had a very satisfactory crop in his locality where the quality has been good. The price has also been good but, with the exception of the southern portion of Manitoba and Alberta I want to tell the hon. members of this House and the hon. member for Portage la Prairie in particular, that a more damaging frost never struck that great western country than that which visited it during this last year. We might as well deal with facts. The hon. gentleman knows that in the northern part of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta the quality has been so impaired by frost that the grain is almost unsaleable except for fuel. At the beginning of the season there was a fair price paid for this damaged wheat, but we find to-day that the price has been reduced from 75-90 cents to 29-35 cents per bushel. There is not the prosperity and the great amount of money among the farmers of that western country that this hon. gentleman would like to lead the members of this House and the country to believe.

The hon. gentleman, in referring to the speech from the Throne, called it a bill of fare, and in so doing he compared it with a speech in the eighties. If the hon. gentleman had desired to make a fair comparison, if he had wished to tell the people about the conditions that existed in bygone days, he might have gone back to the early seventies. The hon. gentleman would like the members of the House and the people of the country to believe, like all Liberals, that the Liberal party was only born in 1896, but I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the Liberal party was not born in 1896. It was born away back in the early seventies. What was the condition of the country then? As we have been told by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), there were soup kitchens and hard times then. My hon. friend from Brantford has predicted that we are getting back to the same condition of affairs. I only hope that my hon. friend's predictions are wrong. The condition of affairs in the early seventies was such that it demanded a change of policy. It demanded that the government of that day should inaugurate and carry out a policy that would change the condition of the country; and, Sir, which was the party that was able to successfully bring about that result? Delegation after delegation, as history shows, waited upon the government of the day and asked them to do something to remedy the condition that then prevailed, but they were told by Sir Richard Cartwright, as an hon. gentleman has stated to-day, that if they wanted the condition of affairs to change they would have to go home, work harder and eat less. The Conservatives of that day framed a policy, they appealed to the people upon that policy, and the result was that the people took that policy and considered it, as they are considering the policy of the Conservatives to-day, they went to the polls, they voted upon it, and the Conservative party were entrusted with the inauguration and operation of the great national policy, the policy which is in operation at the present time, and to which policy is due the great financial prosperity that this country has enjoyed for the last ten years.

The hon. member for Portage la Prairie also had something to say about taxation. I do not think that his argument requires any answer, because he answered it himself. He said that we are being taxed to a greater extent than we were at the time this government took office. The true basis upon which to make this calculation would be to take the per capita taxation, and if the hon. gentleman looks into the statistics he will find that at the time this government took office the taxation per capita was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $5, while to-day it is almost $12.

The hon. gentleman had a great deal to say about the immigration policy of this country. He referred particularly to the class of settlers that we are getting in the west. He had a great deal to say about the Americans who are settling up our country. I quite agree with every word of praise that the hon. gentleman uttered of the American settlers who are coming into our country. They are settlers who have had experience in developing the prairies to the south of us, they come to our country, not only with experience, but with some financial substance, and in a few

years they are able to make great progress. But when the hon. gentleman was making reference to the good class of American settlers, why did he not tell us about the European settlers who are getting into this country? Why did he not tell us about the religious fanatics, the Doukhobors, who, not later than last summer, left their respective villages well shod and well clad, journeyed through the province, yes, right through the constituency of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, until their shoes were worn out and their clothes were not sufficient to cover them? Why did not the hon. gentleman tell this House about that class of immigration that we are getting into this country? Why did he not tell us that after they had walked miles and miles they reached the city of Winnipeg, that the citizens of Winnipeg appealed to the government of this country to take care of these immigrants that they had fathered and nursed for years, and that the government told them they would have nothing to do with them, the result of which was that the poor unfortunate immigrants had to be fed and cared for by the good people of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman might have told the House about the amount of money that was expended at the time that the late Conservative government were in power. He remembers well that the hon. members who were then in opposition found great fault with the government of the day for expending $120,000 for the purpose of bringing immigrants into our country, but to-day we find that this government are expending not thousands, but millions of dollars. And where does it go? In those days we did not have a North Atlantic Trading Company. We find that the government of this country has given the North Atlantic Trading Company, $350,000, and more to bring immigrants into this country, and that while we have given that amount of money the people are getting no value for it. In those days we did not have immigration agents such as Jackson, or a Preston, or a Philip Wagner. We had honest men acting for us then, and with $120,000 a year expenditure we were able to prove that this was a desirable country for settlers, and I believe we got just about as many settlers then as we do now, the difference being that the settlers in these days were of a better class. What we want in our immigrants is quality, not quantity.

The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) had a great deal to say about the money stringency, and he told us it was easier to borrow money from the banks of that western country to-day than it was ever before. I am pleased that such is the experience of the hon. gentleman. I am pleased that he is able to go to the banks of his own particular town, as he tells us, and get more money than he was ever able to get before. But while that may be true with regard to himself, I can tell him that it is not the condition of affairs generally throughout the west. I can mention specific cases right in my own locality where men have gone to the bank this year, and where I have gone and pleaded for them myself; men who a year ago could go to the same bank and borrow on their own note from $3,000 to $5,000 for temporary loan or for a whole year if they wanted it, but these same men cannot do that to-day. I know a man who this year went to the bank with better security than he had a year ago; he not only offered his own signature but the signature of a man equally responsible; he wanted to borrow $1,200 or $1,300 as a temporary loan but the bank told him the instructions were that they were not to loan one single cent. I can tell the House that this gentleman to whom I refer is in as sound a financial position as any farmer in southern Manitoba, and yet he was unable to borrow a single dollar this year. In face of this, the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) announces that there is no financial stringency and no lack of money. But the Minister of Finance does not agree with the hon. member (Mr. Crawford). The hon. gentleman will remember that the subsidized Winnipeg 'Free Press,' which is the organ of the government, announced in big headlines some time ago that the Minister of Finance was going to supply the necessary money to handle the crop and thus relieve the financial depression. How does the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) reconcile his statement with that announcement. Only a few days ago the Minister of Finance is recorded as saying on the floor of this House:

> Mr. Fielding made a statement in regard to the financial conditions of the Dominion. There is at present, he said, outstanding a temporary loan of £500,000 bearing interest at the rate of four and a half per cent. In addition there is an overdraft of £301,000 in the Bank of Montreal at London which bears interest at the current Bank of England rate. During the next year there are falling due £1,500,000 due in April and £4,500,000 due in November, respectively. Mr. Fielding stated that the government has been in communication with the Canadian financial agent in London in regard to them, but in view of the financial stringency he has decided to take no action towards their liquidation at present.

We have here the admission of the Minister of Finance that there is a financial stringency in the west, but the member for Portage la Prairie does not seem to know about it. The hon. member (Mr. Crawford) had a great deal to say about the transportation question, and he told us that in the part of the province that he represents, hundreds of farmers had shipped carloads of grain in October last and that the grain had not yet reached Fort William. That may be true as regards the hon. gentle-

man's constituency and if it be true then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) is recreant in his duty to his constituents in not appealing to the railway corporations to relieve this congestion, or in not applying to the Railway Commission for relief. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if such a thing as that happened in relation to my locality, I would not sit quietly down as he does, but I would take strenuous measures to have relief granted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) had a few words to say as to public ownership of telegraphs and telephones, and I was surprised to hear him state that he did not think this question was deserving of any consideration. Does he forget what he had to say and do with this same question less than a year ago? Does he remember being at an executive meeting with the leader of the opposition in the Manitoba legislature, Mr. Brown, last February in Winnipeg; does he remember that that convention considered the public ownership of telephones and telegraphs in Manitoba, and that next morning their organ, the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' announced that they were willing to go a step further than the Roblin government; that they were not willing to leave it to the municipalities to say whether they would have public owned telephones or not, but that they were going to force it upon the municipalities and construct telephones all over the province. It was that policy which the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) was advocating throughout Manitoba not later than March last. Why has he changed his mind? In so far as his announced opinions on the telephone question are concerned now, and in so far as the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman goes, it requires no further reference from me. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) had also a great deal to say about the election law in the province of Manitoba. I do not purpose taking up the time of the House now in discussing the Manitoba Franchise Act, but when the discussion on that question does come before parliament I can promise the member for Portage la Prairie that he will have data which will explain the true facts of the cases he mentions, and that this data will not be clippings from the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' the subsidized organ of the Liberal party.

The best tribute I can pay to the election law of Manitoba is to quote the opinion of the leader of the opposition in the legislative assembly in Manitoba. Mr. Michel stated upon the floor of that House that it was the best election law that was ever placed upon the statute-book, and the only objection he had to find with it was that it was somewhat costly in operation. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie said that if that law was in force at the time of the next general federal election, there would not be a Liberal returned to this House. I wish to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if that law is in existence and is fully enforced and the honest electorate of that province have a chance to express their true convictions, not one Liberal will be returned; but if that election law is to be handled as it was in the last general election, if the lists that are prepared by this government are to be taken up to the province of Manitoba and handed over to Leitch, Ayot and Ingram and others of that class, the expression of the will of the people of Manitoba may be prevented. The lists when received there were taken into private chambers, these gentlemen dipped their pens into red ink and disfranchised hundreds and hundreds of the honest electors of that country as the hon. gentleman well knows. Sir, if the people of Manitoba are allowed to carry out the intent of that law and the electors get a chance to express their views by ballot there will not be, as I said before, one Liberal returned to this House.

What was the condition of affairs on the morning of the election, November 3, 1904? I was in the polling booth in my own particular town, and when the box was unlocked the list looked as though it had been dipped in blood. I said to the deputy returning officer, what does this mean, what does it signify? He smiled, and said: It signifies danger—and danger it was, because we had the electors coming to that poll, as to every other poll in that province, coming to the places where some of them had been accustomed to vote for the last twenty years, and they were told that their names had been struck off the list at that polling place and that they would have to seek some other place to cast a ballot. This was the condition all over that province, on that particular election day.

I well remember two electors, at this poll, applying for a ballot as they had always done. They were told that they were not on the list there and were driven to five other polls, but eventually they came back to the first polling place and asked the right to cast their ballots. I appealed to the deputy returning officer. I said: Here you are, a member of the church in this town; you have known these gentlemen for years and years; you know that they are entitled to the right to cast their ballot; what are you going to do? Finally he said: Well it is pretty hard, it is more than my conscience will allow me to do to refuse them a ballot—and they were allowed to cast their ballots. But in many other polling places this right was not so granted and the honest electors were disfranchised. The night before my own election, my opponent and his colleagues said: We have Staples beaten and he does not know how. I admit that I did not know how, but, Sir, when that list was brought to my attention on the morning of the election, I concluded that I and every other Conservative candidate in Manitoba would be beaten—and the surprise to me

to-day is that there is one of us here. In the constituency of Macdonald, they disfranchised some 360 honest electors; they went it pretty strong but not quite strong enough.

The hon. member never speaks in this House without having something to say about the Roblin administration. He deals with small things. He deals with things of which I am free to say he has not much knowledge or he would not advance the arguments he has used upon the floor of this House. Why does the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) not deal with some of the big things the Roblin government has been able to effect? Why does he not speak of the railway policy of the Roblin government, of that policy which has given back to the farmers of Manitoba —and he is one of them and has received the benefit—thousands, yes hundreds of thousands of dollars? They have reduced the rates as he well knows and the result is that the people of Manitoba have received a great advantage. But what was the policy of this government when they were making a contract, as the Roblin government did, with a railway company? They assured the people of Manitoba that they would receive special benefits in the way of legislation when the contract for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific was entered into. Did they insert in that contract a clause similar to that imposed by the Roblin government in their contract with the Canadian Northern? No. This government was asked in a resolution moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) seconded by the then hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) that the same clause should be inserted in the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the majority of this government came in as usual and voted that resolution down. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) might have told this House that the government of Manitoba in the last freight tariff which they sent over to the Canadian Northern reduced the rate on coarse grains to that on wheat. He might have told this House and this country that the people of Manitoba have received a great advantage from this reduction. The day after this tariff was submitted to the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific Railway inaugurated the same rate. Has that been any advantage to the province of Manitoba? Yes it has been an advantage to the extent of about $280,000 to the farmers of that province. It has been an advantage not only to the province of Manitoba, but to the western provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta; these provinces have each received an advantage of about $110,000 per annum. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie has referred to a matter which I noticed in the speech from the Throne, that is the boundary question. I am glad to know that at last this government has seen fit to announce that at this session of parliament some degree of justice will be done to the province of Manitoba. This question has been taken very seriously by the citizens of Manitoba for many years. They have employed every argument and exerted every effort to induce this government to extend the boundaries of Manitoba, and we are told in the speech from the Throne that this question is going to be dealt with during the present session. While, if that is the case, I want to tell the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) and the seven Liberal members opposite, that this is not the time this question should be dealt with. This is not the opportune time for doing justice to the citizens of Manitoba. The time to have dealt with the boundary extension of that province was when the autonomy legislation was going through this House. When the legislation creating the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta was submitted to this House, then was the time to do justice to Manitoba; and if the representatives from that province supporting the government had exercised the influence they then had we should have had an Act passed giving our province extension westward. But what do we find? We find that these hon. gentlemen, on being told by their leader to sit up and be good or they would be chastised, were brought into proper submission by the threat. I well remember the ex-premier of Manitoba, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) sitting in his seat, rolling his fingers slicking his whiskers and dusting his coat and not saying a word. I admit that it was pretty hard for him to take the medicine, but he had to take it. It was so hard at one time that after he had voted he shuffled out by the back door. Out of the back door he made his exit, notwithstanding the musical strains of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) singing: 'Tommy, dear Tommy, don't go.' But he went. It may be that he had a promise of preferment. It may be that all these members from Manitoba who voted with the government were promised favours. They may have been told that they would get a senatorship, a judgeship or a lieutenant governorship. Well, if there is any man in this House who has qualified up to the standard raised by this administration in order to entitle a member to a judgeship, a lieutenant governorship or a senatorship, it is the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). That hon. gentleman was wont to go up and down the province of Manitoba and throughout this Dominion shouting: 'Hands off Manitoba; equal rights and equal justice for all.' But what was he willing to do when this autonomy legislation was going through?

An hon. MEMBER. Anything.

Mr. STAPLES. Anything. He also preached: 'Free lands for the settlers.' But no doubt he has been promised a senatorship or a judgeship, just as my other friends from Manitoba may have been promised a senatorship, a timber berth or a snag boat; and for those petty things they were willing to sell the birthright of the people of Manitoba. The people of Manitoba hold these seven Liberals who sat behind the leader of this government responsible for the fact that we then did not get justice and were debarred from the extension we are entitled to. I have noticed the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) appearing at times in his seat opposite very much annoyed. Then he would apparently be cheered up. I suppose at this particular time he was enlivening his mind with some of the beautiful campaign poetry that he himself composed and which was used in the province of Manitoba. It is very amusing to read it. I have some of it here.

An hon. MEMBER. Sing it.

Mr. STAPLES. I am only sorry the rules of the House will not permit me to sing it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Song, song.

Mr. STAPLES. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that probably some time when we are waiting for the whips to come in and take a vote, I may give them a bar.

LIBERAL MARCH.

Men and Liberals, ye whose action,
Put to rout the Tory faction,
In their ranks spread wild distraction
Vanquished all their bands!
Follow still the chiefs who led ye,
Keep your ranks still firm and steady,
Keep your swords still sharp and ready,
Ready to your hands!

Chorus.

Shoulder press to shoulder,
Onward march and bolder
Triumphs more we yet shall see
Before we are much older.
Railways, trade and education
Be our aspiration,
Till we win them for the nation,
And our land be free!

I will give you another:

Honest principles inspire us;
Calls of noble leaders fire us;
In the struggle naught should tire us
Till the work is done.
Every man in combat straining,
Foot by foot the vantage gaining,
Till the people's cause is reigning
And the victory won.

Chorus.

Greenway's government shall rule us,
Men like these will lead, not school us,
Tory tricks no more shall fool us,
We've a better way!

Equal rights all shall be sharing,
Equal burdens all be bearing,
Each for all, for all each caring,
Speed the happy day!

Chorus.

I have three or four more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. STAPLES. Well, I shall give you another. I know you all could join in the chorus, because it is the old familiar tune, 'Tramp, Tramp, the Boys are Marching':

With a loud and ringing cheer,
Which will echo far and near,
Let us hail the noble chieftain of our land,
For he lives to see the day
When the clouds have passed away,
And prosperity shines over all the land.

Chorus.

Give three ringing cheers for Greenway,
Grand old chieftain of our band!
For he lives to see the day
When the clouds have passed away,
And contented men are working on the land.

With a brave and honest heart,
He hath borne a noble part,
And the people's truest friend hath ever been;
Always foremost in the fight,
For the cause of truth and right,
Ever faithful to his country and his Queen.

Chorus.

Give three ringing cheers for Greenway, &c.

But there is here another stanza I think should be read for the benefit of this House. It is another poem. I shall tell the right hon. gentleman at whose cost these were printed before I sit down. I am sorry I cannot do the darkey act very well, but this song is headed: 'Campaign Song,' to the tune of 'There will be a Hot Time in the Old Town To-night':

Come along, get you ready, don't be long comin' down,
For dere's gwine to be a meetin' in dis good, good old town,
Where de 'lectors know de speakers, and de speaker all know you,
And you've got to vote right or you'll be de hoodoo.
When you hear Tom Greenway make his speech,
The Grits all say, 'Oh, ain't he just a peach!'
And he makes the Tories want to yell and screech,
There'll be a hot time in de old town to-night.
You Liberals.

Chorus.

When you hear de 'lections am at hand,
Grits quit work all over de land,
And the chorus of the Liberals will sound grand,
There'll be a hot time in the old town to-night.

One more stanza let me read, and then I will discontinue:—

Some connection with the British is their heavy battle cry,
But they always talk of that when they winked the other eye;
Now they know that Wilfy Laurier give de British Preference Pie,
And the trade with Johnny Bull is mounting pretty high.

Such 'loyal' talk would give us all a pain,
And when they get a chance of power again,
They'll find this people talking pretty plain,
and
There'll be a hot time in the old town that night.

Now I want to tell the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the people of this country are beginning to think and talk pretty plain, and when the elections come on, he will find that the platform he has been trying to belittle is a sound one; he will find that its declarations touch a sore spot. It is making the right hon. gentleman and his followers dance; and it will continue to make them dance until they are waltzed across the floor of the House by the people of this country and relegated to the benches on your left, Mr. Speaker, where they always belonged.

Mr. BENNETT. Who prints that poetry?

Mr. STAPLES. This poetry that I have just sung——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. STAPLES—or, I should say, recited, was printed by the poor deaf and dumb students in the Institute in the city of Winnipeg, and was paid for with the money of the people of Manitoba. I say, as Premier Roblin of Manitoba said, when speaking at Carmen, 'It was enough to make a bronze statue weep. What a spectacle! the public money being used to print defiled English.' This was done by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) ex-premier for the province of Manitoba, who, as I have said, has been made to sit up in this House and submit to the wishes of the Prime Minister and his followers so far as the boundaries of Manitoba are concerned. Now, we must have this Bill before us before we can discuss it intelligently. When it is brought down, I shall be only too glad to support it, provided it gives to Manitoba the justice to which she is entitled. I only ask justice, and I do not ask that injustice be done to any other province. But, as I have said, justice to Manitoba demands that her boundaries shall be extended not only northward and eastward, but westward also. And, as already stated, if the hon. gentlemen opposite representing the province of Manitoba had continued the demands they at one time made, justice would have already been done to their province. As I have said, we do not know what that Bill will contain. The only forecast we have had is that given by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson). We all know the hon. gentleman. A couple of years ago, when there was a by-election in Manitoba, the hon. gentleman folded his map, packed his grip and hurried to the constituency in which the election was to be held. He hung his map up on the wall and, assuming his official air, and taking a pointer in hand, with a few scientific flourishes, such as he alone is capable of, informed the people exactly what the province was to get in the way of boundaries. I asked the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he gave the hon. member for Selkirk authority to make that statement. However, we will wait with patience—although, I must confess, with some anxiety—to know what the Bill is to contain. But, as I have said, if, when it comes down, it gives to the people of Manitoba the justice to which they are entitled I shall be only too glad to support that Bill in every way. But let me say to my hon. friends from the province of Manitoba, sitting upon the government side of the House: We, the people of Manitoba, expect, when this Bill comes down, that you will not allow yourselves to be set aside as you were when the autonomy legislation was before the House. Now, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), in the course of his remarks, the other day, said that they had prepared for us at a future day another dose. I do not know what the hon. gentleman had in mind. He spoke of crookedness and dishonesty. He came very close to the border line, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman that if he continues to make such accusations as he has been making, he may get a dose that will be very hard for him to digest. Now, in conclusion, let me repeat that all I have to say is that we are anxious only that justice shall be done to the province of Manitoba in the way of extension of her boundaries, and that what is given shall be given without constitutional limitations.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Before I resume discussion of the subject before the Chair, I would like to throw out a suggestion to the honourable leaders of the House that they try an experiment some of those days in the method of conducting discussions on these great public question. I would suggest that after the pawn the light-armed artillery had succeeded in demolishing each other, the knights and the bishops of debate be moved forward to take their places, and then the heavy guns be brought to the front, who would succeed in patching up the scattered arguments and in piecing them together in proper shape so as to make a fair presentment to the great jury of this House. Under present conditions the heavyweights of debate come first, and after they have pretty fairly exhausted the subject, the middleweights take their place, and after they have got through the lightweights are brought forward. As a rule, Mr. Speaker, when a new and inexperienced member gets up, the subjects are pretty well exhausted. About all has been said that can be said, and better said than

he can hope to say it. He generally has the inspiration, if so it may be called, of addressing his remarks to empty benches, particularly on the other side of the House, sometimes to a few tired members, and not infrequently to the reporters gallery when the reporters have grown tired and have gone for a little diversion or have become utterly weary and gone home.

Now to return to the question before the Chair. Reference has been made to the existing condition of trade in Canada, and as that matter has an intimate relation to the subject under discussion, I may be pardoned for examining it a few minutes. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), addressing this House the other day, pointed out the adverse balance of trade against Canada and raised a warning note with regard to it. He directed the attention of the government to existing conditions with the view that they should endeavour to rectify those conditions, so far as that can be done by legislative or administrative action. The hon. gentleman was criticised in this House as having tried to create a panic in this country. I cannot help thinking that such criticism comes with very bad grace from certain hon. gentlemen opposite who, a few years ago, traversed this country from Halifax to Vancouver crying blue ruin. Up and down the side line and concession, in the House and out of it, on the platform and in the press, in season and out of season, in wet and dry, cold and heat, on every occasion, they were crying blue ruin. They kept this up for many years, until they finally succeeded in bringing about a condition of affairs that might well be described as unsatisfactory. However, I do not think we have had in late years in Canada anything that might be described as blue ruin, and I hope we have not such a condition of affairs just now. But, Sir, hon. members of the government, led by that old knight of blue ruin, have done something infinitely worse than cry blue ruin. They started out on a deliberate campaign in this country to set class against class, to set individual against individual, to set the manufacturer against the artisan and the artisan against the manufacturer, to set the farmer against those with whom he dealt, and they kept up that miserable propaganda for many years. I hold, Sir, that they are open to censure by every right thinking Canadian for the course they pursued in this regard. But, Sir, the discussion has been useful inasmuch as it has cleared up certain matters in the mind of the great public with regard to the policy of the government. We did not clearly understand until a few days ago that an adverse balance of trade was a splendid thing, and that the government of this country had been bending their energies in that direction. It is true, there are certain other men who make some pretension to a knowledge of financial affairs who do not look at the subject in quite the same light. For instance, the president of the Bank of Montreal a few days ago, in referring to the excess of imports over exports, stated, as reported in the daily press, that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, the excess of imports over exports was $118,760,000 ; and he used these words which I commend to the attention of the government :

> The balance has to be liquidated sooner or later.

The Toronto 'Globe,' a couple of months ago, having some anxiety with regard to the existing condition of affairs, found it necessary to direct the attention of its readers to the subject and to allay public uneasiness, by stating that this condition of affairs was only temporary, that matters would soon rectify themselves, and we would get back our balance of trade. But it appears now from what has been said by the Minister of Agriculture that that is not likely to happen, and according to the views of the government it would be a calamity to this country if we should ever get into such a position as that our exports would equal our imports. If an adverse balance of $118,000,000 was a proof that our condition was satisfactory, we have a further evidence of prosperity since that day, because our adverse balance has now reached the figure of $122,000,000 ; that is to say if the Minister of Agriculture and the rest of the government are right, we are $3,000,000 better off now than we were when the first statement was made. The Minister of Agriculture, dealing with that matter the other day, took my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) severely to task for desiring to see exports equal to imports and he asked : Does the hon. member for Brantford wish to emulate Russia ? Russia is a country that has more exports than imports. Of course the hon. gentleman might have mentioned one or two other countries, but I suppose he did not think that they were of any consequence. He might have mentioned Great Britain and he might have mentioned the United States ; but he did not see fit to do so. It will be a revelation to the people of Great Britain and to the great financiers of the United States to learn that they have been working on wrong lines, that they are courting disaster and I have no doubt that when they come to read the speech of the hon. Minister of Agriculture they will immediately set about to alter their policy and work it out on the lines that have been suggested by the same minister because we know that he is a great authority, a man that can give advice to any member of the government. In matters financial he is ready to speak for them. He can direct the affairs of the Militia Department, and he can direct all matters pertaining to the postal affairs of this country, as well as have everything connected with the Department of Agriculture at his finger

ends. I presume that he must be the most level headed man in the House. He ought to be because, as has been already stated in the debate, he parts his hair in the middle. That is probably the greatest effort we see in that direction.

Now, Sir, it has been claimed by the government that they have been instrumental in bringing about whatever measure of good times Canada has been enjoying and my hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Elson), in dealing with that subject a few days ago saw fit to give credit to Divine Providence for contributing the very good crops that have helped to make reasonably good times in Canada. He was immediately brought to book by hon. members on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) got after him in these words :

> The hon. gentleman thinks that Providence has had more to do with our success than anything else, but in my experience I have found that Providence was of very little use to me or to the people I have had to deal with.

Probably his intercourse has been confined to the government for some time past.

> My experience is that where success and prosperity exist it is to be found among the people who help themselves.

I will give the hon. gentleman this credit by saying that there are evidently other members of the House who accept the same doctrine. If we look over the Saskatchewan land deal, the Robbins Irrigation deal, the various leases of land that have been made out there, the Blairmore townsite steal and the accumulation of vast timber areas under conditions that will hardly bear investigation, we are irresistibly driven to the conclusion that there are others who are guided by the motto that 'The Lord Helps those who help themselves.' But a good deal depends, when we use these mottoes, as to the interpretation and application of them and I would advise that hon. gentleman to look into this matter a little because there is just a possibility that the inspiration that has helped him in this interpretation may have come from the bottomless pit and not from above.

The claim of the government that they have been instrumental in bringing good times to Canada will stand looking into a little. I have no doubt that they have reiterated this so much that they have succeeded in making themselves believe that they had something to do with it. But I feel like giving them some credit. I think they have done something towards bringing about good times in Canada. One of the principal things for which I would feel like giving them credit is that they have not put into effect after they came into power the policy which they advocated while in opposition. That puts me a little in mind of a boy's composition on whisky. It started off like this : Whisky has saved thousands of people's lives. When called upon to give an explanation it went something like this : Whisky has saved thousands of people's lives by people not drinking it and killing themselves. If the government have, to some extent, saved the situation in Canada it has been along the same lines ; that they have not put into effect the policy that they advocated, in opposition, which would have killed Canada. In regard to the claim that they have been instrumental to some extent in bringing good times to Canada, I am reminded of an old gentleman who, a few years ago, lived in the constituency I represent. He was a very quiet and inoffensive man but he used to take a little too much to drink sometimes. Two men of grosser calibre got into a row after which one of them displayed a discoloured optic. A wag made the old gentleman believe that he had something to do with bringing about that result although he was not within gun shot of the place and he was surprised to find next morning that he was responsible for giving another citizen of the town a black eye. The old gentleman spent a great deal of time in going around explaining to his friends that he must have struck harder than he knew and that his provocation must have been great. He was thoroughly convinced that he must have done it and it was not without a little pride that he mentioned the circumstance. I have no doubt that the members of the government have told the thing so often that they really have come to believe themselves that they had something to do with bringing good times to Canada. But, they have been repeatedly challenged to point to the particular piece of legislation or the particular Act of administration which has in some measure contributed to good times in this country. So far they have been unable to point to a particular Act. I had lived in hope that at some time, on some occasion, somewhere, some member of the government or some supporter of theirs would rise in this place or somewhere else and enlighten the public upon this question. But, I have just about given up hope that I will ever witness the attempt. They ought to pick out the particular piece of legislation and, reasoning from cause to effect, show the people of the country just what they have done so that we may emulate them in future. I hope that at some time some of them will give us a little light upon this subject. So far we are unaware of any such piece of legislation.

Now, dealing with the question again of depression in this country, it is well for us as reasoning citizens and members of this House to look into this question and see what the causes really are. To my mind one of the contributory causes is the shortness of crops. Another cause that apparently has not been very much consider-

ed by the members of this House is the great drain on the resources of Canada that is constantly going on to keep up the markets in Wall Street, the kings of the wheat pit in Chicago and other speculative interests. I believe that the drain in this respect is more widespread than the public generally realizes, and I think it is the duty of every member of this House and every public man in Canada, to direct attention to the matter. I believe that Canada contributes very largely to the lambs that are annually slaughtered to keep up these same financial magnates. I believe that if the money lost in this way were gathered together and put into one great aggregate sum, it would startle the people of this Dominion.

Another thing which has drained the resources of Canada is this reckless mining speculation which has sunk a vast amount of money in the Cobalt region and other regions of a like nature. It has been stated that a mine usually consists of a hole in the ground and one or more liars around and about it, and I believe that the general public as a rule realize very little out of the money sunk in ventures of that kind. Certain of the press have raised their warning voice, but I have no doubt that many gentlemen of the press have put their money in such ventures and that this fact has to some extent paralysed the arm that held the pen. I believe that ministers of the gospel should raise a warning voice, some of them have, but there are quite a number of them who have not, because they like other members of the community have been caught by this get-rich-quick microbe and it has silenced their tongues.

I want to say a word or two with regard to the trade policy of the government because after all that is very important. We are told that the magnitude of our export trade is a guarantee of the soundness of our fiscal policy, and the members of the government and those who support them delight to take the sum total of our exports and our imports and they roll the total volume of trade under their tongues as a sweet morsel, and they point to it as proof positive that Canada is progressing on right lines. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the temerity to take issue with that conclusion. To my mind it is not true that Canada is adopting the wisest course in this matter. Let me give an illustration. Suppose a cattle rancher or a farmer dealing in cattle in Alberta has cattle to sell; he rounds them up at considerable expense, gets them to some place where he can ship them, gets them loaded on a train and they start on their long journey. They are taken at very great expense to Montreal; somebody has to accompany the train and look after that stock; they have to be rested and watered and they are removed from the car; they have to be fed and handled at a good deal of expense and finally they are loaded on the steamer at Montreal. Then some one has to accompany them across the Atlantic; they have to stand the rigours of the ocean voyage, and generally some of them die in transit. They have to be landed at some market of the old nations of the world; they have to be looked after there for some time before they are fit to be slaughtered; their value is reduced a great deal; they are many pounds less in weight than when they started on their journey, and all the incidental expenses have to be borne. Now, I hold that this is not an ideal condition of things. I think a better market could be procured than away on the other side of the earth; I hold that we can convert Calgary into a Birmingham and Edmonton into a Manchester; that we can take the other towns such as Medicine Hat, Strathcona, Red Deer, Lacombe, High River, Macleod, Pincher Creek and convert them into manufacturing centres. We can provide a market right at home, and it is my view that the home market is the best under all conditions. I think it would be wise policy for the government of this country to bend their energies in that direction, but apparently the government takes an opposite view. The government seems to imagine that the further away a market is and the more expensive it is to get there, the better it is. That seems to be their settled policy. After the people of Canada, at an enormous expense have reached that foreign market with all its disabilities they get back what little profit is left for them and they put it in their pocket for the moment. Then the farmer and others scrape around and they add to that the little money they have made at home, the money their wives have made out of the butter and eggs, and they scrape on until they get the last dollar and then they send it over to the United States to purchase goods manufactured in that country and on which they have the freight rates with all the incidental expenses to bring into Canada. Now, that may be an admirable condition of affairs in the mind of the government, but I am bound to say that it is just about as nearly as possible opposed to common sense as it can very well be. However, the members of the government delight in picturing to the farmers of this country the beauties of an arrangement like that. Indeed, we cannot always tell what the government really does mean. We did not know until the other day—even though they have been occupying the treasury benches for some years—what a splendid thing it was for Canada to have an adverse balance of trade. Such a declaration from the government is not without its compensation; that I am bound to admit. It is a very nice thing for the farmer of Ontario or the west whose crop has been damaged by drouth or frost, and who finds that when he comes to sum up things at the end of the year and pay his help that he is a little behind and has

to go to the bank and draw the little savings that he has there. Of course he would be feeling blue about that, but after he has read the great speech of the Minister of Agriculture he will be satisfied he is on the right lines and on the high road to prosperity. And the merchant who has been buying a lot of goods and has done his annual stock taking and finds that he has bought a good deal more than he has been able to sell, and who has no more goods on the shelf and no more money in the bank and has had anxious days and sleepless nights, when such a merchant reads the beautiful speech of the Minister of Agriculture he will realize that he will very soon —if he keeps on in that line—be a millionaire; if he does not get into bankruptcy in the meantime. A good deal which is hardly worth following has been said by members on the government side. The hon. gentleman from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) referred to this question and proved to his own satisfaction that Canada is realizing enormously on this adverse balance of trade. He says that by subtracting the value of our exports from the value of our imports, we arrive at the amount of money that we have made in the year, and that in all probability we have made a great deal more than that amount. Our total sales have been a little over $238,000,000 in the last year and according to the hon. gentleman's way of thinking the difference of $122,000,000 between that and our imports is profit that we have made on that amount of business and there are other profits in addition to that, according to his reasoning. Some of the great financial institutions of this country are making a serious mistake in not having that gentleman on their board of directors. Any bank governed by that hon. gentleman would have no shortage of money; it would have such a large cash balance that it would be able to relieve any stringency in the Canadian money market without any trouble whatever.

The farmers of the United States are in a better position than the farmers of Canada. In visiting relatives engaged in the farming business in that country a little time ago, I discussed this question with a gentleman there. He pointed to a large market wagon capable of carrying a couple of tons, and said: I can load that with perishable produce from my place, drive it into the market town and dispose of it for cash in twenty minutes. I replied: In an ordinary town in Ontario a man driving in with a load like that could peddle it from Dan to Beersheba and then he would have to truck it off in some of the stores, but he would still have to take some of it back to his farm. I asked him how it was that he could dispose of it as he said, and he replied: The explanation is very plain. We do all our manufacturing for the United States in our own country, we do a large part of the manufacturing for Canada, and we do a good deal of the manufacturing for the rest of the world; that means that we have large towns, very large centres which create a market right at home for the farming community. That, I think, is a position of affairs infinitely better for the farmer than the condition in this country.

The hon. gentleman has pointed out that farmers are coming from certain sections in the United States into Canada to benefit by our free lands. I am prepared to admit that there are a large number of farmers coming from the United States to Canada, but they are coming from that portion of the United States that has not yet been filled with manufactories to the same extent as the middle and eastern States. But we have not nearly as many farmers coming from over there as the figures given by hon. gentlemen opposite would indicate. Prior to the taking of the last census in the Northwest figures were compiled by the government and according to these tables there should have been a larger number of people there than was found there by those taking the census. According to their figures 300,000 people had got lost. I have very little confidence in the method used in securing those figures. I had occasion some time ago, when coming up from St. Paul to Winnipeg to cross the boundary line. I had met some gentlemen from the other side of the line who were going up to Canada to speculate in Canadian lands; there was not one homesteader or settler in the party. At the boundary one gentleman answered the question put by the officer for all the rest. I asked this gentleman afterwards what the question put to him was, and he replied that the officer asked them if they were American settlers; the gentleman answered that they were, and consequently they were all put down as settlers coming from the United States. That is about the care exercised in compiling the figures given to us from time to time. On another occasion I was going from Fort William to Winnipeg. An officer in uniform came into the car and made certain inquiries in regard to the destination of the people. All the information that he seemed to require was an answer to the question whether you were going to Winnipeg. We were nearly all going there, as there was really no other place to go, and I have no doubt we were all put down as settlers going to that northwestern country on account of the answers given to that question. I ascertained the calling and destination of the various people in the car, and there was not one settler among them. There were half a dozen commercial travellers going there to take orders; a woman with a couple of children who had been visiting her parents at Fort Francis and who was going to Minneapolis; an old gentleman who had been on a trip to buy potatoes and was returning to the west; an old man and an old lady, a couple of boys

and a girl and a young man, members of a troupe who had been giving dime shows, they were from the State of Iowa. They had a couple of trick dogs with them and I presume they were all put down, dogs and all, as settlers going up into that northwestern country. We are told that the population of Canada is increasing by leaps and bounds. I have shown you some of the sources from which the figures are derived, the figures which have enabled hon. gentlemen opposite to arrive at the conclusions which they announced to us.

I wish to point out that our emigration to the United States to-day is probably equal to the number of people coming to Canada from the United States. During the last ten years I am confident there is not a year in which there have not been as many going from Canada to the United States as coming from the United States to Canada. We have a constant stream of emigration going out of this country to the adjoining republic, composed of the cream of our young men and women, who find over there a diversity of employment which they cannot find at home. Our young women cross the line to become nurses in the hospitals, to take charge of or work in millinery and dressmaking establishments, to become domestic servants, and in time the majority of them marry American citizens and will become the mothers of future generations in the United States. This thing is constantly going on, hon. gentlemen opposite to the contrary notwithstanding. In the town where I reside a considerable proportion have gone to the United States in the last few years, and the same is, I believe, true of other towns and villages throughout Canada. Making every allowance for the general tendency of people to move to large centres, I believe that the trade policy of the United States is the great attraction which is drawing our people from this side. Owing to that policy the Americans pay better wages, as a rule, and the conditions under which the labouring class work are much better. We cannot hope in Canada for any great increase in population while this state of things exists. All the time we are working at a great disadvantage. By their very high tariff wall we are debarred from doing any considerable business with our American neighbours; and yet we raise but a very low tariff wall against them, so that when our manufacturers demand British fair-play in the great battle for commercial supremacy, they find themselves confronted by conditions that are absolutely unfair and un-British. In my judgment, we cannot hope for the development of any great trade under the circumstances. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we are increasing our population by leaps and bounds, but it seems to me evident that Canada, which has occupied this portion of the North American continent for the last three hundred years, has not much to boast of in the fact that she has to-day but a population of some six millions, while on the other hand the United States, which have only been occupying their portion of the continent about the same length of time, have a population of eighty millions. It would be no great surprise to me if it were shown that possibly one-half the native-born Canadians are in the United States at present. In proof of this I need only point out to the fact that when some time ago a great disaster overtook a city in California, there was hardly a city, town or village in Canada which had not given some contribution from its citizens to the numbers who were in that city at the time of the earthquake, many of whom had gone there within the last few years, and one can readily understand what anxiety is felt by their friends and relatives who remained at home. If a like catastrophe should happen in Detroit, Chicago, Buffalo, New York or Boston, the number of Canadians affected would be very great indeed. Those American cities are full of Canadians who have gone there within the last few years, and that number is increasing every day. What we need in Canada is a policy which will develop this country, which will keep our people at home, and then we shall have a population filling up our fertile lands of which we might well be proud. To-day we are trying to make up for this exodus by bringing in foreigners, by importing Doukhobors, Galicians, unattached people from all the countries of central Europe and the floating population of the great cities of England. When a representative came over here last summer he said that we were not getting good settlers from England, but simply the offscouring of the cities. I am simply using the term used by Mr. Perks, and I think he knew whereof he was speaking. It would be well for us to ponder over the statement he made, and see whether the immigrants we are getting are really of such a class. In the town where I live we have some of these, and it is impossible to get them men to do a day's work. Some of our charitably disposed ladies went around getting work for the wives of these men, simply because their husbands will sit down at the wharfs and fish and chew tobacco, which is about all you can possibly get them to do. Of course, all are not of that class, but a large number are, and such people will not contribute anything to the development of this country, but become a source of great anxiety, expense and trouble. It is impossible that we should bring into Canada large numbers of that class without lowering the moral tone of our population. How are you going to assimilate them? How are you going to make good citizens out of them? When the time of depression comes, we will have a task on our hands greater than we are

able to undertake. It would be much better for Canada, even if our population did not increase, to pay more attention to the quality of those we bring in than to their numbers. I would rather keep in our country one good Canadian young man or woman than bring in a dozen of these foreigners, because the result would be much better. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up the time of the House at more length than I expected. There are some other subjects that I think might fairly well be discussed; but as I am an advocate of short speaking, as I do not believe in any member of this House, unless the occasion imperatively demands it, taking up more than an hour of its time, I shall not trespass on the rule I think should be followed. It is unfair to members generally that a few should make very long speeches and thus shut out others who may wish to address themselves to the subjects that may happen to be before the House. I thank the House, Mr. Speaker, for the patience with which they have listened to my remarks and the courtesy and attention they have given me, and shall very gladly give way to others.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH (North Oxford.) I wish, Mr. Speaker, to trespass but a few moments on the indulgence of the House. I rise under rather discouraging circumstances, as I have to be classed, according to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright), as a light weight, starting in at this stage of the debate. And I was rather amused at some of the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. William Wright) who has just sat down. I have been taught to believe that the popular theory concerning what is called the adverse balance of trade is, according to such authorities as Thorold Rogers, Fawcett, Mill, Ricardo and others, quite a mistaken idea. However, we have the opinion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wm. Wright) against that of such distinguished authorities as those whose names I have given. We have in our provincial university text books which teach the very opposite doctrine to that enunciated by the hon. member for Muskoka. That provincial university is supported by public funds. It receives a larger measure of support from the present Conservative government of Ontario than it ever did from the Liberal government in the past. If it is teaching public heresies, it is the duty of hon. members on the opposition benches to endeavour to convert the premier of Ontario and to bring about a change in the teaching of that university. And, that accomplished, they would still have work to do; for, as I understand, and happen to know, in the universities of Great Britain and in nearly every university in the United States, the teaching is the same as that in Toronto University. True, the hon. member for Muskoka says that this is wrong doctrine, that it is false political economy. I trust that he will at once set about correcting and righting these wrongs that he has endeavoured to point out. I shall not claim much of the time of hon. members in what I have to say. While I entertain, and have stated that I entertain, a high regard for the methods of debate followed by the leaders on both sides of this House, yet I regret, in reading the newspapers and in listening to the discussions in this House, to find assertions made that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), while on his western tour, when he was at Medicine Hat never referred to the Robbins Irrigation deal, and at Saskatoon said not one word concerning the North Atlantic Trading Company. And while he was in the country of the Doukhobors, he was entirely silent with reference——

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. George Smith) allow me to ask a question?

Mr. GEORGE SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. I was at the Saskatoon meeting, and heard Mr. Borden speak of the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH. It is, then, the word of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Thomas Chisholm) against the word of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher) who, as I understood him, stated what I have quoted.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. But I was present, and heard it myself. The Minister of Agriculture was not there.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH. This reminds me of an anecdote I heard once concerning Wendell Phillips. He was travelling in a railway train; on the same train was a clergyman, who, hearing that the great Wendell Phillips was aboard, expressed a great desire to meet him. The conductor offered to introduce the clergyman to Wendell Phillips, and when the clergyman met him, he said: 'Mr. Phillips, I am very pleased to make your acquaintance. I have a great admiration for much that you have said on the public platform. But there is one thing I notice, and that is that Wendell Phillips does not go to the Southern States to talk Abolition.' (It would appear that the leader of the opposition, when he goes to the west, does not talk about those subjects that he talks about here that particularly relate to that country.) But the reply of Wendell Phillips to the clergyman was characteristic. He said: 'You believe in the doctrine of eternal punishment, do you not?' And when the clergyman replied in the affirmative, Wendell Phillips asked him, 'Well, why don't you go there and preach that doctrine?'

Now, with reference to the question of immigration which was touched on by the hon. member for Muskoka, there is one thing that can be said with certainty, and that is that during the regime of the Liberal party, the goods have been delivered. Mr. Emmerson Hough, the celebrated American writer, has stated that we have going on here in Canada one of the greatest world-movements of humanity known in the life of the race—greater than the movement of the Aryans into Europe, greater than the movement of the Goths and Cimri from Northern into Southern Europe. Now, surely the policy of the Liberal government is entitled to some credit for causing this great influx of population. Surely there is some quality when there is so much quantity. These people are not all Doukhobors; they are not all Galicians. And, even if they were all Doukhobors, I am not sure that they would not be an advantage to the country. I was talking to an elector of North Oxford who had visited the Doukhobor settlements. I asked him what sort of people they were. He told me they were very much like the German Mennonites of North Oxford. Well, I can say that there is no better class of citizens in this country than these German Mennonites, as found in the riding of North Oxford. While I was in Edmonton last year, I stood on the corner of Jasper avenue and one of the streets leading out to the north; and I saw turning the corner of the street, and trekking out, what they call out there a bull team. There was the sturdy six-footer, with cow-hide boots, long whip, and his four oxen; behind that team there were two mares, two colts, and the female portion of the immigrants on the second load. There was wealth going into the country, and I thought that perhaps this was a Canadian who, driven out during the lean years of Conservative rule, had returned to enjoy the sunshine and prosperity of the Liberal regime.

Now, I have felt, sometimes, that I was probably not doing my duty to Ontario in sending broadcast throughout my riding literature advertising the great West. But my better thought tells me that that is a provincial idea. I believe that we in Ontario feel that we are doing a great work in empire-building when we start our men out there to keep the West, Canadian—to keep it, if you will, Anglo-Saxon. If we are losing, we are certainly in some respects, gaining; if we have given, we also receive; if we have taught, we also are taught. And I believe that we in Ontario are quite pleased to do our part in this work of empire-building by sending our sons out to that great West to keep that West, Canadian.

I believe we are writing a page of history to-day in that boundless west in which all Canadians of the east and west can feel a pride. We are writing that story, not with the implements of war but with the peaceful implements, the axe and the ploughshare of the pioneer. Permit me to quote, as showing our honoured Premier's part in this history, an opinion from a non-partisan source; I would like to read an article from Appleton's Magazine for November, 1906, written by Mr. Wm. S. Stewart. I will only read a few paragraphs:

> For more than one hundred and forty years in Canada the question whether it was possible for Anglo-Saxon and Gallic communities to grow and prosper together remained unanswered. If to-day it not only appears possible, but is an observable fact, the result is the work chiefly of one man, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.
>
> Bismarck achieved a united Germany by war, but the man of blood and iron would have failed in Canada. The conditions which confronted the constructive statesmen of the Dominion called for conciliation and compromise. A broad-minded grasp of the problem, clearness of perception between essentials and non-essentials, the genius to conceive a policy which could be accepted by all sides, and the courage and persistence to follow it against whatever obstacles—these were the qualities demanded of the man who should unite Canada. For his success in the face of great difficulties Sir Wilfrid Laurier is well entitled to the encomium of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, that he is 'one of the five great men of the world.'

Further on he states:

> As the settlement of the school question in 1896 was the beginning of the end of racial strife in Canada, these steps are the first in the evolution of an independent nation north of the United States. Both are the accomplishments of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

This is an American writer, as you will notice. I will conclude this quotation:

> The dominating policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's life—a policy early determined by the conditions in the Dominion—has been the championship of civil and religious freedom, and a resistance to the denationalizing tendencies of sectarianism and racialism.

I think, Sir, we may well say that we have less of religious and racial antagonism in Canada to-day than we have had in years gone by. I have read Tam-o'-Shanter, and I believe that when he describes the trip of his hero from the old Kirk Alloway to the 'Keystane o' the Auld Brig,' when he describes the evil spirits, the pitfalls and the dangers, he is drawing a picture of life with its pitfalls and dangers. I believe that we in Canada here have passed from our Kirk Alloway to the 'Keystane,' and that we have now a plain road forward to a united Canada, and to a great empire.

Now, one of the chief endeavours of the Conservative party to-day is to try to create a belief that we in Canada are morally and politically worse than we were in years gone by. On this point allow me to read a quotation from a letter of the Hon. Edward Blake, written in 1891, and which is reproduced in Willison's life of Sir Wilfrid

Laurier. The quotation is taken from his celebrated revenue tariff letter:

Worse, far worse. It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue and a death-like apathy in public opinion; racial, religious and provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed, with a subservient parliament, an autocratic executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes.

Is not that a true picture of Canada under the regime of the late Sir John A. Macdonald? Let us look at it for a moment. Lowered standards of public virtue—I think we may find all over America a tendency of late years to raise the standard of public morals, and I think you will admit that some progress has been made in that direction. Racial religious animosities—I think we have happily passed in Canada to-day that sad era of racial and religious animosities which formerly prevailed in Canada. Debauched constituencies—surely our Conservative friends will admit that this is a true picture of the conditions in 1891. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wm. Wright) referred to the annual report of the Bank of Montreal. I would like to read a quotation found in the same report, from the vice-president, Mr. Clouston:

The stringency is largely the result of universal prosperity and as a natural consequence the world has been spending more and saving less. This state of affairs will cure itself by retrenchment. When it comes suddenly, as it usually does, it brings many hardships, but we will eventually reach a much better and sounder basis.

The president, Sir George Drummond, referring to the agitation against trusts in the United States, said:

No doubt all these disturbing conditions may be expected to pass away and normal and saner views once more rule, and it must not be overlooked that all the present trouble leaves the resources of that country practically undiminished and its powers of recuperation unimpaired. Here in Canada we have escaped most, if not all the troubles of our neighbours.

Further on he refers to this adverse balance of trade of which I have spoken, and I also find this paragraph:

Canada has experienced a decade of remarkable commercial expansion. Ten years ago our total foreign trade, on the basis of imports for home consumption and domestic exports, amounted to $234,926,000; in 1907, on the same basis, it reached $571,783,000, showing an increase of not less than 143 per cent.

According to the census of 1901 the population was 5,370,000, and in the six years which have since elapsed the returns show some 930,000 immigrants to have entered the country for settlement and adding to this the natural increment our population to-day is approximately 6,600,000, representing a gain of 23 per cent, as compared with a gain of 143 per cent in foreign trade.

These figures indicate an extraordinary increase in population and commercial development, perhaps unparalleled in any country and, mark you, during a period corresponding with a period of Liberal government, from 1896 to 1906-7.

Now, one word more and I am through. In reference to hard times, I think you will find from the statement of that vice-president that they are rather the opposite. It has been a period of over prosperity. I was talking to a citizen of Detroit only the other day, I asked him what was the trouble over there, and his answer was 'over-prosperity.' He said: Take the building line, we have been going on in Detroit, our population has nearly doubled, we have now a population of nearly 500,000, and during the last three years we have been building to excess; probably not more than $300 or $500 has been paid on a $3,000 house. When the crisis comes, when the hard times arrive the equity of these would-be owners will be gone and whole streets will probably be deserted by the owners and their equity will be swamped.

Another matter that almost escaped my observation is the silence of members opposite in reference to the Arctic scandal. We have heard no more about that Arctic scandal. Why? I suppose it is that expedition has made good, that the expedition has gone to its destination, policed the shores of that great Canadian sea, asserted the sovereignty of Canada, or, if you will, of the British Empire, on these shores, has returned and has shown by what it has accomplished that it has justified all the expenditure. Hence the silence of hon. members opposite.

Mr. W. JACKSON (West Elgin.) Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for the citizens of Canada to read the speeches of the members of this House to know whether there are hard times or not. I think that they know themselves the condition of affairs in their own localities just as well before they have read some of the speeches that have been delivered in this House as they do afterwards. I think they are the best judges and they will be the judges. We have been discussing the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I claim it makes very little difference to the majority of the people of Canada so long as we are well governed. What we want in Canada is an honest and advancing administration. Now, we have a bill of fare laid down before us in the speech from the Throne which is more remarkable for what it does not contain than what it does contain. The best proof we have of this is that upon looking over the Order Paper we find that two prominent members sitting on the government benches have given notice of motions, one for the remodelling and one for the abolition altogether of our upper chamber, the Senate. What has led up to this agitation? The

motions that have been introduced here represent the opinion of the people from one end of this Dominion to the other that there is something wrong with our upper chamber. There is a feeling, it appears, from one end of the country to the other that some change should be made in the Senate. I do not say that there is a very strong opinion that the upper chamber should be abolished, but there is a feeling abroad that the Senate should be elevated to a higher standard than it has up to the present time attained. It is my contention, and I believe it is the contention of all right thinking citizens of the Dominion, that we should send to this chamber the very best men that the country can produce. I have no objection to whatever party is in power sending men of its own stripe to the Senate, but I do say that it should select good men to occupy seats in that House. I am not so narrow-minded as to say that there are not good men in the Liberal ranks, but I do say that it is from among the best men that the appointments should be made to that body. I will go farther and say that there should be no trafficking in so far as that body is concerned. What would we say if we were to find members of our bench stooping to the things that members of our Senate are doing to-day? When a man is appointed to the Senate, from whichever side he may come, or by whichever party he is appointed, he should from that time on refrain from taking an active part in party and political controversy. We respect our bench. We would not respect our bench if our judges went about the country and acted in the way that a great many of our senators are acting to-day. If they would go into the country when elections are not on and in that way show their good will and attempt to develop and improve the tone of our people we would not say much about them. But, we only find them moving around the country when there is an election or something of that kind going on. We find them, when there is a candidate wanted in a constituency, supporting aspirants for that position. We respect the bench, and I believe that in Canada we have a bench that is above reproach, but let our judges do as our senators are doing to-day and we will lose that high respect for them that we have at present. I will cite you one instance here. The right hon. the leader of this government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was forced by the condition of things to reorganize his cabinet. I ask you: Had not Mr. Derbyshire been member for Brockville at the time, would he be in the upper chamber to-day ? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we should get the very best talent we have in Canada to go into that chamber. Then, our people would have confidence in the Senate, and it would fill a want in this country. I regret another plank that this government seem to have adopted and that is that no man can receive an appointment either in the Senate, on the bench, or to any other high position, except by passing the threshold, by being a member of the party or a candidate of this government. That is a vicious system, and one which is bound to demoralize the tone of these institutions.

There is another question that I wish to call to your attention for a moment or two, and that is a question that I believe I have some knowledge of. I refer to the cattle industry, which is an important branch of agriculture. Last year I called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that his department was not giving that attention and care which it ought to this branch of our agricultural industry, and the minister was kind enough to say he agreed with most that I had said, and he would see that my ideas were put in force. No country in the world has as fertile an almost unlimited area of pasturage as has Canada. There is no gainsaying the fact that we can produce the best cattle and the best beef in the world, but I regret, as a farmer, to have to say that we are not doing so. We have just as good cattle in Canada as they have anywhere else, but the trouble is that our cattle is not uniform. We have a Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, we have experimental farms from one end of the Dominion to the other, but with all that they are doing practically nothing along the lines I have indicated. Let the average man who wants to engage in agricultural pursuits and who has no special knowledge of farming, let him look at the results of the demonstrations on these farms as published in the blue books, and he will be driven to the conclusion that no man can engage in the industry and come out with a balance on the right side unless he is subsidized by the government or a rich friend. Well, that is misleading. We who have spent our lives in that industry know that such is not correct, because we have built up our homes and we have put aside some savings for our families, and we have demonstrated that if agriculture is properly conducted there is a fair profit in it. I regret the Minister of Agriculture has not carried out the suggestions I gave him last year as he promised to do, and I trust that he will now see his way to adopt my ideas. Canadians can go to the United States and carry off nearly all the first-class prizes for their cattle, but notwithstanding that I regret to have to say that when we go to the British market our cattle are not quoted as high as United States cattle. We have heard a great deal during the last three or four years about what the Department of Agriculture is doing in the matter of cold storage and the improvement of butter and cheese, but whilst they are bolstering up that one branch of the agricultural industry they should not neglect all others. As my hon. friend who sits be-

side me told the Minister of Agriculture last year, he is paying too much attention to the butter and cheese industry and neglecting the live stock industry. I would point out to the minister that no branch of agricultural industry can be conducted with as little labour as that of producing beef, and in a country like Canada, where labour is scarce, that is an important consideration. The government should direct its attention to an effort to make our herds more uniform, so that we may produce better beef; and if they did so, it would tend greatly towards increasing the revenue of the country. I do not think there can be a grander sight than to see a herd of Durhams, Herefords or Polled Angus roaming over the pastures for seven or eight months of the year, feeding, fattening and becoming more valuable to their owner without any laborious effort on his part. I trust the Minister of Agriculture will introduce legislation calculated to improve that trade.

There is another matter I wish to call attention to. Although a farmer myself, I represent a constituency partly agricultural and partly industrial. I believe it is the duty of every man in this House, no matter what his business, to assist in the development of the natural resources of Canada. I think the population of this Dominion may be divided into three great classes—the agricultural, the industrial and those engaged in transportation—and each is dependent on the other. To quote the motto: 'United we stand, divided we fall'; the agricultural interests cannot stand without the transportation interests, and what would the transportation interests be without progressive agriculture? In this connection I want to say a word about farm crossings, and now I have no reference to railways crossing public highways. I sympathize with what the member for East Middlesex said with regard to public highway crossings. Of course, the railway corporations do not want to injure the agricultural industry of this country, but nevertheless they are looking out for their own interests first. Traffic on our railways is increasing every year, trains are running faster, and in the near future there will be a demand for greater protective regulations at public crossings. I sympathize with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) in his efforts to provide greater safety for the people living in populous centres, but I regret his Bill does not go further and that it does not seek to provide greater safety at farm crossings, which are just as dangerous as crossings in cities and towns. This legislation gives railway companies power to run their lines from one point to another, and in doing that they may take away the farmer's land. The farmer has no say in this matter and I think it is the duty of this government to relieve the farmer, as far as it lies in their power, of the inconvenience to which he is continually put by reason of that railway going through his farm. It may be said that the farmer enjoys the convenience of a railway near his door, but he enjoys no more convenience than does the farmer next him through whose farm the railway does not run.

In a large country such as this conditions vary in different districts and possibly it may be difficult to enact legislation that will be equally suitable for all parts of the country, but I shall describe the conditions that exist in the section from which I come, in the western portion of the province of Ontario. We have running through the counties lying north of Lake Erie, a network of railways such as cannot be found in any other section of the Dominion. It forms a short cut for all of these American railways between New York and Chicago, and there may be three or four railways running side by side through the one farm. It is a great inconvenience to the farmer to have these roads run through his place, but he has no redress; they run the road through his farm, paying him for the land but never for the inconvenience that he and his successors are put to. The traffic on these roads is increasing with great rapidity, and the speed of the express trains is also increasing. Some of the roads running through St. Thomas between Detroit and Buffalo have a running time of between fifty and sixty miles per hour. I wish to quote some information with reference to the amount of traffic in that country, which I secured for the use of the committee on the Lord's Day Act, session before last. I have here a letter addressed to myself:

> Dear sir,—With reference to our recent conversation, I find that during the months of January, February and March of this year, 105,959 freight cars were moved out of St. Thomas in 2,497 trains on the main line only, making an average of 1,177 cars a day.

That is only one of the roads doing business through that part of the Dominion and in addition to that heavy freight traffic, there are a dozen express trains a day with scarcely one stop so that they are of hardly any convenience to the people of Canada; they are practically through trains between Detroit and Buffalo or Chicago and New York, with this vastly and rapidly increasing volume of traffic, the inconvenience to the farmers is greatly increasing.

Two or three years ago a commission of which Mr. Robertson, of St. John, was chairman, went through the country investigating the question of public crossings, but the public crossing is not of so much interest to the farmer as the private crossing. He uses the public crossing for the driving of stock possibly twice a year but he has to use his private crossing for that purpose three or four times a day, and while there is on the statute-book an almost perfect definition of a public crossing, there is no provision for a private crossing in the statute-

book. At the sitting of that commission in St. Thomas, a number of farmers, some of whom had travelled forty miles to be present, testified and the chairman promised he would lay their ideas before the Railway Department. Mr. Hugh McAlpine, a farmer through whose farm a railway runs, said :

I came here more for information than to give suggestions. I have a railway going through my farm. I find that as far as our own interests are concerned we are naturally very selfish, but this question is a very serious matter with the farmer, when he attempts to cross the track with a herd of cattle: he always has to get assistance in driving them over the track. I have thought this over and have had considerable trouble. Where farmers have a track running through their farms I would like to make a suggestion that I think would be a help to him, and that is for the farmer to have fences built up to the track on his farm crossings. If it is too expensive for the company to give, let the farmer have the privilege of putting it up himself. I have this summer attempted to drive cattle across the track alone and I was in danger. It is not always easy for the farmer to get help. When you do this and a train comes along, a number will go east and others west and then you are in trouble and also in danger. I would suggest that if the farmers cannot get the railway company to build up to the track that they be allowed to do it themselves under the inspection of the railway company and have them kept so that it will be safe for all. If I am going with a drove of cattle to market, I generally have assistance, but cannot always get it every time I drive my cattle over the track on my farm. On my farm there is no chance of getting a subway under the track. With a herd of cows, once they get in the way of crossing over two or three times a day it is not so bad but it is a serious matter to do it with steers. The farmers placed in this position should have some consideration.

Q. You mean to have the privilege of making a fence up to the track and then you would not ask for a cattle guard. You could manage them across the track if you had them up to a point?—A. Yes, I could feel safer then. The expense would be very trifling and if we cannot get the railroad company to do it, I would be willing to go to the expense myself if I had the privilege for the sake of the safety. It is a very serious matter.

These men who do not have railways do not seem to have any sympathy with the man who has to cross them two or three times a day, and it is a very serious matter and we have no right to suffer.

Now that is the idea of a prominent farmer whose farm is crossed by one of these roads. He is willing as he says here to go on and erect these fences in order to secure safety for all concerned.

I wish also to quote from the evidence of Mr. Hill, who said:

I do not know that I have anything to say about the public crossings. I am interested in the farm crossings. I live in Aldborough——

This man came forty miles to put his ideas before the commission expecting to get relief from this government.

—and there is a double-track on the M. C. R. and L. E. and D. R. also passes through my place.

There is a space of five rods between the two. I find it very inconvenient driving my cattle through there, and I think dangerous both to my cattle and the railway. It is not safe for one person to drive them through there. There are ditches and water on each side, some will go down to the water and some up the track. I have fifteen rods to drive them until they are through and three tracks to cross. The trains run very fast there and have often come at the rate of a mile a minute. I have quite a lot of stock. Have nine cows and thirty-eight cattle, and every time the cows come home they have to cross those three tracks, so it is very inconvenient to me. I think as Mr. McAlpine does, that if there was a fence built up the tracks it would be of some help.

I wish now to read the opinion of an ex-member of this House, Mr. Jabel Robinson, whose acquaintance many hon. gentlemen here no doubt have enjoyed. He said:

Farmers have rights as well as the railway companies and we want them to respect their rights and they will if they are made to. I have great respect for those who have railways running through their farms. He has to drive his cattle over tracks twice a day to water them and you can see the difficulty he has in driving the cattle, and I think it would be only wise for you to recommend in a case of that kind, that the railways assist the farmers to get a proper crossing.

That is one point I think the farmer should have consideration about. Mr. McAlpine's point is that it should be fenced up to the track. I think that is right. . After you get through the gate there is generally water in the railway ditches and the cattle will turn down to the water and you have difficulty in getting them back and through the other gate.

Let me just read what the Act says about these farm crossings:

Every company shall make crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried, convenient and proper for the crossing of the railway for farm purposes.

I claim that that does not go far enough. The second clause is as follows:

Live stock, in using such crossings, shall be in charge of some competent person, who shall take all reasonable care and precaution to avoid accidents.

As a matter of fact, the farmers take every precaution that they can, but they have this difficulty to contend with. Take any of our domestic animals, take, for instance, a horse and buggy, as soon as you bring that horse to the plank and he sees the shining steel of the railway track, that horse is very apt to stop or falter. Take cattle, when you are driving them across, they do not want to cross that concern at all and will buck on either side. A simple remedy would be to build crossings for the private use of the farmers. I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) taking his seat and hope he will assist

the farmers in the line I am pointing out to the House. In the statute there is no provision at all as to how a farm crossing shall be constructed. All that it has reference to is the way the cattle guards and fences should be built for highway crossings. It says that the fence shall be run from the parallel fence of the railway up to the edge of the track and there an efficient cattle guard be put in. What the farmer wants is something of the same kind for his private crossing. He does not use the public crossing more than once or twice a year when he takes his cattle to market, and then he takes his men with him who drive his cattle across. But he cannot do that every time he drives his cattle across his farm.

Another thing to which I would call attention is the gates. The Act provides:

> Swing gates in such fences at farm crossings of the minimum height aforesaid, with proper hinges and fastenings. Provided that sliding or hurdle gates, constructed before the first day of February, 1904, may be maintained.

Therefore, if all the gates on those railways constructed before 1904 be sliding or hurdle gate, they need not be disturbed. But all the gates constructed after 1904 must be swing gates. Well, if it was right to relieve the farmers by ordering the companies to put up swing gates after 1904, why not have the sliding gates then in existence changed to swing gates? Take a sixteen feet sliding gate; the farmer's little daughter or son sent to drive the cattle cannot open that gate, but a child could open a swing gate. There is no desire on the part of the farmers that the gates should be removed. They want the gates to remain where they are put, but they want a safe means of getting the cattle to the other side without any possibility of their going to the right or the left. I am sure that the railway companies will not be opposed to the remedy I am suggesting. What is more dangerous for an express than to have a herd of cattle, with two or three persons behind them, trying to drive them from one side to the other, with the risk of a bullock or a horse at any minute jumping on the track in front of the engine and causing loss of life or property. You have the Act so drafted that if anything is destroyed or hurt on the railways by crossing the track the owner has no redress against the company. Hon. members all claim to be friends of the farmer, and here is an opportunity for them to put their professions into practice. There is not a man in this House who has been as good a listener and has done as little talking as I have in the three or four sessions I have been here, and I would not get up now if I did not feel that I had an imperative duty to perform on behalf of the farmers. I ask the House to do everything possible to make the responsibility and the risk to the farmer in connection with these railway crossings as light as possible, and in so doing you will, to no small extent, promote the safety of railway traffic on our railway tracks. I sincerely hope that during this session the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) will give this matter his best consideration. Nothing that has been brought about in the last twenty years will, I am confident, be as great a boon to the farmers as what I am now asking for. On looking over our legislation it will be found that the farmers are prejudiced in this matter and it is about time that a remedy should be applied. I shall not further take up the time of the House. I am asking the co-operation of each and every one in this House to assist me in removing this inconvenience under which our farming community suffer.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, the members of the government, instead of treating the matters set out in the speech from the Throne, deal with the policy which was enunciated by the leader of the opposition in his tour of Canada, which commenced at Halifax and extended to Victoria. The policy enunciated by the leader of the opposition, if we may take the press as an indication of the feeling of the people, is favoured by a large majority of Canadians from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The Minister of Finance (Hon. W. S. Fielding), in an attempt to belittle this platform, alluded to a petition which, he said, had been presented to the leader of the opposition at Winnipeg, praying that a convention should be held for the discussion of the platform of the party. I have it on the highest authority that such a petition was never presented to the leader of the opposition. The statement made by the Minister of Finance emanated from himself, or probably he took it from the Calgary 'Eye Opener' which was the first paper in Canada to state that such a petition had been presented to the leader of the opposition.

Now this platform seems to have nettled the members of the government. Why did not these hon. gentlemen and their supporters discuss the matter contained in the speech from the Throne? Simply because the speech from the Throne afforded them no material for discussion. It was stated by the Minister of Finance that this policy of the leader of the opposition was favoured by the leader of the opposition alone, and would not commend itself to the people of Canada because it was not agreed to by a convention of the Liberal Conservative party. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance this question: Does he remember when the national policy was propounded by the late Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878? Was that policy laid before a convention of the Liberal-Conservative party, or announced to the people of Canada as the utterance of a convention? No; it was simply enunciated by Sir John A. Macdonald himself;

and the people of Canada, in 1878, carried that policy by an overwhelming vote. In no uncertain tones, they instructed Sir John A. Macdonald that this policy which he had enunciated was their policy, and they gave him power to carry it into effect. Mr. Borden, taking a leaf out of the book of Sir John A. Macdonald, enunciated his own policy, and I believe that that policy commends itself to the people of Canada as fully as the national policy commended itself to the people of Canada in 1878.

A great deal has been said by the supporters of the government in this House about the great expansion in Canada's trade. And we have the remarkable statement by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) that the balance of trade shows that Canada's foreign trade is healthy and that, though the balance of trade is strongly against Canada, that is only a proof that the profits made on the exports of Canada have been used to buy greater quantities of goods abroad for importation into this country. Now, we find that last year the exports, the products of Canada, amounted to $238,000,000. The balance of trade against Canada was something like $122,000,000. According to the argument of my hon. friend from Kings, there must have been a profit of something like fifty per cent on these exports. If that were so, it would be a good thing for the people of Canada. But does any reasonable man believe that on our exports for the last fiscal year we made a profit of fifty per cent? It seems to me that to ask the question is to prove that the position of the hon. member for Kings is wholly untenable. This adverse balance of trade means that, for every man, woman and child in Canada, $20 worth of goods was brought in more than was sent out. Last year the Minister of Finance took out of the pockets of the people $1,322,000 a week or $800,000 more than was collected under the previous government eleven years ago. The taxation for the nine months ending March 31 last, amounted to $68,750,000 or $10.30 per head. The average for the five years ending 1896 was $27,750,000 or $5.66 per head. The Minister of Finance boasts of his surplus, declaring that in eight or nine years these surpluses have amounted to over $90,000,000. What has the Minister of Finance done with that money? And what was that hon. gentleman's opinion of surpluses before he entered this House to support the right hon. Prime Minister? What did he say in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' when he was simply editor of that paper and not a member of this House?

> A surplus of millions at the capital is just so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country. How long can the Dominion stand the drain?

And again:

> Every dollar of the surplus is taken out of the pockets of the people without the shadow of an excuse.

Last year he boasted that $3,000,000 more was taken out of the pockets of the people than was required to run the government of this country. Will he repeat the statements that he made previous to becoming a member of the government of Canada, and say that it is not in the interest of the people that so large an amount of money should be taken out of their pockets, that whenever a surplus is taken from them it is without a shadow of excuse? Will he tell the people of Canada that there is not a shadow of an excuse for taking these millions out of their pockets? No, but he gets up in parliament to-day and justifies it. He says: We paid out of the treasury, not only these millions of dollars, but we have paid greater sums in order to meet the wants of the people of Canada. It may be all right from his standpoint to-day, but it was not all right from his standpoint previous to 1896. He boasts of the $644,000,000 of trade to-day although the export trade only amounts to $238,000,000. As has been well said by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), after we have sent away our butter, our cheese and other products, we have to put our hands into our pockets and pay out $122,000,000 in cash to meet the balance. Still the Finance Minister does not attempt to justify the situation, he does not refer to the position he took previous to 1896; but he simply comes in here and makes a big bluff. He criticises the action of the leader of the opposition with reference to his policy and the manner in which he has put it before the country; but he does not say one word with reference to the position which he occupies himself as to the $3,000,000 of surplus and the disposition he has made of it. He says:

> The Dominion has been blessed by a long series of prosperous years, and, though at the present moment its business is being restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world, I feel assured that this unfavourable condition will be temporary and that the illimitable resources of Canada and the world-wide recognition of them give us ample guarantee of continued material progress.

He thinks that the unfavourable conditions will be temporary and that the illimitable resources of Canada are ample guarantee of material progress. He makes that bald statement. Any gentleman in Canada could make that statement. But has he attempted to justify it? He referred to many things which had been accomplished by this government, but which the people themselves do not approve. I might refer to the navigation laws and to the coasting trade. Last session an hon. gentleman in this House made a speech in reference to the manner in which the coasting trade of this country was conducted. We find that men from Norway and Sweden are doing our coasting trade, men who have taken away

the bread and butter from our own seamen. We find Norwegian steamers to-day doing a great part of the coasting trade of this country, carrying coal from Pictou, Sydney and other parts of Canada which produce coal, to Montreal and even to Toronto. What is the reason of this? Simply because the government are afraid to ask Norway and Sweden to enter into a treaty, the consequence of which would do away with this great injury to our own seamen. But the government are afraid. Why should they not be as anxious to make a treaty with Norway with respect to this matter as they are to make a treaty with France respecting the admission of absinthe and light wines?

We find to-day that the great shipbuilding industry, which was so prosperous twenty years ago, has almost gone down to nothing. What is the reason? Because foreigners are allowed to come into this country and do all the coasting trade. Norwegians bring their ships into this country and are permitted to trade from port to port in Canada. They pay their seamen about one-half the wages which Canadian seamen get or should get, and the consequence is that our Canadian seamen are put out of business altogether. In Pictou the other day a gentleman who is engaged in the coasting trade told me that he was there for six weeks with a schooner and could not get a load of coal, whereas during that time five or six Norwegian steamers came in and were filled right to the decks with coal and left for Montreal. Some which were loaded after he had arrived there had come back empty and were ready to load again before he could get his load at all. Privileges are granted by corporations and others to these tramps who come here from foreign countries, and our own steamers are excluded from the benefit of the trade of this country. Something should be done this season to foster the business of the transportation of commodities by our own people, by the seamen of our own country; and unless some such legislation is put upon the statute-books this year, you will find that the maritime province trade will soon be in the hands of foreigners altogether. I know that is the feeling throughout the maritime provinces. Every seaman I have spoken to has told me that he was absolutely disgusted with the manner in which the Dominion government were conducting this business. Petitions have been sent to the government over and over again, representations have been made, but no remedy has been applied to protect the seamen of Canada; and the consequence is that young men who should be engaged in a seafaring life in Canada are leaving and going into other occupations. Why should we not have to-day a shipbuilding industry? We have everything that is necessary to build up this industry; we have our iron, we have our steel, we have our men. Why should our young men go to the United States to build up the shipbuilding industry in that country? I know that from my own province fifty or sixty young men are in the works in Fall river building ships for the United States navy. The fact is that in almost every maritime province port there are young men who have obtained an education in the iron industry, but cannot obtain employment, and they are compelled to go to the United States. You will find in every shipyard in the United States men from the maritime provinces, and I presume from Ontario, who could not obtain employment in Canada. This industry is fostered by the United States, they are building an immense navy, and the cry in the United States to-day is: Make the navy stronger. What is the cry in Canada? Let us have no navy. What kind of vessels are to-day employed by our people in the coasting trade? Old derelicts of the United States, vessels that were abandoned as unseaworthy at Portland and ports in Massachusetts. These vessels are sent up to Canada and are sold to our Canadian seamen, who attempt to navigate them, and if you read the newspapers you will find that scarcely a week passes but that one or more of these vessels founder with all on board. The iron industry is fostered by the government; it fosters every other industry but the ship-building industry, which would build up this country more perhaps than any other industry. Where do we buy our vessels? For the coasting trade we buy the derelicts of Massachusetts and New Jersey. Where do the other vessels come from, those steamers which are engaged in the coal trade? From the Clyde. Why could we not build those vessels ourselves? Why could we not build every vessel for the coasting and carrying trades of Canada and for the trade between Canada and the United Kingdom? I understand that the first steel vessel to be constructed in the maritime provinces is now on the stocks in New Glasgow, N.S. This should be an object lesson to the government; it should show what private enterprise will do and if the government would give some help to the men engaged in this great industry we would have perhaps the greatest commercial navy in the world. It may be said that we have enough of these bonuses, but we have not enough of that kind of bonus. What would be the result if we had a great ship-building industry in the maritime provinces? Take Prince Edward Island; we last year raised something like 6,000,000 bushels of oats and we raised 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 bushels of potatoes. We have no place to put these potatoes or oats. We also raised enough wheat to support ourselves. We probably would be in a position to place these oats if we had facilities to move them, but to-day we have no such facilities. We have not sufficient steamship and railway facilities to

move this crop. If we had a tunnel connecting Prince Edward Island with the mainland we would very probably, in the winter season, be able to move these products of Prince Edward Island, and we might be able, if these great industries were started in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, to supply the men who would be engaged in them with the means of living. But as it is to-day three-fourths of the products of Prince Edward Island are kept in that province until navigation closes by reason of the want of facilities to move them. We are told by the Department of Agriculture of the province of Prince Edward Island that during the season of 1907 between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 worth of products were yraised in that province. With something like 103,000 people living in Prince Edward Island that represents a production of $600 or $700 for every man, woman and child during the season. I think that when this state of affairs exists and when the government have these reports from the Department of Agriculture of Prince Edward Island they should see that better facilities are given to the people there to move this great product to the markets of the world. We have been told, and this matter has been threshed out in this House day after day during the last three sessions of parliament, that 'we will consider the matter,' that 'the matter is under consideration,' that 'we will give you a steamer.' Only to-day it was stated that Mr. Dugas, an expert from the old country, had come out, that he had made certain recommendations; that these recommendations were under the consideration of the government; that they were sending them to Lord Strathcona, that probably in the dim future estimates might be made for the construction of a steamer to combat the severity of the winter and the ice between Prince Edward Island and the mainland and that in the dim future we might be able to move our products during all seasons of the year to the mainland. But what guarantee have the people of Prince Edward Island that this steamer will ever be constructed. We have a right, Mr. Speaker, according to the terms under which we entered confederation to be connected with the mainland by continuous steam communication, and I say it, and say it advisedly, and it is the opinion of not only Mr. Dugas, who is the adviser of the government, but it is the opinion of Sir Douglass Fox and of every other engineer who was employed by the government to look into this matter, that there is only one way to fulfil the terms of confederation and that is to construct a tunnel across the straits of Northumberland between Capes Traverse and Tormentine and give us every day in the year communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Our position as a farming and fishing community warrants us in asking for this boon. I said 'boon,' I do not consider it a boon. It is a matter of right. Last year according to the statement of the Department of Agriculture of the province of Prince Edward, our product amounted to $7,000,000. Where will you find on the continent of America a farming community of 103,000 people who can raise $7,000,000 worth of products? I do not think it exists in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Quebec or New Brunswick. I do not think it exists in any state of the great republic to the south of us. I think that the product which we raised last year was so extensive that the government of this country should take cognizance of the fact that we are entitled to all the facilities which people who are so energetic as we are should have in order that we may be able to meet the markets of the world as the rest of Canada are by reason of the facilities which the government have provided for them out of the public treasury. They have given to the great Northwest millions of dollars and they are giving to the great Northwest millions of dollars in places where there is not one inhabitant. Along the Grand Trunk Pacific, built from Moncton, N.B., right to the extreme Pacific coast, for hundreds of miles there is not one inhabitant. I think this government should look after the thickly settled portions of Canada before they commence to spend money where there are no inhabitants at all. It is all very well for the government to say that it is necessary in the interests of this country to build these transcontinental lines. We are a nation, they say, and it is necessary for us to do great big things in order to show to the world that we hold a position, that we are a nation and that we should be recognized as a nation by other nations of the world. But we should commence in places where the people are most thickly settled. We should build our railways where they are required by the inhabited portions of Canada. We should build them in the first place on the north shore of Prince Edward Island where there are no railways, and we should build them in many places in Ontario and Quebec where they are required to-day. I know there are many places in Nova Scotia, such as Antigonish and other counties, where railways are very much required. I think the government should build these great public works. They boast about their surplus of $3,000,000. Why not take a portion of that $3,000,000 and make an estimate of that tunnel? Last year, the year before and the year before that they promised that they would spend money in order to make an estimate. What did they do? They simply sent one of their engineers from the department here, a man who had no knowledge of matters of this kind, an ordinary man, a very ordinary man, down there; he went, stood upon a cliff on Cape Tormentine, looked over to a cliff

on Cape Traverse and said: I believe that the business is feasible. He came back and reported the matter to the Minister of Public Works and he had the statement of the Minister of Finance that the matter was under consideration. That is what these gentlemen who compose the government of this country are telling the people of Prince Edward Island—we have this matter under consideration. The government have had it under consideration since 1896, and that is all the distance it has got. Why have they not mentioned it in the speech from the Throne? It is a matter of national interest, just as much as the thin red line or the All Red Line. When the Prime Minister was in the old country every newspaper in Canada had it in large type that we were to have the All Red Line; the newspapers we got on our breakfast tables were full of it, but there is not a word about it in the speech from the Throne. Time and again, when the Prime Minister was asked in this House the news about it, his answer was: We have the matter under consideration; we cannot give you an answer just now. That is the way this government trifles with the people of Canada. The speech from the Throne tells us that there is financial stringency in Canada, but when we come into this House we are told not to say a word about it. Why does the government thus blow hot and cold? Well, they found the statement in the speech from the Throne did not commend itself to their followers, and so they ask us in this House not to say anything about it because it might stop immigrants from continental Europe coming to this country. Here we have immigrants pouring in at the rate of 600 a week to find in Toronto, and in Hamilton, and in Winnipeg and elsewhere that there is no employment. When the government knew this financial stringency existed why did they not cable to Lord Strathcona to stop these people coming here instead of allowing them to flood the country, without a dollar in their pocket, to become objects of charity. That is the way this government is conducting the business of the country.

Then we have this great French treaty of which we have heard so much when the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine were in the old country. The farming people of my province thought there would be something in that treaty which would be beneficial to them, but they find now that there is no reduction in the duty on any commodity which comes from France except claret, and light wines, and absinthe and other poisons. These gentlemen went to France at the expense of thousands of dollars; they kept running between Paris and London; they said the treaty was a great boon to the people of Canada; that it was the first time in our history the right to make a treaty had been conceded to us; they heralded in every paper in Canada, the United States, and the continent of Europe, that they had made a great treaty, but now we find that the treaty stands to-day as it did in 1893 except that light wines and absinthe and such poisons are allowed to come in at a lower rate.

We have heard a great deal about the administration of the postal service, and the government boasts they have made a large surplus in the Post Office Department this year. A question was put on the Order Paper this week by the senior member for Queens (Mr. Martin) and he was told in reply that there were a large number of post offices in Prince Edward Island which had only a tri-weekly or a bi-weekly service. Why is not the post office surplus used in giving a daily mail to every portion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, instead of a bi-weekly or a tri-weekly service? I have nothing to say against the rural free delivery, but before the argument on that question is entered into I would like to see a daily mail service placed at the disposal of every man, woman and child in Canada. The government built a railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour in my own province and before that railway was built the people in that locality had a daily mail. It started from Charlottetown at six o'clock in the morning and was distributed all along the route down to Murray Harbour before six o'clock in the evening. The people hoped when the railway was built that the mail service would be improved, but now the mail starts from Charlottetown at 3.20 in the afternoon and instead of the mail being delivered in those localities as to the rest of the province on the day it arrives in Charlottetown, it is not distributed till the next day. This shows there is something wrong. When you ask the Post Office Department what is the cause of the delay they throw the blame on the Railway Department, and the Railway Department gives as an explanation that the government of Canada cannot afford to run two trains a day on that railway. Now, the fact is that the railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour is, and I say it without fear of contradiction, the best paying section of the Intercolonial Railway. But with all that, the people along the line get the mail one day later than before the railway was constructed; and in addition there are other drawbacks which make that railway almost useless to the community with regard to mail accommodation and otherwise.

Something has been said on the question of insurance and the speech from the Throne stated that a Bill would be introduced this session in reference to the matter. One would have thought that in view of the fact that such an important matter has been before the people of Canada for a year past, some reference would have been made to it

by the leader of the government. In answer to questions placed upon the Order Paper we have been informed that Mr. Shepley, who is solicitor for the government has received $25,000 for his services in connection with that insurance commission. During that time he carried on his own private practice, he was engaged in his practice in the Supreme Court of Canada and in the courts of Ontario; he was occupied with the commission for smething like nine months and the government of Canada paid him $25,000. They paid altogether to that commission, including the expenses of the commissioners and travelling expenses, something like $96,000. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you have ever seen anything to represent this great outlay. Have you ever seen any results? Have you ever heard of any results? Have you ever seen anything at all which was the result of that commission which would commend itself to the people of Canada? I have never read anything nor has anything been tabled in this House, nor has any statement been made in this parliament which would lead me to believe that there was any result at all from the work of this commission which was appointed by the government, the appointment being given to their own particular friends and involving the expenditure of $96,000 of the people's money. If I could see that there had been any good results from it I would say nothing against it, but I know from my own experience and from the feeling expressed to me in all parts of Canada where I have heard this matter discussed, that no good results have been given by this commission, certainly nothing commensurate with the great expenditure that it has involved. They have, it is true, made political charges against certain members of this House, but these charges have fallen flat before the people and to-day they are not even thought of or heard of.

Mr. Speaker, as the hour is late and as there are doubtless other gentlemen who wish to speak on this matter, I do not wish to make any more extended remarks at this time.

On motion of Mr. Uriah Wilson, the debate was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—DESTITUTE IMMIGRANTS.

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

Mr. SPROULE. Before the House adjourns, has the acting leader of the House any intimation to make to us regarding the three hundred Bulgarians who are yet stranded in Toronto, and I believe there are also four hundred in Halifax. Could he state what the government has done with regard to this matter or what disposal it intends to make of these men?

Mr. FIELDING. I would rather not answer my hon. friend in the absence of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). I am aware that some arrangement has been made. I think that in each case the numbers have rather been exaggerated in the information given to my hon. friend. However, I hope he will refer to the question again to-morrow in the presence of the Minister of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 10, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 22) respecting The Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Herron.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 27) to amend the Government Railways Act. He said: The Bill which I have the honour to introduce is similar to one which I introduced last session. The provisions of the Railway Act with regard to the rights of railway companies in connection with claims made against them on account of damages due to negligence are clearly settled and pretty well defined. There are no such provisions in the Government Railways Act, and the object of this Bill is to incorporate in that Act similar provisions to those in the Railway Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On questions being called:

Mr. FIELDING. I would ask that the questions be allowed to stand, as there is

a misunderstanding, this not being a question day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no objection to letting them stand. The misunderstanding probably arose in view of the terms of the motion originally proposed by the Prime Minister, namely, that the order for the debate on the address should have precedence next after questions.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so, and therefore questions would come upon the regular question day. I know that the First Minister was under this impression, because when I spoke to him in regard to the questions to-day, he said this was not a question day.

DEATH OF B. B. GUNN, ESQ., M.P.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, who is unavoidably away for a few moments, it becomes my duty to call the attention of the House to a very sad event which is already marked by the presence on a desk on the other side of the chamber of that wreath which usually signifies the presence of death amongst us. It is somewhat sad to reflect that though we are as yet only in the first days of the session, death has already twice appeared amongst us, a fact which is well calculated to make us all serious, sad, and thoughtful. It was not my pleasure to know Mr. Gunn, the departed member for South Huron, so well as he was known to many other members. He did not take a very active part in the debates of the House, but he was very attentive to his duties on committees. When he did take part in our debates, his remarks were received with attention and respect. Those not associated with him politically have often had the opportunity of meeting him in that happy way in which gentlemen on both sides meet each other in social intercourse from time to time, and I wish to say for the government and for all the members on this side of the House that we desire to offer our warmest sympathy to the family of our departed friend, and in that expression I am sure that every member of this House, irrespective of party, will join.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thank the hon. Minister of Finance for the sympathetic words he has just uttered respecting the untimely death of our friend, Mr. Gunn. It is true that Mr. Gunn did not take a very active part in the debates of this House; nevertheless he took a keen interest in public affairs and was a faithful and diligent servant of the people who sent him here. It is not more than a week since he was walking around amongst us apparently in the full enjoyment of his health and strength. I saw him on Saturday last, and he hoped then to resume his place once more amongst us within a very few days. Neither he nor I had the slightest idea at that time that the end was so near. We thank the hon. Minister of Finance for his words of sympathy for the family of Mr. Gunn. Our own sympathy goes out to them in the largest possible measure, and in this time of trial I am sure that this message of sympathy from both sides of the House will be to them a source of very great comfort.

DISTRIBUTION OF BLUE-BOOKS.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the government what new arrangements have been made with regard to the House of Commons post office. During the long time that I have been in parliament the blue-books issued to members have been placed in the post office, where each member had a box at his disposal for the purpose. I find that now the blue-books for members of the opposition are piled in room No. 6, where we have no means of taking care of them. Many members of the House have private rooms where they can properly take care of their blue-books, but I am not so fortunate as to have a room. I cannot see why the arrangement which has been in existence for so many years should not be continued. I would like to have some explanation from the government as to why this change has been made.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the First Minister a few days ago, in answer to a question, gave an explanation to the effect that there was not sufficient space in the post office to enable them to carry on the old arrangement. However I shall be prepared to discuss the point with the other members of the Internal Economy Committee. This is not a matter for the government but it is one of those referred to that committee, which comes under the direction of Mr. Speaker, who has associated with him several ministers, of whom I am one. I therefore cannot repudiate responsibility.

BROCKVILLE—OTTAWA RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). Has the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) yet interviewed the Railway Commission with respect to the connection at Brockville from the west. Yesterday in order to get here, I had to leave home at eight o'clock in the morning, go to Brockville, and remain there four or five hours. The Canadian Pacific Railway left at two twenty and the Grand Trunk Railway was fifteen minutes late, so that there was no connection. It is high time that the hon. minister moved in this matter and saw that something was done.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The question of railway connection at Brockville has been claiming some of my attention the last few days. I have had a communication from the Railway Commissioners, in which they gave me the history of what has been done. It is however rather a history of what has been done than of what has been accom-

plished. We took the matter up with the two railway companies, and each expressed its willingness to meet the situation if the other would. The difficulty of arranging a time table, which affects their trains, is greater than it may appear on the surface, and I have a good deal of sympathy with the company who take the position that their through time tables should not be disarranged in order to make any such connection. But I am still of the opinion that the connection at Brockville could be made if the companies were not so obstinate in trying not to have it made. Each company now puts the blame on the other. The matter, as taken up by the Commission, has resulted in a sort of tentative arrangement by which the Canadian Pacific Railway agrees to hold its train at Brockville, if the Grand Trunk Railway conductor in charge of the fast train will wire to the Canadian Pacific Railway that he has passengers on board for Canadian Pacific Railway points. But they do not remain longer than ten minutes, so that if the Grand Trunk Railway from the west is fifteen minutes late, the passengers are left stranded at Brockville. Last week there was even a more serious state of affairs ? The mails at Brockville which might have been placed on the Canadian Pacific Railway, had connection been made from the west, remained five days out of the seven, last week, over at Brockville until the next day. On one occasion part of the mail was on the Canadian Pacific Railway when the train steamed out leaving the balance on the truck. This thing must be remedied. Unless the railway companies, with whom the Commission are now having some correspondence, decide to make connection at Brockville which, while not being unreasonable to themselves, will reasonably accommodate the public, I think the government must be prepared to place some amendment on the Railway Act which will compel the companies to look after the interests of the public. But we are in hopes that some arrangement will be arrived at without going to that length. I repeat however that if the companies do not show a reasonable desire to give the accommodation required, it will be the duty of the government to amend the Railway Act so as to compel the companies to do what they ought to do voluntarily.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. minister might take pattern from the British Board of Trade and compel every railway company to submit its time table connections and any changes proposed to the board of trade.

Mr. SPEAKER. This does not arise out of the question.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did the hon. minister take up the question of having the connection made at Prescott Junction ? That was done for thirty years and I would like to see that connection made again.

Mr. GRAHAM. I mentioned that latter to the Commission. They said it was the first complaint they had had. This morning, in reply to a letter of theirs, I explained the situation and what was necessary to be done in order to make that connection.

HARLAKA JUNCTION—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. J. B. MORIN. Has the hon. Minister any information to give regarding connection on the Harlaka Junction of the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have taken that matter up and hope to be able to have a reply in a day or two. None of the hon. gentlemen who asked me the question the other day, except one of them, complied with my request to put their request in writing.

Mr. ALCORN. This matter is already covered by section 903 of the Railway Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not like to be positive but I think that the Act does cover the situation and possibly we might make it a little more emphatic.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session and the proposed amendment of Mr. Armstrong thereto.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). In the speech from the Throne our attention is directed to the fact that it is the intention of the government this session to submit a measure in amendment to the election law. It is particularly with respect to this matter which I wish to direct my attention. I do not know how our laws correspond with those of Great Britain, but we all know that such a thing as bribery and corruption in Great Britain is very rare. And we all know equally well that in our own country the reverse is the case. In fact I may go so far as to say that bribery and corruption is sometimes winked at. The fact that the laws we have dealing with this matter have not been properly enforced has led us to ignore them completely. I sincerely hope that something will be done this session to improve this condition, because it is a standing disgrace to this fair Canada of ours to have to admit that such performances as have taken place in the past and are taking place to-day may continue. I believe that, all other things being equal, and under the conditions which we have had in the past, it is possible to influence the elections in three-quarters of the constituencies of this coun-

try by the use of money, by reaching the corruptible vote which is to be found in nearly every constituency, sometimes small and sometimes large. I feel that we are simply continuing the course we have pursued of making criminals by neglecting this matter. In the corruptible element in every constituency we find men who are not made worse by the purchase of their vote; but there is in every constituency a class of men who, I believe, are lowered in the scale when they are approached and purchased. Therefore, I say we are simply making criminals by continuing the course we have pursued in the past. I have more sympathy for the man who sells his vote than for the man who purchases it; I have the greatest contempt for the oily, smooth canvasser who goes about with his pockets full of bills, sounding this man and that man to see whether or not they are corruptible. It may be the first time that the voter has ever been approached. Think of the process of reasoning that goes on in that man's mind while he is being sounded by this canvasser! It is a matter which affects his self-respect; he finally succumbs; he is bought up, and there you have another corruptible voter for all time to come. We turn from the ordinary voter and the corrupt canvasser and we go higher, we go to the system under which such a condition of affairs can exist, and what do we find? I believe that from 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the money subscribed for election purposes in this country comes from interested people; it comes from contractors who expect to get their bills of extras allowed and want favourable consideration; it comes from corporations which want legislation or favourable attention from the government, who want a line or a few words in an Act changed; or it comes from private individuals who are seeking favours from the government. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House is prepared to deny that. Therefore, if we go a step further what do we find? We find that the government that is in power, if this system is to continue, as it has continued, becomes compromised and involved with gentlemen who are seeking favours from the government, and such a condition of affairs ultimately arises that when favours are asked and legislation is sought, or when contracts are to be given and supplies are to be purchased, these matters cannot be dealt with upon their merits. Therefore, I contend that this lies at the very foundation of the good government of this country, and I sincerely trust that some method will be devised whereby the conditions will be improved.

I have noticed comments in the press from time to time in respect to election petitions. It is sometimes said when, after a general election, one party accuses the other of corruption, that the accusing party can resort to the courts, that protests may be entered and justice in that way may be had. I look upon the election petition as the greatest farce in existence. Why should a private individual be forced to prosecute people who have infringed the law in regard to an election and bring them to justice any more than he should be obliged, at his own expense, to prosecute a man for committing a theft? Why should a man be put to the expense of such a trial? Most of the members of this House, in the first place, are not financially able to stand the strain. An election fight, I understand, is a very expensive legal battle. Supposing after a general election in this country, out of 214 constituencies it might be considered in the interest of justice to enter protests in 50 of those constituencies, say 13 maritime constituencies, 30 in Quebec and Ontario, and 7 in the western provinces. That means first the depositing of $50,000 to cover the $1,000 deposits required by law. I understand that sometimes the legal and other expenses in connection with an election petition run up into the thousands—sometimes $5,000, sometimes more than $5,000—but assuming that in these 50 constituencies the expense of the trial will average $3,000, making $150,000 in all, we have a total of $200,000 required to carry on these protests. Why should private individuals be obliged to go to any such expense as that to enforce an election law any more than to enforce the criminal law of this country? Therefore, I hope that some amendment to the Election Act will be devised that will overcome the evils to which I have referred, and others which I shall not detain the House to mention now.

Then, too, I have never been able to reason out in my mind why the criminal laws of this country have not been put into force in respect to the crimes of bribery and corruption. We have in our criminal law ample provision for the prosecution of people charged with bribery or conspiracy to commit bribery, and yet for many years past, with the single exception of what took place in Ontario last year, there have been hardly any prosecutions under the criminal law. I cannot understand why the attorneys general of the different provinces of Canada have not enforced the criminal law in regard to bribery and corruption; that law has lain as a dead letter in the code for years and has been absolutely ignored. One Attorney General of Ontario, Mr. Gibson, dealt very lightly with this subject; on one occasion he made the statement, when asked to take certain steps in this matter, that he was not a policeman. This statement of his is well known throughout the country. We have in this House to-day an hon. gentleman whom I see before me, who has occupied the position of attorney general for New Brunswick (Hon. Wm. Pugsley), and I am sure it will be very interesting to all of us to know why, in all his experience in

politics and during all the time that he occupied the position of Attorney General of his province, he did not prosecute offenders under the criminal law in respect to bribery and corruption.

I have not had the pleasure of meeting any gentleman who could speak with authority on that subject, as occupying the position of Attorney General in any province ; but we have now before us face to face an hon. gentleman who, I am sure, will be glad to enlighten us upon the subject. In this connection I may remark that a good deal has been said by the hon. gentleman, the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) about certain things which took place on the eve of the last general election in 1904. He has not said much about it in this House, but he has said a good deal outside of this House. From the time he decided to enter federal politics, and from the time he was nominated in St. John, New Brunswick, he has said a good deal to his partisan followers in this country with regard to corruption in elections ; therefore we are glad to have him with us face to face in order that he may enlighten us on this subject. While speaking of what took place on the eve of the last federal election, I want to call attention to what I consider was a most sensational and spectacular affair that took place. I have in my mind a certain function which occurred at a point not very far from Ottawa, in the month of October, 1904. I think the House will be interested in knowing something about this affair because it leads up to other things I want to refer to. In that month, in 1904, there was an excursion on a trip extending over 1,096 miles, and which was composed of 120 gentlemen. This excursion or expedition was chiefly controlled by the Minister of Public Works, whom I see before me, and his friend, Mr. David Russell. It appears from the rumors current at that time that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Public Works, seized no doubt by a true patriotism, and his friend Mr. Russell stood by him, desired to sacrifice himself on the altar of his country, and if possible by a flank movement to capture the portfolio of Railways and Canals. These were the rumours which were current in the city of Montreal, in the city of Toronto, and in other places. I say by a flank movement, because what object could this excursion have had if it did not mean that it was desirable to bring that hon. gentleman to the attention of the country, and help him to supersede the gentleman who then occupied the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, the Hon. Mr. Emmerson. Mr. Speaker, what happened ? In order to find out what happened, we had better refer to the accounts published in the daily papers at that time. The St. John 'Telegraph,' the Liberal organ at that time, stated on the 6th of October what the programme was. In great headlines it said :

Off to banquet to Dr. Pugsley.—Special train away with 120 New Brunswickers.—Guests of Mr. Russell.

Then it gives the name of the conductor of the train, gives the number of sleeping cars, 8, two dining cars, and one baggage car. The Montreal guests, who were in evidence in great number, joined the train at Montreal. Then they returned to Montreal after the banquet the same night at Caledonia Springs after they had partaken of refreshments to the Windsor Hotel, where the party were breakfasted and lunched as the guests of Mr. Russell, who paid the bill. The weather was damp, and I understand that the party was supplied with umbrellas and overshoes. Cabs were engaged at the expense of Mr. Russell to drive the party round Mount Royal and see the sights of the city. The guests outside the city of St. John received free transportation to St. John and return. It was stated in this report of the St. John 'Telegraph' of that date that attached to the train out of New York were three cars bearing Mr. Russell's guests to this celebrated banquet—out of New York. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to follow up the thread of my argument I wish to read the views of some of the Liberal papers at that time in regard to the purpose of the banquet. The Montreal 'Herald' of October 7, says :

St. John's Attorney General feted at Caledonia Springs.—Generosity of Mr. David Russell brings together a large number of maritime province and upper province men to do honour to a Liberal statesman.

It further says :

Mr. David Russell, the extremely enterprising gentleman from the maritime provinces, gave a banquet last night to the Hon. Wm. Pugsley, Attorney General in the New Brunswick government. It was a most remarkable dinner in many ways. Mr. Russell himself the genial host of the evening, through his magnetic personality pervaded the entire function, did not actually utter a single word for public hearing.

A beautiful oration which effectually awoke the gathering at a very late hour of the evening was delivered for him by a phonograph, which unkindly refused to stop for the applause. Mr. Russell, during its delivery posed gracefully with his hand on his heart and smiled at his delighted guests.

The gathering was also noticeable for the great enthusiasm with which it protested against Hon. Mr. Pugsley's expressed desire to remain in provincial politics, and for the conviction manifested by his maritime and western friends alike that he should seek a larger sphere for his services.

This quotation appeared in the Montreal 'Herald,' of October 7th. In the St. John 'Telegraph' there appeared this report upon the same thing, beginning with these headlines :

Feeling strong among the guests that Dr. Pugsley will in the future be forced to heed the call to the larger sphere of activity.

Now I want to show what the Minister of Public Works said at that banquet in

respect of Mr. Russell. But before doing so, I will read a few lines from the remarks of Mr. C. N. Skinner.

Recorder Skinner, at the conclusion of his speech, alluded feelingly to Mr. Pugsley's announcement of his desire to remain in the provincial service 'He says he will remain where he is,' said Mr. Skinner. Our country will be glad if he does. But I hear a call coming from many quarters for the Attorney General to go up higher and perform greater duties for this Dominion. This country is a very jealous mistress, and if the call she gives is once slighted she is likely never to come back again. Therefore I would beg the guest of the evening to bear this in mind. In this I speak not as a mere resident of the province down by the sea, but for the whole of Canada. There should be but one Canada, no east, no west, no north, no south, nothing but one country indivisible for ever, and it is in the interest of that country I ask him to consider.

When the hon. gentleman got on his feet he spoke as follows :

I am proud that we in St. John have given to you in Montreal a young man of the sincerity, integrity, ability and foresight of Mr. Russell. (Applause.) It was my pleasure to know Mr. Russell a number of years in the city of St. John in the days of smaller things with him and with me as well. He was my friend and is the friend of us all here to-night (applause), and I have no doubt that he often looked out of the city of St. John and longed to exercise his talents in the successful enterprises with which his name in recent years has been associated.

It is the man who can look ahead and see where possibilities are to make enterprises pay. These are the men who are holding up this country. The capitalist comes in after the success of an enterprise has been demonstrated. It is men like Mr. Russell who are able to select the worthy enterprises and discard the unworthy ones.

You gentlemen from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, I want to say there has come here to-night the flower of the men of New Brunswick (applause). I thank you most heartily for coming here to do honour to me, and in doing honour to me you are also doing honour to the splendid host who has given us the honour of gathering in this magnificent hall and witnessing the surroundings of the health-giving springs.

I will not detain the House very much longer in reading the extracts, but I think I ought to read an editorial which appeared in the St. John 'Telegraph' of October 7, dealing with this matter. It is headed 'The Pugsley Banquet.'

Considerable space is devoted in our news columns this morning to a report of the splendid function at Caledonia Springs last night, where Hon. William Pugsley was the guest of honour at a banquet given by Mr. David Russell. The banquet was non-political and Mr. Pugsley deprecated the insistent intimation that he is to be called into the greater arena of Dominion politics. He expressed his intention of remaining in the high and responsible position which he now holds. It was noteworthy however, that the feeling among the distinguished company at the banquet board was that the guest of the evening possessed talents which marked him as a public figure who would not long withstand the imperative call of the country to activity in a wider sphere.

The list of guests, the speakers and the speeches, and the arrangements generally made the banquet one which must long be recalled as a marked success. Not least among the notable features was the fact that the guest of the evening, the host and the chairman were all sons of this province who have acquitted themselves with distinction in the useful activities of the Dominion. The gathering was widely representative and the manner in which men of prominence in both parties and many walks of life embraced the opportunity to do honour to the attorney general is and will long be a pardonable cause of pride on his part.

I have read these extracts because, as I have said before, this was the most spectacular affair that happened on the eve of the last general election. It was a most remarkable thing. There was, up to that time, no precedent for such an excursion, and I have seen it stated in the press that the whole thing cost about $15,000. Now, it will be in the minds of hon. members of this House and there will not be very much doubt as to what the object of it was. The hon. gentleman and Mr. Russell were very intimate. They were intimate in business, they were intimate in newspaper deals—and we have heard a great deal about newspaper deals—and they were intimate in land deals.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman but I may say that this statement that I was associated with Mr. Russell in newspaper or land deals is entirely erroneous. My hon. friend has been completely misinformed as to that.

Mr. KEMP. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, Mr. Speaker, but I will just point out to him what I was going to say. I think that he did not have in his mind what I had in mine. It was in reference to the St. John 'Gazette' that I was speaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The St. John 'Gazette'?

Mr. KEMP. The St. John 'Gazette.' I understand that the hon. gentleman owned or controlled the St. John 'Gazette.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that the only transaction I ever had with Mr. Russell in connection with the St. John 'Gazette' is this : I was one of the proprietors and I sold out my interest in the 'Gazette' to Mr. Russell.

Mr. KEMP. That is all I intended to say in regard to the St. John 'Gazette.' The hon. minister, amongst other things, during the short time he has been in federal politics, has talked a great dealt about campaign funds. He knows the exact amount of the Conservative campaign fund

of 1904. If so he is wiser than any one else in that respect because I do not suppose that anybody else knows what the campaign fund was although he knows it down to a dollar.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Don't you believe yourself. There are many others who know it besides myself.

Mr. KEMP. I observed the statement of the hon. gentleman in regard to this matter, I made a reference to it in the city of Toronto a few weeks ago and after I had made a reference to it the hon. gentleman took to the city of St. John, got on the platform and said : I have not denied it. I did not know that a man could deny something of which he had no knowledge. I said a moment ago that no one had any knowledge in respect to the matter ; I will repeat it. I know that he cannot produce any one and if he does know any one who has any knowledge on this subject he ought to produce him. In so far as my knowledge of this matter is concerned I may say that I look upon the proposition as one of the most preposterous and ridiculous that was ever made in this country. Talk about a party in opposition having such a campaign fund. Let me direct the attention of the House to what happened in the province of Ontario a few years ago in respect to the provincial elections when it was proved and demonstrated that the total amount of money that was used in the campaign fund of the Conservative Party in Ontario in that election was $26,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was that the Conservative fund ?

Mr. KEMP. That was the Conservative fund, when the Conservative were in opposition, and it was during a political contest in Ontario that the whole facts were made public. I may say that in so far as a campaign fund is concerned, if the elections were carried on in other parts of the country with as great an amount of economy as they are in the province of Ontario, if a cypher were taken off the figures that were mentioned by the hon. gentleman the statement would likely be nearer the truth. But, Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the statement which I made about this matter in the city of Toronto to the reply which was made by the hon. Minister of Public Works. I desire to refer to another matter. The hon. Minister of Public Works has made the statement in this country, on the hustings, at meetings of his partisan supporters, that in a certain county in the province of New Brunswick there was spent the sum of $25,000, and he is prepared to give the names of the persons to whom this money was sent. A few weeks ago in the city of Toronto, as I have stated, I said, knowing that this money had been sent into a constituency and assuming, as we must assume, that the money was sent into that constituency for corrupt purposes, the hon. gentleman, being Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick, should have prosecuted the parties that were guilty. The hon. gentleman met that statement by saying that he had only recently learned of the fact, and yet, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman admits that he knew of the matter at the time of the Minister of Finance's by-election in Shelburne and Queens. But whether that is so or not, he says he is in possession of the facts, he knows all about them he says, and surely it is his duty to lay information against the guilty parties and to prosecute them under the criminal law as was recently done under similar circumstances in the province of Ontario. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has chosen to deal with this matter in what appears to me to be a very frivolous fashion for a gentleman occupying the high and responsible position he does. He said :

If I started prosecutions the jails would not be large enough to hold all the Tories of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, who is a minister of the Crown, makes a frivolous statement like that with respect to such a serious matter. I would suggest to him that he should go ahead and prosecute, and then when the jails are filled he should let a few go on suspended sentence until there was room for them. Surely the government with all its money which it expends so lavishly can provide jail accommodation for all the criminals in the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has resorted to the lowest kind of a campaign in this matter ; he has gone before public meetings of his partisan supporters and he has made statements which I challenge him to make in this House face to face with us. At a meeting in Ottawa last week when Mr. Caron was chosen as Liberal candidate in the by-election, and in the presence of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Public Works indicated that he looked upon the leader of the opposition as a hypocrite and a liar. Now, no matter what the feelings of the Prime Minister are we must realize that he tries to so conduct himself as to leave the impression that he is a gentleman, and yet he allows the Minister of Public Works in his presence and without reproof to use such language towards a colleague in this House. And the Minister of Public Works has sat in this House since the opening of the session, and in view of the statements he has made with regard to bribery and corruption in the province of New Brunswick on the public platform, he has not dared to explain to this House what he means or to reiterate the charges. He told his hearers at the meeting in Ottawa the other night, that when he was in Woodstock on the eve of the last election he had received a telegram from a gentleman asking him to go on the stump with Mr. Blair, I trust that when the Minister of

Public Works gets on his feet in this House, he will tell us who that gentleman is, and tell us all he knows about the case. It will be of some interest to the country if he does. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has spoken about campaign funds. I do not know how much he knows about campaign funds, but I would presume he knows a good deal to hear him talk. However, if he wants any information with regard to campaign funds I would direct him to ask the Prime Minister who it is, that has handled the campaign funds for the Liberal party in this country during the past eleven years. A letter from the Prime Minister to these gentlemen will unseal their mouths and they will be able to give the Minister of Public Works pointers he has never heard about. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) not to overlook the name of the Speaker of the Senate if he wants to find out about campaign funds; if he goes to that gentleman he can doubtless find out something about such matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have referred to this matter of political corruption; I have referred to the position which the Minister of Public Works has taken in regard to it, and to the plight he finds himself in at the present time. He has talked a great deal about a libel suit—that is a specialty of his—and he has gone so far as to give notice of a libel action against the Toronto 'World.' How my heart bleeds for the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean); how he must tremble in his shoes when he thinks of this terrible libel suit the Minister of Public Works is to take against his paper. And here is the basis of the libel suit which the Minister of Public Works threatened:

> There are some now think that Mr. Pugsley was on the inside in all the Blair-Russell deal.

That is what the Minister of Public Works takes as an offence against him, and he threatens to sue the Toronto 'World' because it said that. I see published the names of the lawyers who are acting for him. I have not asked the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) what is the position of that libel suit to-day, I do not know anything about it, but I venture to say there has never been another step taken in regard to it. And yet the Minister of Public Works talks about taking libel suits. I can direct the hon. gentleman's attention to a libel suit which he might institute. I can draw his attention to what appears to me to be a libel if it is not true, and it is a statement made in a very prominent newspaper which is published right at his own doorstep in the province of New Brunswick. And yet I do not believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has taken an action for libel against that newspaper. Here is what is said in an editorial in the Fredericton 'Gleaner':

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the Fredericton 'Gleaner'?

Mr. KEMP. Yes, the Fredericton 'Gleaner.' The hon. gentleman shakes his head; he does not like the sound of the name of that newspaper. This editorial is in the Fredericton 'Gleaner' of September 18, 1907, and it deals with the $25,000 matter to which the hon. gentleman referred in his speech at his nomination in St. John. It says in part:

> In the contest of 1904 (when the $25,000 which Mr. Pugsley himself alleges he knew was spent in Westmoreland against the Liberal candidate, who was Mr. Emmerson, the most active opponent of Mr. Emmerson was a bosom friend of Mr. Pugsley, the closest friend he had, and one who has been identified with him in a business way for years and who supports him in all things. What Mr. Pugsley knows about this alleged expenditure of $25,000 he knows as a back-slasher of the then Minister of Railways, whose place he was seeking, and whose downfall he was evidently endeavouring to bring about by whatever means would accomplish the end. As to that expenditure, Mr. Pugsley can speak with some authority, for there was nothing that was done with the purpose of bringing about the defeat of Mr. Emmerson in Westmoreland that he was not aware of, and our opinion has always been that he was the chief advisory man in the scheme. The money was paid over by friends of Mr. Pugsley to serve Mr. Pugsley's ends and in endeavouring to work the game Mr. Pugsley operated under the cloak of others. It may be that if Mr. Pugsley does not wish to go farther into this $25,000 business somebody else will, for now that he has chosen to make reference to it, and that in the fashion peculiar to himself and for a purpose not in keeping with the dignity of men who are respected in the public life, the matter is one in which the people will expect to be enlightened as to all of the facts.

If the Minister of Public Works considers himself to have been injured by the article which appeared in the Toronto 'World,' a very innocent article, he must have been ten times more injured by this article; and yet the hon. gentleman has not entered an action for libel against this newspaper nor even protested against the article. Now, I hope that the Minister of Public Works will deem it his duty to make good what he has stated outside of this House. In the speech he delivered in Ottawa, he practically accused the leader of the opposition of being a hypocrite and a liar. I have under my hand the newspaper in which the report of that speech appeared, and I doubt whether the hon. gentleman has the courage to stand up in this House and repeat what he then said in effect upon the public platform in Ottawa. The hon. gentleman has reflected upon gentlemen in Montreal and in the province of New Brunswick, alleging in effect that they conspired to defraud the electors of the county of Westmoreland, and I doubt if the hon. gentleman has the courage to lay the information by which these gentlemen will be brought to justice if they are guilty. The hon. gentleman claims to be in possession of certain facts in regard to that elec-

tion, the alleged offences being a breach of the criminal law; but I doubt, as I say, whether he has the courage to lay this information in Montreal and New Brunswick for the purpose of bringing these people to justice. Mr. Speaker, the press is reeking with statements based on this hon. gentleman's insinuations. He is bound to go further. He does not need to spend a dollar of his own money, he only needs to hand the matter over to the Crown prosecutors in Quebec and in New Brunswick and they will carry it on. So far as I am concerned, and I believe any other hon. member on this side of the House, we desire to see him go the full length. It does not make any difference whom this hits, be they high or low, be they in this House or out of this House; we want to see this matter brought to light, and we want to know what there is in it. If the hon. gentleman refuses to go further, if he is satisfied to make insinuations in the way he has done outside of this House, without taking steps to make his position good, I cannot but feel that he is condemned before the country for making statements which he knew were not true. Sir, he has talked of these things on the hustings ; but he has sat in this House like a whipped spaniel, not daring to open his mouth. He is now, Mr. Speaker at the bar of public opinion, and let him choose his course.

Mr. W. McINTYRE (Strathcona). Mr. Speaker)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh. Speak now.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen opposite expect to disconcert me by political fireworks, they are doomed to disappointment. My only reason for speaking at this particular moment is to discuss the matter which would naturally call for discussion under the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). In that amendment the hon. gentleman puts forward a proposition which it is the duty of the members of this House to discuss, not as it affects the constituency of East Lambton, but as it affects the whole Dominion of Canada. It does seem to me, without making any criticism concerning the different sections of the country, that there must be some laxity of employment on the part of certain men from the eastern portion of this great Dominion, when they take up their time discussing matters which to my mind belong more to the hustings than to the floor of this House. That does not apply to one side of the House alone. It seems to me that as representatives of certain bodies of people, it is our duty to discuss more particularly what is for the betterment of this country. The proposition contained in the amendment of the hon. member for East Lambton is that of the enforcement of rural mail delivery. That question is one which possibly affects his constituency specially, and he seems to think that it should apply to the whole Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman, in discussing the question, gave us a great mass of statistics which he assured us had been taken from the reports of the Post Office Department of the United States ; and from these he attempted to prove that it would be a good business proposition for the Dominion of Canada, at this stage of its growth, to institute a system of rural mail delivery. I wish to say that when an hon. member is considering matters concerning his own constituency, he must as a federal representative bear in mind that there are other parts of this great country to be considered. If you take the meagre surplus which we have from the Post Office Department to-day and spread that over the various portions of this great Dominion which must necessarily be served by the Post Office Department, you will find that you cannot inaugurate any great reform in any particular portion of the country without affecting the whole country. The hon. member for East Lambton, when giving his statistics, had the misfortune to suggest under what conditions the system of rural free delivery should apply. At page 396 of 'Hansard,' the hon. gentleman said :

> It is distinctly and plainy laid down by the department that the route must be twenty-four miles long, that there must be one hundred families on that route and that eighty-five of those families must not only put up boxes but agree to take rural free delivery. Thus the rural free delivery system can only be installed in a district where it can be successfully carried on and if these requirements are not fulfilled, the system cannot be installed until the population increases.

The hon. gentleman, in putting forward any such condition as that, cut western Canada entirely out of the system. He has put it beyond our grasp, and if we should institute any such service in the Dominion at a cost of $10,000,000—the American system cost $35,000,000—what would be the result ? In my constituency we have the different settlements stretching out into the more remote parts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. If he had read the whole of my speech he would not make the statement he has made. Twenty-four miles is a standard route, and in Dakota the routes were thirty miles long. I gave the salaries paid to the men up to thirty miles and under twenty-four miles.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman gave us the regulations under which this matter was carried on. He has put himself on record, and by that record must he be judged. He can make any other additional routes he chooses. He can make it twice as long, and he still cuts out our great west in the operation of this altogether. In his scheme of carrying out these regulations he has not taken into consideration the fact that the condition of our roads out

west is such as to entail very great difficulty in travelling. There are mail routes that run, not one hundred miles or ten or twenty-four miles, but that run hundreds of miles, and you must take this into consideration, that when you use up the surplus, when you use up in the new scheme the money that goes to carry on the post office operations, where are you going to get money to institute new mail routes and establish new post offices and new post office centres? We are complaining in the west to-day with a great deal of feeling that our post office system is not extended far enough. But what would be the case under such a system as the hon. gentleman advocates? It would result necessarily in a further starving of the west, and I would be remiss in my duty if I did not stand up and protest here against any such system being instituted. Rural delivery may be good in those places where it can be carried on, but I am here to speak for those places where it cannot. What we want out in the west is our present system extended. We want more frequent service, a greater number of post offices, and in order to give us that you must use the surplus revenue you now have. You can institute no great reform in the system which will not interfere with furnishing the west such conditions as are now obtained in the older settlements of Ontario. Speaking of the number of miles a farmer has to travel to get his mail, the hon. gentleman pointed out how great a distance a certain constituent of his has to cover in a week in going for his mail. But what would he say of a man who has to travel once a week for forty miles in order to get his mail, who has to take his team—possibly the only one on the homestead—and use his own time going that forty miles. The hon. gentleman, if he had a case of that kind in his constituency, would know something of hardship. Here is a man in a village, who no doubt has children who could easily go for the mail, who lives within a mile and a half of the post office, what great hardship is it to him that he knows not rural mail delivery? That man knows nothing of the difficulties of a homesteader or pioneer settler out in the west.

On the subject of increased postal facilities I have this to say. On inquiry at the Post Office Department I find that I am supposed to be the last man to grumble, for within the last month my constituency has received more mail contracts than any other in the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you do it?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The only trouble with me is that I do not do enough. We must still widen out; we must still more increase our service, but if you use up your surplus in instituting some great reform, these people out in the west will not be able to get the service they are entitled to. No doubt some hon. gentlemen will say that in the thickly settled portions of this country a greater revenue is supplied and that the postal surplus really comes from the eastern provinces. But we are legislating for the whole Dominion. We are besides carrying on an immigration propaganda, and when you bring people in you must give them a fair measure of postal facilities. If we had the rural delivery system, it would be idle to think of citing to you the enormous distances you would have to cover to go over my constituency alone. In my constituency alone there is as much arable land and as fertile as you can find in the whole province of Ontario south of Lake Nippissing. If you are going to establish a rural free delivery over so great an area, you are going to use up practically in so doing all the surplus you have now. Another feature to be remembered is this, that in the constituency which I represent is one-third the population of Alberta, and yet to institute on the lines laid down by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) regular routes would practically deprive my whole constituency of rural free delivery. One hon. gentleman last year, in reply to an hon. member from the west, said that we were not having a fair, square deal in this particular of mail delivery generally. He said that one reason why we did not deserve greater post office facilities was the fact that we were an unreading class of people. No statement could be more fallacious. You will find that the people in that country are a reading class and per capita a greater letter writing class than any community in the east. Most of these people are isolated from kith and kin and consequently write home to numerous friends, and thus have a greater correspondence than people in the eastern provinces.

Mr. BLAIN. What member on this side made that statement?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I did not say that any hon. gentleman on that side made it. What I said was that an hon. member of this House made it. The question is one that resolves itself simply into a business question, and as such it must be considered in all its aspects. It may be a vexed question in certain thickly settled populations, but with us the question is greater post office facilities under the present system. I believe that hon. gentlemen who will study this matter carefully will see that any argument brought forward to support rural free delivery, in our present condition, is fallacious, and the carrying out of any such system would result in increasing the facilities at one point and further starving them at another. There is no hon. gentleman here, no matter how much he may think of his particular constituency, who would like to put in operation any such system that would necessarily shut out people who have not yet received the post office facilities to which they are entitled in order that some little further privileges should be granted

their own immediate locality. I appeal to the sense of fairness of this House that it should recognize that the institution of any such system as a free rural mail delivery would be to the detriment of Canada as a whole and of the west in particular.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) in speaking to his motion the other day took occasion to criticise certain statements made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) during the debate regarding the Transcontinental Railway in 1903. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) stated that the right hon. the Prime Minister had said that the new Transcontinental railroad would cost the country $13,000,000 and not a cent more. He then read extracts from the remarks of the Prime Minister at that time, quoting from the 'Hansard' of 1903, at page 7691:

> The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 and not a cent more.

The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), who spoke after my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) took occasion to criticise the hon. member for Brantford in a very extraordinary way. I suppose that those criticisms must have been in accordance with the rules of this House, but it seems strange to me that he should designate the utterances of an hon. member as—

> Dishonest—a foolish and silly attempt to deceive this House—absurd statements.

In another part of his speech he claimed that the hon. member for Brantford was guilty of separating from their context a few words of a speech and this he said was surely not an honest thing, not a right thing and something unworthy a member of this House.

I have taken occasion to read the remarks of the Prime Minister during the debate of 1903, and I consider the statement made the other day by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) as exactly as it ought to have been and as quite by the book. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) simply stated that the Prime Minister had said that the road would cost the country 13,000,000. That is just exactly what the Prime Minister did state. If you read the Prime Minister's speech you will find that he nowhere gave an estimate himself regarding the total expenditure and obligation to be assumed by this country in connection with that road. This matter of the total cost seems to have been slurred over or forgotten at that time. A few days after the speech of the Prime Minister in 1903 the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) went into the matter of the actual cost of the road. At the same time he backed up the Prime Minister in claiming that the cost to Canada would be only $13,725,706. Please note how carefully he made up this statement, exactly to one dollar. This seems to have been an evident attempt to mislead the voters of this country as to the obligations which Canada was to assume in connection with this Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad. I know, of my own knowledge, that this argument was used on the platform in the last campaign, as a reason for supporting this government, which was so wise and able that it could build a railway from Moncton to the Pacific and have it cost the country only $13,725,706. I was confronted with this argument on many platforms in my campaign and when I stated that it was absurd, that this simply meant the loss of interest that this country would sustain, I was informed by my opponents in a very sympathetic fashion: Oh well, if Mr. Perley knows more about it than the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance why, all right. In other words, the attempt was made to laugh me out of court in the matter as not knowing anything about it whatever. As a proof that, intentionally or unintentionally, this was used to deceive the people of this country at the last election, I wish to refer to one of the campaign sheets published and spread broadcast by this great government before the last election. I hold a copy of it in my hand. On the front page it says:

> Progressive policy—Record of the Liberal government—Conservative fallacies exposed.

On page 10 of this little pamphlet we find in letters so large that if you look carefully you may see them across the House:

> A transcontinental railway for $13,000,000.

No words of explanation—it is true that in very small type farther down it says that this is only going to pay our loss on interest account. It reminds me of an advertisement published some years ago when two railways were competing vigorously between Ottawa and Montreal. They had been making the run in three hours and a quarter, but one of them came out with an immense advertisement:

> Ottawa to Montreal in two hours!

Then underneath in little type that you could hardly see:

> And 59 minutes.

That is about the way that this announcement, spread broadcast throughout the country appears to me, and I would ask if it was fair for the government to put this information before the people of this country in that sheet at the last election and if it was fair for the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) to speak as he did the other day in this House with regard to the remarks of my friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) who certainly put the case, as

I understand it, exactly in accordance with the facts. It appears now when every one sees that such vast sums will be required for this Grand Trunk Pacific, that the ministers wish to have this little estimate of theirs forgotten. In that connection I would like to say that even the estimates made of the actual cost of this road seem to have been far away below what they should have been. I noticed at the time that the late Hon. Mr. Blair, who certainly did everything he could to put the matter before the people in its proper light, estimated the total cost of this railway as $121,000,000. The Minister of Finance, in his estimate of the cost, stated it would be something under one hundred million dollars. Now is it going to be built for that sum ? It is a matter of knowledge that the contracts which have already been let have been let at a great deal higher figures than any one expected in 1903. Before this government gets through providing money for this Transcontinental Railway, they are going to have a good deal of trouble in getting it in the money markets of the world, or I am much mistaken. Even this estimate of $13,000,000 is based on a 3 per cent rate of interest and I will ask if this government is able to-day—not that it shows anything wrong with the Dominion, because our credit is as high as the credit of any other country ; but as interest stands to-day, it is impossible for any one, or any government, to borrow this money at 3 per cent. They will have to pay a greater interest, and have to stand a greater loss of interest than they expected. I notice that the Hon. Mr. Blair at that time explained that if the government had to pay 3½ per cent interest, the extra loss in the seven or ten years' interest would be $18,850,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a word of congratulation to my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Thos. Chisholm) for the remarks he made the other day on the French treaty. I thought those remarks were made in such a way as to make us all understand that the ratification of this treaty by this House would by no means be plain sailing. It is a treaty that ought to be most carefully considered. We certainly want to cultivate trade with the great French republic on a fair basis ; but I doubt very much, after the criticism of the hon. member for East Huron, whether this convention now before the House has been made on a fair basis. It is to be remembered that the farmers of France are especially the backbone of that country, even more than are the farmers the backbone of other countries. In France the land is divided into small holdings, and they carry out a system of intensified farming which produces more to the acre than we are in the habit of producing in this country where land is so much more plentiful. It seems to me that the French government were bound to protect the farmers of France, especially when they were negotiating this treaty. Our government surely must have realized that before they went to France to make this treaty, and I do not see how they could expect to get for our farmers reasonable reductions in the French rates of duty, which would be of benefit to our farmers in sending their products to that country. However, we hardly need be surprised that this government should have gone there without thinking of that, when they refuse to give our own farmers the protection they are able to give on their products.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall), in moving the address the other day which we are now discussing, made a comparison between the increased debt of this country at two periods in its history, namely, the last eleven years of the Conservative regime and the eleven years which have just passed under the present regime. He stated that the Conservatives, in the last eleven years of their regime, had increased the trade by $66,000,000, and increased the debt by $118,000,000 ; while the wonderful government of the present day had increased the trade by $378,000,000, and increased the debt by only $5,000,000. Now, I believe that is so, but I would like to ask what that has got to do with the question. What connection is there between the two facts ? The question whether the debt has increased has nothing to do with the increase of trade. It all depends on the rate of taxation and the expenditure of the country, and I submit that the trade of this country would have increased just as fast during the past eleven years if the government had borrowed more and taken less from the pockets of the people. I think therefore that the argument of the hon. member for West Peterborough was not well founded.

It is strange that the supporters of this government always take credit to themselves for everything good that happens. I notice that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), on the 6th of December, when discussing this address, said :

> In my experience I have found that Providence was of very little use to me or to the people I have had to deal with. Providence is, of course, all right in a way. But my experience is that where success and prosperity exist it is to be found among the people who help themselves.

I think I never heard the Grit policy so plainly enunciated before. In our experience on this side of the House we have always found that we owed more to Providence than to anything else. That has been my experience, and I regard the remarks of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie as rather strange, to say the least.

Now, I would like to say a few words with regard to the question of surpluses which has been mentioned during this debate. In the first place, I would say that I am much better able to agree with Mr. Fielding when he was editor of the Halifax 'Chronicle' than I am to agree with the hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, with regard to this matter. This surplus, so-called, was not brought about by the magic wand of the government. In the first instance we have to inquire how much money we take in taxes. It may be said, Sir, that the people of Canada have two pockets, they have their own private pocket, and they have the pocket of the government, which is surely the pocket of the people, or ought to be.

The government is able to increase the taxes, and this government has increased the taxes from $5.66 per head in 1896 to over $10 per head now. It is, of course, a good thing to make both ends meet in a government such as ours as far as receipts and expenditures are concerned, but if this government collected less taxes and borrowed more money there would be no surplus. At the same time I submit that the country would not necessarily be worse off if the people paid $10,000,000 a year less taxes and the government had to go and borrow $10,000,000 in the English market. The people would have that $10,000,000 left in their own pockets and would therefore, in a way, be as well off as if the government had taken the taxes from them as it is doing now. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on the 3rd of this month, made quite an argument in regard to the surpluses of this government as compared with those of the Conservative government. He stated that he found that the Conservatives, in their last eleven years, had had an average deficit of $249,000, whereas this government had had a net surplus in the corresponding eleven years of $93,626,000. The Minister of Finance congratulated himself on this grand showing. He also congratulated himself on the fact that this government had made $127,000,000 of the capital expenditure while it had only added 5,000,000 to the debt. I claim that neither of these facts is an argument in favour of the wisdom of this government or a proof of wise and economical administration. I claim that the question of the surplus is purely a question of taking money from one pocket of the people and putting it into the other pocket. It seems to me that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) must be forgiven for making an argument of this sort in support of the wisdom of this government, but it is utterly beneath the dignity of the responsible position of the Minister of Finance to try and make party capital out of a fact of that kind. There are always in this country too many people who think that the government is something away above and outside of them and something with which they have nothing to do. I find that many of the electors of this country think, if they get some money from the government for their own use, or to be spent around them, that it really does not cost them anything, that it comes from some outside source, some great benignant source that does them no harm. I think it is a pity that the Minister of Finance should try to encourage this idea. You would think that this surplus was coming down like manna from heaven and that it cost nobody anything, whereas, it represents so much money taken out of the pockets of the people. Surely if this government had taken $93,626,000 less from the people in taxes during the last eleven years there would have been no surplus. That is true. It would have been necessary for this government to have borrowed money, but our people would have had in their pockets $93,626,000 more money than they have now. I think, Sir, that a government can make wise or unwise laws, can spend our money wisely and economically, or can spend our money on graft and rake-off. In other words, it seems to me that the government is able to make good times better or bad times worse, and to help the people by wise legislation, but that it is able to make a surplus of $93,626,000 out of nothing, is of course impossible. I think that the main question is whether the money which it takes from the people is well expended on remunerative public objects and for public purposes. I find that the total disbursements of the Dominion of Canada have increased from $44,000,000 in 1896 to the equivalent of $87,700,000 in 1907; in other words, they have just about doubled. I find under the head of taxation, in the public accounts which have been brought down, that while the Conservatives in 1896 collected from the people $27,759,000, this government during nine months collected $51,565,000 which would be equal $68,753,000 for twelve months. That is the record of this government. The Conservative government had great works to carry out. It spent large sums of money on the Canadian Pacific Railway which has been of so much use to this country, on the system of canals and in acquiring the great Northwest. This government has had no great expenditures to cope with. The Grand Trunk Pacific is being built, but a comparatively small portion of that money has yet been spent by the government. In other words this vast expenditure, it seems to me, has been frittered away in small things. The money has been spent for useless public works, in many cases for rake-offs and deals of various kinds. I do not propose to-day to go into such matters—they have been referred to in this House many times—such as wharfs built where they are not wanted, dredging done for twice what it ought to cost, deals like the Moncton land deal,

bridges built for municipalities, like that at Disraeli, and in order that I may not be accused of referring only to things away from my own county, a wharf at Greece's Point in the county of Argenteuil was built by this government which is of no use to anybody whatever. The hon. Minister of Finance, at page 108 of 'Hansard,' says that this government has had in their eleven years larger charges for capital account than the Conservatives had in the previous eleven years. Larger ? Yes, larger in total but not larger in so far as the usefulness of the works upon which this money was spent is concerned. I claim that the Conservatives, although they had so much less to spend, although they took from the people of the country so much less in taxes, accomplished far more with a smaller amount of money than the Liberals have in the past eleven years with their vast expenditures. I believe that the people of Canada are at last awakened to this fact and that they will remember it when they cast their votes at the next election.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). Mr. Speaker ; the debate has been very interesting in many respects but it has developed some peculiarities. The great width of the field open to each speaker, brings it about that each speaks with regard to what ever particular feature appeals to him and the peculiar result follows that as one member takes his seat after treating of his particular subject the next rises and deals with an entirely different matter, thus breaking completely the connection of the debate. I, however, shall endeavour to stick closely to the amendment moved by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) which is really the question before the House. It seems to me, that that gentleman having spoken for such a length of time so eloquently and so powerfully, must feel somewhat dissatisfied that even on his own side of the House his remarks have not been appreciated as they deserve.

An hon. MEMBER. He did it all himself.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. If that be so, then it is evident that gentlemen on the Conservative side feel that the two members who previously spoke on their side, did not sufficiently develop their points, because they seem to be willing to give them considerable assistance in that respect. For my part, I shall at least pay the hon. gentleman from East Lambton the compliment of a remark or two on his amendment, and I trust that by brevity I shall show my idea as to what should be the length of a speech in this House of Commons on most subjects. The amendment of the hon. member is divided into two parts : In the first part we have a regret that certain statements mentioned in the address have not been sufficiently developed, and also a regret that other subjects which ought to have been mentioned are absent from it. In that feature of it the amendment is a want of confidence motion and as a government member it invites my opposition. The second part of the amendment treats more especially of rural free delivery of the mails, and although the member for Lambton travelled over a wide circle, his remarks more especially centred on criticising the Post Office Department, the administration of which the Liberal party as a whole has been proud of. And, I confidently believe that we have had very good reason to be proud of the administration of the Post Office Department, under the present government. When the Liberals came to power the department was placed in charge of a very strong minister with a very able deputy, and as we look at the development of his policy and see the result of it ; the improvement of business methods by which old deficits were changed to surpluses, the lowering of the rates of internal postage, the obtaining of imperial penny postage ; these, and everything in connection with the department have reflected the highest credit on its administration. It is rather an unusual thing that a department of the government that has been so successful and progressive should be asked by a member of the Conservative party to advance still more rapidly. But, the member for Lambton has told us he feels very keenly on this particular question ; he tells us he has studied it for a length of time and given it a great deal of thought, and that in the pursuit of his investigations he went to Washington to interview the Postmaster General of the United States and his officials with regard to the operation of the service in that country. The hon. gentleman tells us he was courteously received at the American capital ; that he got a great deal of information and that he comes back full of enthusiasm for the service, and I think I may say with also a considerable amount of impatience towards those who have not been able to see as he does in connection with it. As I beheld the picture the hon. gentleman painted of the merits and advantages of rural free delivery, it certainly charmed me because I have taken interest in the matter myself. I have felt, as does the hon. gentleman, that it would be a very great benefit indeed to many parts of our country. In what he said as to its advantages from a business and social point of view I agree with him, and with him I have hopes that the time is not far distant when we can enjoy these advantages. So far as that particular part of his amendment is concerned I am thoroughly in accord with him. I do not think he exaggerates the advantages to be obtained by the introduction of rural free delivery ; when it can be properly and economically brought about. But I have noticed also that in his amendment, the hon. gentleman has taken stronger ground than the leader of the opposition takes in the platform he laid down

in Halifax. That particular item of the public service is dealt with in the Halifax platform, and the benefits of it are described, but attached to it there is a rider—the exact phraseology of which I do not remember—in which the leader of the opposition says that rural free delivery is to be undertaken after the due consideration of the cost. That is a very prudent rider to attach to such a policy. Not only does the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton go further than the proposition of his leader, but the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) go still further than his amendment. In his enthusiasm, zeal, and earnestness, he proceeds to very great length and in his closing remarks he not only nails the motto to the mast, but he adds : 'Do it now.' In my opinion it would be a very good thing indeed if we could prudently and properly do it now. I have such a liking for the movement as a general principle that I wish it could be undertaken now, but I fear that the enthusiasm—the youthful enthusiasm, shall I say—of the hon. gentleman, has carried him beyond that prudence which must naturally guide the party in power, and from all I can ascertain I fear it is not possible to do it now, without doing very great injustice to the financial affairs of our country. Up to a certain point I follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) but when he says : 'Do it now,' I fear I must separate myself from him. I do not say that with any intention to throw discredit on his judgment, and certainly I do not wish to throw any obstacle in the way of his desires. But I must remember that the hon. gentleman went to Washington with his mind very largely settled in the desire to obtain rural free delivery, and when he asks me to accept his judgment on all the facts which have been placed before him, I must remember that he asks me to forget that our Post Office Department in Canada has been under the control of a very able man who was not unwilling to adopt such a programme, but who a session or so ago showed very plainly that with all his willingness he could not see his way clear to do so. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) asks me to forget that the reports made by the officers of the Post Office Department were not favourable to any immediate adoption of this scheme ; and so, after all, I feel that at the present time and in view of the dangers incident to the great financial cost it would entail, I must hesitate to accept the judgment of my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) ; I must give due weight to the argument of the expert officials of the department, and so I cannot conclude that the phrase : 'Do it now' has been wisely applied by the hon. member.

I realize also this difference, that there are advantages and disadvantages to the different parties in this House. The government party has the advantage of being in power, and, therefore, in a position to put into force its particular policy. The opposition has not that advantage, but the opposition has compensating advantage, of which my hon. friend has availed himself. An opposition can announce a policy which it knows it will not be called on to put in force. It is a right and privilege of an opposition to bring up new a question, and even to advocate it, before the country is quite ready for it. I will not say that my hon. friend does not deem the country ripe for this reform, but his motion is not accompanied by any other responsibility than a desire to see it accomplished. On the other hand, the government, clothed with the responsibility of immediately putting the project into operation if it accepts the principle, of imposing the expenditure on the country, and providing for the deficit which unfortunately might result, must think well and think long before it undertakes such a project. But favouring as I have done the principle of such a measure, as soon as it could possibly be obtained, I have not failed to urge it on the government, and I hope that as soon as it can be done it will be done. I hope that the government will not only act with prudence in the matter, but have courage enough to strain prudence almost to the point of adventure in order that we may obtain this boon, but I am not to condemn them for exercising proper care and prudence in the meantime. On this question my hon. friend and namesake from Strathcona very vigorously defended, as he always does, the interests of the west. I can understand indeed that the inauguration of a system of rural mail delivery in the more thickly settled parts of the east might to some extent injure the prospects of better mail service in the west. I hope it would not do so, but it might. The hon. gentleman is no doubt right in looking after the interests of his own constituents. In the same way I feel that as representatives of thickly settled parts of Ontario, the hon. member for East Lambton and myself have the right and the privilege, and are in duty bound, to look after the postal facilities in our districts. I think the rural population of Ontario will not hereafter increase very largely, so that when rural mail delivery comes, as I believe it will come eventually, it will not find a much larger rural population in Ontario than there is now, or a condition of affairs in which it will be any more strongly desired than it is now. But if we look for an absolutely even division of all these privileges and opportunities we cannot get it. At the present moment we have not got it. The hon. member for Strathcona might also object to the free mail delivery which we have in the larger cities and which we have extended to the smaller cities. For my own part, while I do not object to that, I would rather see any further extension of free mail delivery in towns postponed until we can accomplish something for the country. In the mean-

time I see that the government is looking forward to the inauguration of free rural delivery, as soon as it is prudent and proper to undertake it, for I believe that the department has the matter in view and I notice a suggestion from the Minister of Agriculture that the present facilities be increased. I accept that suggestion with a great deal of heartiness. I have not in the past had the amount of success which I desired in the way of obtaining post offices and postal facilities. I think I can in one respect quote a very unusual and almost anomalous state of affairs; I doubt whether any other member from Ontario can quote the like. I do not quote it as a complaint; it is simply one of the peculiarities of the situation. There is in my riding a township, a fine township, peopled by splendid people, as you will acknowledge when I tell you that they give a Liberal majority of nearly 300. Within that township, and it is an intelligent township, too, there is not a single post office. However, I do not say that the people lack postal facilities; that is a peculiarity of the situation of the township, the post offices being round about. However, though I have not had quite the success which I desired in obtaining post offices and postal facilities, if rural mail delivery is not to be established in the immediate future I will certainly act on the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture and persistently haunt the corridors and offices of the Post Office Department until I get greater favour in this respect than I have obtained in the past.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, the speeches of the members of the government who have spoken during the present debate have been a great disappointment to myself and I believe to the country at large. Instead of taking up the important subjects which were brought to our notice in the speech from the Throne, they have delivered speeches which one might rather have expected to have heard on the public hustings during the heat of a contested election. There is one subject which was mentioned in the speech from the Throne, which I believe is at the present moment occupying more attention amongst the people of the country than any other, and which is perhaps the most important subject dealt with in the speech from the Throne, and in their remarks during the present debate that question has not been touched upon by the members of the government. I refer, of course, to the financial stringency which exists at the present moment throughout the Dominion of Canada. We might very well have expected that some light would have been thrown on this subject, and we might also well have expected to hear what measures the government proposed to take in the emergency. There have been various reports in the public press of interviews with the Minister of Finance on the one hand, in which he is reported to have stated that he had made arrangements with the bankers of the country for facilitating the purchase and transport to the markets of the world of the crops of the Northwest; while on the other hand we have had reports that his interviews with the banks had been productive only of failure. At any rate, whatever may have been the outcome in his mind of these interviews, I can tell him that the crop of the Northwest is not being moved as it should be at the present moment, and that conditions in that country are far from what we would wish them to be. The farmer who cannot sell his produce except at ruinous figures, and the merchant who cannot collect the debts due to him on the one hand, while on the other hand he finds his credit curtailed, and the man who is hard up and does not know where to find the money to provide himself with the necessaries of life or to find the work in order to obtain that money, will not consider the speeches which we have heard from the government in this debate to be in any degree satisfactory. I wish to call the attention of the government to the state of affairs which exists in many parts of the Northwest. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), in speaking the other day, gave us a story of the prosperity which exists in his own immediate district. We have, of course, similar prosperity in other portions of the Northwest, but I regret to say that that prosperity is not universal. Unfortunately the impression which was conveyed by the speech of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was to the effect that great prosperity exists throughout the whole of the new provinces in the Northwest, and that the last crop has been more satisfactory to the producers of that crop than the crop of last year.

We have even seen interviews during the last few days with the Premier of Saskatchewan, in which the same impression is conveyed. There never was a better promise of a heavy crop throughout certain portions of that country at any rate, than during the present year. But the very luxuriance of the crops was their undoing. The season was late there, as in many other parts of the world, and unfortunately frosts came before the crops were in a condition to be immune from damage. The consequence has been that in some districts you may go out and see some of the finest crops, hundreds and thousands of acres, still standing, absolutely uncut, which will never be cut, which have nothing in them. There are many other portions where the crops have been cut, and the farmers feel they would be better off if they had never cut them. But I am speaking more of the grain which is in the farmers' hands at present, and which they desire to market. There is an extreme amount of difficulty in selling the feed wheat at any price. I had a letter

only this morning in which I was told that the price offered for feed wheat at a large centre on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the province of Saskatchewan was only fifteen cents per bushel of sixty pounds, and that even that price was not given to everybody. You had to have a pretty fair quality of wheat even to get that. There were people who had wheat for which they could not get any offer at all. I had another letter from that point some days ago, in which I was told that the price offered for oats was 23 cents and for wheat 19 cents, and that the prices were gradually coming down even from those figures. This is a very serious question. It is very serious when some of the best wheat growing districts find that five-sixths of their crop comes under the category of feed wheat, and when, in the majority of instances, the yield was only ten or twelve bushels per acre, and the harvesting was extremely expensive. I know of one case in which a gentleman, who had a magnificent crop before the frost came, and who has a pretty considerable amount of grain from it, finds he would be much better off if he had let that crop stand. The cost of harvesting and threshing and hauling to the market—he has some little distance to draw it—was greater than he can realize from the prices now offered. It may be said that what I am now stating is not borne out by what we read in the market reports. There is no doubt whatever that the prices for contract grades are good at present and have been good throughout the season, but the prices for the lower grades, especially the feed grades, are absolutely illusory. I have come across no one who has been able to avail himself of the prices that are advertised for those lower grades of wheat. Few are able to sell at the prices we see quoted and a great many are absolutely unable to sell at all. And while I am on this question, I would like to call attention to the feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction which exists at present with regard to the grading system. It is of course especially difficult to grade to the satisfaction of everybody in a season like this, in which there has been so much frost and so many different grades of wheat. There will never be a satisfactory solution of the question until we are able to get a sample market. I do not see any prospect of that in the very near future, but I still hope it will not take many years before we have it. But there are other ways in which the government can do something to relieve the present stringency, and I propose to make a suggestion later on. I am not sufficiently conversant with the grain business to give an opinion which would be of value to this House regarding the reasons generally speaking for the low price of inferior grades of wheat and the reluctance of grain buyers to pay even those low prices; but there is one reason, which has a considerable bearing on the question, and which it is in the power of the government to remedy. I refer to the lack of transportation facilities. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) made a complaint regarding the transportation facilities throughout the portion of Manitoba from which he comes. But I can tell him that in Manitoba he can have no conception whatever of what we have to put up with in the provinces further west, especially the province of Saskatchewan. The Prime Minister himself said the other day that he was aware there were complaints that the railways in the new provinces were not properly discharging their duties and he believed that some of the complaints were well founded, and the remedy he suggested was in their control by government and parliament. I hope the right hon. gentleman will exercise that control. For years past we have had a constant shortage of cars and motive power throughout the Northwest. The climax was reached last year when for months scarcely any part of the crop was moved during the winter. Certainly excuses then were to be found in the extreme rigour of that winter, and I for one, and other gentlemen, did not deem it the proper time to take the strenuous action we otherwise would have done. We brought the question before the House, and I myself had the assurance, as well as others, that the companies were doing everything possible. But while last year there was ground for excuse, there can be none this year. This year the crop is very much smaller and the weather since the harvest has been simply ideal for railway purposes. Yet we find that the condition is nearly as bad in certain parts of the country as it was last year. The condition is such that no one can reckon on getting a car for months after he has ordered it. Consequently there is a great spread between the street price and the track price. If you cannot get your grain into a car, you have to take whatever you are offered for it by the wagon load or by the car load in the street.

The Manitoba Grain Act provides in very considerable detail for the distribution of cars amongst the different people who desire to ship wheat but it does not insist—and there is the great matter in which it falls short—on a reasonable number of cars being supplied to meet the demand for transportation facilities; so that to-day if a grain dealer buys a carload of wheat he cannot be certain of shipping it within six or eight months. With an uncertain market the purchase of feed wheat then becomes so speculative that the dealer quite naturally does not wish to touch the proposition at all. I found that the spread in price between track and street quotations depends to a great extent upon the prospect of getting cars at a certain point. I noticed where cars were coming in pretty freely the spread between track and street price was only 12 cents. At that same point two or three weeks earlier, when no cars could be obtained, one of

the grain dealers told me that he would not give within twenty-four cents of the track price for street wheat.

During the last month or two before coming to Ottawa I made a large number of inquiries in regard to this transportation question at many different points and I found that the usual answer I received as to the spread in price between track and street wheat fit only for feed was 20 cents a bushel, and that was entirely due to the fact that the railway companies were not supplying the transportation facilities which they should. At one point where I happened to be on November 7, I was told there were one hundred and twenty-two applications for cars on the order book and that from the time the first car was supplied on October 17, to the day of my visit, November 7, only some five cars had been supplied by the railway company at that point. I could multiply cases of this nature, but do not propose to do so. I shall however give one specific case which occurred last year which was told me by a gentleman whose name would carry weight in any part of the province of Saskatchewan.

At 5.30 o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

Hose resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 7) to incorporate the Northern Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Adamson.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Co., Ltd.'—Mr. Carvell.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment of Mr. Armstrong thereto.

Mr. LAKE. When the House rose at six o'clock, I had been calling attention to the lack of facilities for moving the wheat crop in the Northwest, of which the public are complaining at the present time. Having given some examples of the present condition of affairs, I was proceeding to mention as a further example a case which had been brought to my notice showing the difficulties which our farmers experienced last year. I was giving the case of a gentleman in the province of Saskatchewan who is well known, and whose reputation stands extremely high, and his statement can be accepted as thoroughly reliable. That gentleman told me that last year he had raised a crop of 11,000 bushels, and had put that into an elevator on the 15th of September last year. He was unable to ship the whole of that wheat until the 15th of August this year; so it took him eleven months to ship out 11,000 bushels of wheat, though throughout the whole of that time he was using every endeavour to get the railway company to carry that wheat for him. He told me further that he only got three cars provided for him in six months and a half, that is to say, although he was anxious to ship his wheat, in six months and a half, all the facilities the railway company could supply him with were only sufficient to ship 3,000 bushels or perhaps a little more. I stated a little while ago that I did not wish to go into this whole question of transportation at the present time, but later on I wish to do so. I think I have said enough to-day to show the government that a very serious condition exists at the present time, and I would urge them in the strongest way to take this question up and see whether something cannot be done to relieve the situation which exists in considerable portions of the new provinces. Navigation has been closed at Fort William, and therefore any wheat which is not shipped at the present moment and which it is intended to bring down to the east, will have to go by the all rail route.

I am informed that in the province of Ontario there is a great shortage of feed, and the farmers have to dispose of their cattle at prices which are absolutely ridiculous, otherwise they would have to allow them to starve for lack of feed. Now, I would suggest to the government that they bring these two parties together, bring the man in the Northwest who has cheap feed wheat to sell into communication and into contact with the Ontario farmer who is most anxious to obtain such feed for his cattle. I think this could be done by entering into an arrangement with the railway companies which are operating west of Fort William and getting them to supply sufficient cars to take the feed grain which is offering in the western provinces and transport that grain by the all rail route, at a reasonably cheap figure; I think the present figure might be cut in two. It would be greatly in the interest of the whole country if this suggestion were adopted. Then the Canadian Pacific Railway and other transportation companies could be approached with a view to getting them to transport this feed grain at low rates to the eastern provinces. I do not think we need go far to find a precedent for the government taking such action as this. It will be remembered by this House that at a time not long past when the farmers of Nova Scotia were in straits for want of feed, the government stepped in and granted them transportation for hay, I believe practically free. Immediate action is called for, and I trust the government will not let this opportunity go by. I notice the statement

has been definitely made that the government is assisting the banks with money to do business in the Northwest. If that is true, though we have not had it so stated in the House, the government should certainly go one step further and make arrangements with the railway companies in the manner I have suggested.

There is another question affecting the Northwest that I wish to impress upon the members of the government, and that is the absolute necessity of looking after some of the newly arrived settlers in that country. The government are under some special responsibility with regard to the large number of immigrants who have recently come into that part of the country. The government control the whole of the public domain, they control immigration, they are responsible for all the regulations under which these immigrants are permitted to take up land : they have encouraged the immigrants to come in and to settle on homesteads, they are also responsible for the statements in pamphlets which have been spread broadcast encouraging them to come into this country ; therefore, I say, the government are under a special responsibility in regard to those immigrants. In the past the custom in that country has been that merchants and business men have practically carried the newcomers through the first year or two of settlement. I do not suppose one man in six who comes into that country to settle, has enough money to build his house, buy his implements and stock, and secure the necessaries of life for the first two or three years, and until he is able to produce sufficient to keep himself and his family. In the past the merchants have been able to give credit to those who they believed were likely to succeed in that country. At the present time that condition is changed. The merchants themselves have to rely upon the credit which they have from the banks of the east, and if that credit is very largely closed down by the banks and business people of the east, they will no longer be able to give credit to the newer settlers. I very much fear that many of the new settlers who have not been long enough in the country to get themselves fairly established may be up against a very difficult proposition during the present winter. Many of them may be short of food and fuel for themselves and seed to put in their crops in the spring. In the past the local merchants have generally seen to that part of it, and if the credit of the local merchants were such at the present time that they were able to take charge of the newer settlements I feel quite sure that they could safely be left in their hands. And I think it would be the part of good statesmanship for the government to see that the merchants of the Northwest are put in as good a position as they have been in the past to look after new settlers who have come into the country. I believe that if it had not been for the way in which the merchants of the Northwest have carried the newer settlers when they came into that country we should have had very few people in the west at the present time. They could not have stayed there and the conditions yet are very much as they were in the old days when we had so many difficulties to contend with in the way of early frosts and drought.

Now, Sir, in my opinion, it would have been more commendable if the members of the government had gone into these financial questions more closely in speaking during this debate rather than to have branched out into political campaign speeches and an arrogant glorification of the prosperity of the country and of the share which they stated they have had in bringing about that condition. I have been very much struck by the way in which the members of the government, as well as their followers, have arrogated to themselves the whole credit for the prosperity which undoubtedly this country has been enjoying during the last few years. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) distributed to the members of this House copies of a speech which he had delivered, I think, in the town of Aurora not very long ago, and I was very much struck by the language which he used in regard to the present prosperity of the country. This is what he said in one particular part of his speech :

> Much as we owe to Divine Providence, one must realize, however, that the general policy of the Reform government, which was entrusted with the affairs of this country in 1896, has added not a little to that happy state of things. Whilst it is unnecessary for me to dwell at length upon the cause of this prosperity, yet it is but fair to remind you that the fiscal policy of the Liberal administration has given the farming community of Canada the good times which it is your happy lot to enjoy.

It will be noticed that the Postmaster General did allow that a certain amount of credit was due to Providence for the good times which this country has been enjoying in the past, but it remained for a follower of his, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) to take quite an opposite view, to refuse to give any credit at all to Providence for these good times, and to ascribe the whole of it to the way the Liberal administration have been carrying on the affairs of this country. This is what the hon. member for Portage la Prairie says :

> The hon. gentleman thinks that Providence has more to do with our success than anything else, but in my experience I have found that Providence was of very little use to me or the people I have had to deal with. Providence is, of course, all right in a way, but my experience is that where success and prosperity exist, it is to be found among the peo-

ple who help themselves, and unless people help themselves and use energy and effort, Providence, I think, plays a very little part.

I do not propose to say anything in regard to the good taste of that part of the speech, but it shows that not only members of the government but their followers are ever taking to themselves the whole credit for the prosperity which Canada has been experiencing in the past. Canada has been prosperous, it has been a growing time, and I think it may be fairly said there has been a splendid period of expansion of trade throughout the whole world; but I claim that the prosperity is not so great in Canada as one might reasonably have expected from the magnificent chance which the government of this country have had before them. They have had a new country to open up which I think is unequalled in any part of the world in regard to its vast natural resources, and in my opinion they should have been able to do more than they have done. Let me take the basis which they have selected as the gauge of the prosperity which this country has been enjoying. They have taken in every case the tables of trade and commerce and they have argued from the splendid increase in our trade and commerce that the prosperity of Canada has been greater than that of any other part of the world. Comparisons have been made in this House—they were made by the hon. gentleman who moved the address (Mr. Hall)—with the older countries of the world. I would suggest to him that it would be very much wiser to make comparisons with the young and more growing countries of the world, and I would suggest that he might make a comparison with other countries which are in much the same position as ourselves, with the great self-governing colonies of the empire, with that sisterhood of nations which was represented at the late imperial conference. I have been looking into a very interesting book of which a large number of copies are purchased for our library—The Statesman's Year Book—which has been a standard work for a great number of years. I have looked at the figures which are given in that book for all the colonies of the empire. Unfortunately the years for which the tables of trade and commerce are given are not the same in every case, but about five years are given in pretty nearly every case, and in these years I find that the colony of Australia had an increase in its trade and commerce of 35 per cent, while Canada had only an increase in its trade and commerce to the extent of 29 per cent. Cape Colony, during the four years which are given in that book, had an increase of 85 per cent, while Canada had only an increase of some 24 per cent. New Zealand is the only one of the great self-governing colonies which has not beaten the record of Canada in regard to her trade and commerce, the basis which these gentlemen have selected as the gauge of their prosperity. I find that New Zealand had an increase of 16 per cent, while Canada increased 24 per cent. Newfoundland, during the period given, increased her trade 31 per cent, while Canada only increased her trade and commerce by 21 per cent. I might mention also one other great dependency of the empire which had a representative in that conference; that is the empire of India.

During the three years for which the figures are given, the trade and commerce of the empire of India had increased some 27 per cent while during the same period in Canada our trade and commerce had increased only 18 per cent. It appears to me that our increase in trade has not been as great as we might reasonably have expected when we compare it with the expansion of trade in most of the great dependencies of the empire. When we speak of trade and commerce (which includes the imports and exports according to these tables), we are only telling half the story, because we have still to take into consideration the proportion between the exports and the imports, and I think the true gauge of the prosperity of a country is that exports and imports should increase in reasonable relevancy to each other. I find that in every one of the great colonies, and in the empire of India, their exports have steadily increased, and they have been for the last two or three years in excess of the imports. It is the first time I have ever heard the argument advanced, as it was by the Minister of Agriculture the other night, that the prosperity of a country was to be gauged by its imports. I think it is perfectly true that it is impossible to lay down any fixed rule, as to whether it is necessary for the exports of a country to exceed the imports to prove that a country is prosperous, or whether it is necessary, in some countries at any rate, that the imports should exceed the exports, but I hold that there should be a steady increase in both, and that there should not be a most extreme disproportion between the two as has been the case in Canada. The Minister of Agriculture in support of his rather astounding doctrine quoted from the writings of some German economist, but the statement of that authority was simply to the effect that the old idea had been exploded, that a country which was importing more than it exported was necessarily doing a worse business than a country in which the conditions were the reverse. However, the authority quoted by the Minister of Agriculture did not go on to say that for a country to be prosperous it was necessary it should have an excess of imports over exports. Only the other day the president of the Bank of Montreal, who is a gentleman who has studied this question perhaps more deeply than have most members of this House, called attention to the fact that the foreign trade balance is running somewhat heavily

against Canada, and that in five years the imports for home consumption exceeded the domestic exports by $291,850,000 ; and he went on to state that this balance will have to be liquidated sooner or later, showing that in his opinion there would come a day of reckoning if our imports continued to so enormously exceed our exports. In this connection I call attention to the fact that in the speech from the Throne, a statement is made which, if the true meaning of the word 'trade' is considered, is not in accordance with the facts. The government put in the mouth of His Excellency this statement :

> It gives me great pleasure to be able to congratulate you on the remarkable expansion of the trade of Canada with other countries; the total trade of the past year far exceeding that of any of its predecessors.

Now if the true meaning of the word 'trade' is an interchange of commodities, and it is, it is not true that the interchange of commodities last year exceeded that of the preceding year. I will take a charitable view of the ministers and I will say that they have been so accustomed to talking of this increase of trade without considering whether it was imports or exports they were speaking of, that they possibly had not the intention of stating what is not correct. But it was perfectly easy for them to be candid with the people of Canada, and to make a statement which was absolutely and emphatically true, and to do that they simply had to substitute the word 'imports' for the word 'trade,' and then the people of Canada would have known what the true state of affairs was ; and they would have learned that our imports had increased during the past year in a degree far exceeding that of any of the preceding years. It might be well for me to say that the Trade and Commerce returns for the year ending August 31 (the last returns which I have been able to procure) show that the exports of Canada have actually fallen off by more than $2,000,000 although the imports have increased to such an enormous extent. I therefore claim that the trade of the country has shown a falling off. I have made a comparison which shows that Canada is not making the same progress as some of the self-governing colonies of the empire, but I think our condition can be better shown by a comparison with the great Argentine Republic ; and I am encouraged to make this comparison by reason of the fact that a member of the British House of Commons who was entertained by the Canadian Club in London a few days ago, made this same comparison which I have been looking into for some time past. The Argentine Republic is our greatest rival at the present time ; the conditions in that country are strikingly similar to those in Canada. The Argentine Republic is the great colonizing country in South America as we are in North America. Its area is not very dissimilar from ours if you deduct these portions of Canada in the far north which so far we have not been able to settle. The area available for settlement in the Argentine Republic is similar to ours ; the population of the two countries is almost alike, and both countries have been getting in about the same number of immigrants.

The immigrants into the Argentine Republic have been from the southern races of Europe, mostly Italians and Spanish, while we in this country have been getting our immigration from what we call the more virile, at any rate the more energetic races of northern Europe; and therefore we might expect that our trade would increase more rapidly than that of the Argentine Republic ; and yet I find that the imports and exports of the Argentine Republic increased from $268,085.000 in 1900 to $527,998,000 in 1905, an increase in the five years of ninety-seven per cent, while during the same period the increase in the foreign trade and commerce of this Dominion was only twenty-three per cent. So that on the basis on which members of the government and hon. gentlemen opposite generally gauge the prosperity of this country, it has fallen very far behind that of the Argentine Republic.

But when we go a step further and inquire into the imports and exports respecively, the disparity is even greater. In the five years mentioned the excess of exports over imports in the Argentine Republic amounted to $455,639,000 while in Canada our excess was the other way—it was an excess of imports over exports, and it amounted to $116,858,905. In that period the balance of trade was in favour of the Argentine Republic by some fifty per cent of its total business, and in no one year did its imports exceed its exports, while the balance of trade against Canada amounted to about nine and one-half per cent of its total business, in spite of the fact that in two years of the six given, the balance had been in favour of Canada. In the past year the balance of trade against Canada has amounted to nearly fifty per cent.

There is another striking comparison which might be mentioned to show that these gentlemen had not been making use of the opportunities which they had for forwarding the interests of this country. That comparison is furnished by the Republic of Mexico. A short time ago the Department of Trade and Commerce distributed a statement by their commercial agent in that republic which gave some figures in regard to Mexico. Mr. Donly used these words :

> While the totals are only about one-half of Canada's foreign trade for the same period, the percentage of increase during the last ten years has been quite as remarkable as that of our own foreign trade.

And he goes on to give the figures for those ten years, which show that the in-

crease in the trade and commerce of Mexico in that period amounted to 145 per cent as against an increase in the foreign trade and commerce of Canada of 130 per cent; showing again that even the old-established Republic of Mexico has been forging ahead more certainly and more surely than this new Dominion of Canada with everything in its favour. The balance of trade in those ten years has also been in favour of Mexico, while it has been against us for many years past. In connection with this it must be remembered that Mexico has a very large debt and has to spend a large amount of money on her army and navy. In fact, her expenditure on these three services amounted to 63 per cent of her whole revenue, leaving only a comparatively small percentage to be devoted to the building up of the country; while the expenditure of Canada on debt and militia during the same period amounted to only about 25 per cent of our total revenue. It seems to me that we should have been able to show far better returns for the great expenditures we have made than these other countries to which I have been calling your attention.

Another matter referred to in the speech from the Throne is that of the abounding revenue, for which a great deal of credit is taken by the government; and, strange to say, they use that as a further argument to show the prosperity of the country. The Minister of Finance the other day admitted that he had been converted from the opinion which he had formerly held that a surplus is just so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country, which are the words he used a good many years ago. Now, Sir, I think that the Minister of Finance is taking a wrong view of that matter. I believe the view he originally held was the much more correct one. Perhaps I would not go so far as to adopt his exact words, and say that it was so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country. But if that was his opinion at that time, and I have no doubt he held it sincerely, what would he have said to the fact that some sixteen and one-half millions of dollars were taken out of the pockets of the people of this country in nine months above and beyond what was necessary to carry on the business of the country? If he was correct in that view, how much better would not our position have been at the present moment if those sixteen and one-half millions of dollars had remained in the pockets of the people to enable them to meet the financial stringency which we are up against to-day? The Minister of Finance did what to me appeared to be a very extraordinary thing; he drew a comparison of the surpluses and deficits during the last eleven years the Conservatives were in power with his own record in the eleven years in which he has been Minister of Finance, and he actually appeared to boast of the fact that during those eleven years he had on the average been out eight and one-half million dollars every year in his calculations as to what would be necessary to carry on the government of this country, while during the eleven Conservative years the finance ministers of those days had only on the average been out in their calculations about a quarter of a million dollars. It seems to me that that is a most extraordinary confession for a finance minister to make. If a chancellor of the exchequer in the old country were to come down to parliament and admit, after having imposed let us say a shilling on the pound as income tax, that he had taken out of the pockets of the people some sixteen and one-half millions pounds more than was necessary for the carrying on of the government, I think he would very soon find that he would have to vacate his job. It would be something the people would not stand for a moment. If he had made a slight miscalculation of two or three millions, he would try to correct that in his next year by taking off or putting on a penny of the income tax.

But is is simply inconceivable to me that any Chancellor of the Exchequer in the mother of parliaments would dare to come down to the British House of Commons and boast that he had in eleven years made a miscalculation to the extent of $9,500,000, or pounds sterling, on the average every year. The principle is an entirely wrong one to apply in this country, namely, to take from the ordinary revenues of the country to meet the expenditure which should be charged to capital account. We are a young and growing country and we should allow the people who are to populate Canada in the future to bear some share of the capital expenditure which we are making in the present day. To-day we are short of cash, yet we find the government boasting that they have taken sufficient money out of the hard earnings of the people to build the National Transcontinental, to meet all charges in that respect and other capital expenditure, and actually to pay off some of our debt; and they are actually proposing in the speech from the Throne to apply something more than $3,000,000 at present to further extinguish the debt of the country. I protest strongly against any such step. It would be most fatal policy to send now $3,000,000 more of our cash out of the country for the purpose of extinguishing to that extent our national debt. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said, in his earlier days, that if these surpluses were created in some magic way, it might be well enough; but that every dollar of them was taken out of the pockets of the people without a shadow of excuse.

Allow me also to take up a very few moments more in discussing the high taxation under which we are at present labouring. I shall merely deal with one item of that taxation, the customs duties. The customs

duties, during the twelve months ending the last day of August this year, amounted to the enormous sum of $58,259,233, while in the year 1897 they only amounted to $19,891,997. Thus that taxation has actually increased very nearly three times what it was under Conservative administration; and it is an actual fact, to which attention was called by the leader of the opposition the other day, that higher duties are being paid on specific articles to-day than were paid when the Conservatives were in power. It may be that, in some instances, the rates of duty are lower; but it has been the policy of this government to increase the values of articles for customs purposes, so that the duties which our people are actually paying are higher than they were under the Conservative regime. By various devices and pretexts, which they carefully concealed from the general public, the government have been able to extort from the pockets of the people the enormous customs taxes which they are taking from us at present. In proof of this, let me just mention one item, that of cement, concerning which an expression of opinion was given by Mr. Ashdown, a strong supporter of the government in Winnipeg. Mr. Ashdown, in his evidence before the tariff commission, speaking of those dumping clauses of which the government are so proud, said :—

The operation of the dumping clause, as a rule, injures the consumer and benefits no one except the American manufacturer, who generally raises his prices accordingly.

Further on he said :—

The duty on importations of cement amounts this season to nearly forty-eight per cent since a duty was put on the sacks. This is on actual importation and on the values approved by the customs.

Then he added : It is an outrage. I do not think that any one in this House had any doubt whatever, when the duty was placed on the sacks in which cement was imported from the United States, that it was intended to work out, as it has done, in an increase in the duty on the cement itself. Therefore I consider I am right in saying that the government have increased the duties by various pretexts, which they have endeavoured, and with some success up to the present, to conceal from the people. These same dumping clauses, as Mr. Ashdown has said, are forcing the Canadian consumer to pay to the foreign manufacturer more than the foreign manufacturer is willing to supply his goods to this country for. It is a policy in favour of the foreign manufacturer and against the Canadian consumer and its effect has been to lead to higher prices. The increase in prices may not be entirely due to the action of this government, but a considerable portion of that increase is in a measure due to their policy. I find that the average customs taxation per family in Canada in 1896 only amounted to some $19, while this year it amounts to nearly $50, and in the words of the Minister of Finance it has been taken out of the pockets of the people without any shadow of justification.

Allow me also to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon the admission he made the other evening that the principle of protection has been in the tariff ever since he knew it and that it is there still. I am glad that he has at last come to the point of making that confession, because we find the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) session after session reiterating the same old speech in which he professes to show that this government have carried out in their entirety the policies which they laid down in their platform of 1893. That platform definitely laid down this policy in regard to the tariff :—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

* * * * *

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

The promise was clear and definite in regard to the elimination of the protective principle from the tariff, and so I hope we shall hear no more about the government having carried into effect the promises which they made in the year 1903. The present Prime Minister made several speeches prior to the elections in 1896 in which he defied pretty clearly the policy of the Liberal party and showed clearly the meaning of the Liberal tariff plank. At Winnipeg he said :

I came before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of freedom of trade. I denounce to you the policy of protection, as bondage, yes, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which American slavery was bondage.

Later on, speaking at Montreal and Quebec, he let it be clearly known that the intention of the Liberal party under their tariff plank was to have free trade as it exists in Great Britain. He said :

Upon that question I need not tell you we stand at the very antipodes of the Conservative party. The Conservative party believe in protection; all their hope is in protection. The Liberal party believes in free trade on broad lines such as exists in Great Britain, and their immediate object is a revenue tariff, a tariff to be derived from customs but which will levy no duties except for the purposes of revenue.

Speaking at Quebec the Prime Minister said :

I have told you that our object is to have a customs tariff for revenue only. Upon the question of protection there can be no com-

promise. We stand here against protection and in favour of a customs tariff based upon the principles of revenue and nothing else. The system of protection has been the bane and curse of Canada. The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines such as exist in Great Britain.

He went on further to say :

We will tax for revenue, but not one cent for protection. When we are in power we will relieve the people of protection which is a fraud, a delusion and a robbery.

Thus he set forth most clearly that the intention of the Liberal party was, as we have always believed it to be and as the people of this country believed it to be, to produce just such a customs tariff as they have in the old country, a customs tariff which under the name of free trade raises a considerable revenue by means of the taxation of certain luxuries and certain necessaries of life, but does not afford any protection whatever.

Therefore, Sir, I say that after the confession of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the other day that the protective system is still embodied in the tariff, we expect the Liberal party to accept the situation which they have themselves admitted, that they have failed to carry out the promises which they made to the people of this country in regard to that question. As an example of an attempt to explain away a difficult situation, the statements made the other evening by the Finance Minister as to what was meant by the Liberal tariff platform exceeds anything I have ever come across. He said that their meaning was that they endeavour to reduce the tariff but with due regard to existing industries. That is his explanation of the meaning of the tariff plank in the Liberal platform of 1893.

In the Northwest the Liberal party press have always posed as free traders and they have always declared that the Conservative party are high protectionists. The speeches which were delivered the other day by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) must have convinced the Liberal press of western Canada that such contentions are absolutely at variance with the facts.

I wish in conclusion to refer briefly to the speeches bearing upon that particular phase of the amendment now before the House which refers to rural free mail delivery. I feel that the country is indebted to the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) for the extraordinary amount of information which he has been able to lay before the people of this country in dealing with this most important question. He has evidently devoted an immense amount of time, energy and industry, to the preparation of that information, and I consider that the facts that he was able to lay before the House certainly deserve some answer and some consideration at the hands of the members of the present government. I would like also to congratulate the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Gilbert McIntyre) upon the statesmanlike way in which he dealt with that question. He and the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre)—who I think dealt with it from an extremely narrow point of view—both appeared to agree that the postal facilities in the west were not what they should be, and I most cordially endorse that statement. With the extraordinary revenue which the Post Office is making out of the people of this country it is a scandal and a disgrace that the postal facilities in the newer settlements in the west are not better then they are to-day, and I hope that some part of the much boasted postal surplus will be immediately applied to the relief of the people in the west. But it does not necessarily follow that giving rural free mail delivery in the more densely populated portions of Canada would interfere with the extension of postal facilities in the Northwest.

The evidence adduced by the hon. member for East Lambton went to show that rural free mail delivery in time became self-supporting and was really a factor in adding to the postal revenue of the country. The two improvements in my mind could go on side by side. I commend the proposal that there should be a system of rural free mail delivery most heartily to the consideration of the present government. If they refuse to take it into consideration I believe the people by their votes at the elections, which we believe are likely to take place in the near future, will state most definitely and positively that they believe equal postal facilities should as far as possible be given to the farmers as are given to the people who reside in our cities and towns.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate, after the numerous amendments that have been proposed to the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I feel that I would not be doing my duty if I gave a silent vote, and I shall therefore explain the position I intend to take on the address. At the opening of this session we are generally informed of the proposals which are to be presented to the House. We have seen part of the policy of the government in the speech from the Throne, and I may add that there are matters which will come up in the House that are not referred to in the speech from the Throne. The subjects dealt with in that speech might, I think, be divided into two groups, the things that are good for the country and those that are not so good. Amongst the many good things which have been presented for our consideration by His Excellency, I notice with pleasure that the government propose to initiate many liberal measures, such, for instance, as old age pensions, an amend-

ment to the Insurance Act, government control of telephones and telegraphs and better postal facilities for the country. I am sorry I have not heard a clear declaration from the government in favour of public ownership, but I understand that they propose to advance step by step, and that some day that will be the policy of the country. The Finance Minister the other day, speaking I think of Colchester, said he had not found there any sentiment in favour of public ownership except in respect that it was opposed to the economy practiced on the Intercolonial. This would tend to prove that the policy of the Liberal party should be that works of public utility should be property of the public and then operated under the control of the government, or rented to some private company which would operate them under the control of the government.

But the chief point, I think, in the speech from the Throne was the reference to the Imperial Conference, and I am glad to be able to congratulate the Prime Minister on his having saved Canada's autonomy at that conference. He championed colonial autonomy against some jingo and imperialistic attempts by other members of the conference upon the freedom and liberty of the colonies.

Mr. FOSTER. What one ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I think the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Deakin, was one and I think there are some others. But I am not an Australian and have nothing to say as far as that colony is concerned. But at the same time we have seen a new scheme launched at the Imperial Conference, which is now before the public as a great point of interrogation, I refer to what is called the All Red Line. What it is, we do not know yet ; but I hope that if it comes before the House this session it will be thoroughly discussed. At first sight it seems to me that the Canadian parliament would be subsidizing an Imperial scheme, and would be sacrificing some portion of Canadian autonomy. For instance, we have at present in Ottawa interviewing the government a delegation from Ireland asking that if there is to be an All Red Line it should start from Ireland. The very fact of this delegation coming here shows the physical impossibility of establishing such a line without sacrificing a certain portion of our autonomy. If the Canadian parliament were to express an opinion as to the point where this All Red Line should start from, the Australian parliament might express another opinion, and the Imperial parliament itself might express an altogether different opinion, and where would we be ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. An All Green Line should start from Ireland.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I do not think the Imperial parliament would favour an All Green Line. However, these incidents show that before this scheme is adopted it should be discussed thoroughly, because as I have just said, it seems to me it would be impossible to accept it without sacrificing some part of this country's autonomy.

Then we find the French treaty is mentioned in the speech from the Throne. Of this I will say but little. We are told that trade follows the flag. I think capital follows the trade also. The treaty, although not perfect, is a good one. It should tend to encourage French immigration to this country and capital also along with the trade. Everybody knows that of all countries in the world there is in France the greatest amount of surplus capital available for starting new enterprises in various parts of the world. I cannot say that the treaty is altogether perfect. I think I could agree with my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Thomas Chisholm) who the other day objected to the introduction of absinthe or imitations of cognac. But these are small defects which could be easily remedied. I think the country will profit from the treaty, and so far as that goes, it is a credit to our Canadian diplomats.

But the speech of His Excellency also refers to some things which are not quite so favourable to the country as was the attitude of our Premier at the Imperial Conference, and the French treaty. First of all, we are told that the country is in the midst of a financial crisis, though that is not as bad as in the United States. But there is a crisis in the country, and something should be done to relieve the situation. First of all, I think that the banks are somewhat to blame. I think the government should put some capital in the banks, and relieve some of the uneasiness which is felt to-day. I have seen the suggestion that if the government paid the debt it has in the country they would put so much more money into circulation and relieve the banks to some extent. I think also that something should be done to prevent the banks from sending Canadian money to the United States to favour wildcat schemes, when that money is urgently needed for circulation in Canada. The difficulty is that when the money goes abroad we cannot get it back again when we want it.

We have also to deplore what has been called a national calamity, I refer to the collapse of the Quebec bridge. It may truly be called a national calamity, when in consequence almost 80 good workingmen went down to their death while doing their duty in constructing a government work. Apart from the loss of life, there is a great loss of time in getting the bridge ready for the railway, and a great loss of capital which is now at the bottom of the St. Lawrence. I hope that the government will take steps to have a vigorous investigation into

this matter. Last year my hon. friend for Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille) made a very learned speech on this subject, and we discovered from his statements that although the government should have had an engineer to supervise that work according to its contract with the Quebec Bridge Company, no such engineer was there. We also heard during the debate last year about graft in connection with that company. Nothing has been proved so far, but this much we know, that the bridge has disappeared, and that no satisfactory inquiry has been made into the accident. The public mind is still in a state of tension and anxiety, and will not be satisfied until we have a complete and searching parliamentary inquiry and investigation.

Another suggestion in His Excellency's speech which surprised me more than anything else was that we should rejoice over the increase of immigration into this country, and that the immigrants have come mostly from the British Isles. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have made my position on the immigration policy of the government quite clear. I am opposed to bonusing immigration, because it can have only the one effect of securing quantity and not quality.

When I raised that question last year in the House I must admit that my words did not carry very far. I must admit that I had no great success. I must admit that my policy was challenged as being that of a little Canadian,—and as such I was proud of it. But, what has happened since? The motion that I had the honour to bring before the House has been taken up by the press of the country, and since then there has been throughout Canada a strong current of opinion against the bonused immigration policy, and to-day we hear that it is time for Canada to stop bonusing immigration. The policy followed to-day especially in Great Britain has had no other effect than to hypnotize immigrants and to bring them to this country under false pretenses. We have been advertising our country as a patent medicine and the result is that all the diseased have come to our country, diseased in body, diseased in mind and diseased in soul, and I cannot think we will succeed in making sound Canadians out of them. The British immigration, which I think ought to be the best immigration that we can have in this country, has been spoiled by the policy of bonusing and canvassing immigrants, and to-day we see in almost all the English press of this country reports that in the west, in the province of Ontario as well as in the province of Quebec, the immigrant who came from England has no means of securing work or engaging in business in Canada, because there is no need for him. By bonusing immigration to this country we have brought about no other result than to spoil the very best immigration which could be brought to this country. I think that should be stopped. I think that this policy of advertising Canada and of bonusing booking agents and steamship companies should be stopped immediately in the best interest of our country and in the interest of the future of our country. There is no use of bringing to Canada the scum of the continent, or even the scum of the British Isles. Blood may be thicker than water, but there is one thing after all that is more important to every Canadian. It is not the maxim that blood is thicker than water, but that Canada is for the Canadians and that Canada should be looked after before any other part of the empire. We have seen the result of the labours of those employed by the agents of the government. We have seen that the Church Army have been calling on ex-convicts drunkards, tramps, hooligans, and people from the slums who are diseased in mind and body to come to Canada. We have denounced that system, and I see that the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada have denounced that system. I see they have denounced also the Salvation Army. It was insisted upon that an investigation take place.

Whether by his department——

The Department of the Interior.

—or the Department of Labour, it mattered not, and that if, as a result of the investigation, it was found that the allegations made were well founded, the granting of moneys to the Army, as well as the grant toward the maintenance of one of its institutions in England, should immediately be stopped.

That has been found out after investigation. But, what have we also seen? We have seen that in Vancouver there were riots. These riots are said to have been started by men who are not Canadians but who are Americans, and who had no other idea in mind than the creating of a disturbance in Canada. I think not. I think that these riots were not started by anybody from the United States. There may have been some agitation coming from the United States, but that agitation came from the labour leaders who are united with the labour men of Canada, and who want to protect white labour, it may be of the United States or it may be of Canada, and I am one of those who believe sincerely that British Columbia is for British Columbia, and that it should be a white man's country. It is true that we have sent one of our ministers to Japan. Is the treaty between Great Britain and Japan one that has been passed by Canada? I do not think it is. It is a treaty which has been passed by the Imperial government. I think it is time to apply what has been said of our country, that if we are daughter in our mother's house we should be mistress in our own, and if Canada does not want to have any Japanese immigration we should not look first to a treaty of which we had nothing to say, but we should urge

our ministers in Canada to represent strongly to the Imperial government of Japan that Canadian labour wants to be protected and that British Columbia wants to remain a land for the white man, and wants to keep its labour for its own children. That is my humble opinion with regard to the general policy of the government immigration, and I strongly appeal to the government as a Liberal government in the best interests of the country to stop bonusing immigration. If we do not want to have this country within twenty years, or within ten years, especially in the Northwest, filled with a foreign-born population who will rule with a rod of iron the Canadian-born population, who will find themselves to be a minority and an insignificant minority, we must stop the policy which has prevailed in the past and which the government are still continuing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen also in the speech from the Throne that the Dominion Lands Act will be presented again this year. I might safely add, I think, that it is understood also that certain additions will be made to some provinces of the Dominion. I understand—I may be mistaken—that it is promised that parts of the Northwest will be added to Manitoba and also certain territory to the province of Quebec. I hope, if these additions are made to these provinces, that the broad principle upon which confederation has been based, the respect of minorities, shall be maintained in those territories after they enter the old provinces. I sincerely hope that the Conservative party will join hands with the government so that the rights of the minority will be respected, and I think I can safely guarantee that if any territory is added to the province of Quebec, the Protestant, English-speaking minority will not have to suffer, but will receive the same treatment from the province of Quebec that it has received from the time of confederation. But I hope that in the western provinces, or in Manitoba, a law, and a strong law, will be passed in this House to protect the rights of the minority, that the opposition will join hands with the government on that question and that we shall see maintained by both sides of the House the broad principle upon which our confederation has been based, and that we will have maintained the principle upon which our confederation stands to-day, that there will be equal justice for all, and that the minority, be it a Catholic or Protestant minority, shall be protected and shall see its rights and privileges maintained when it enters into any province of this Dominion. I saw the other day in the Toronto 'News,' I think, that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), when he was out west, skated over a very important question—the school question. If the report is true that the leader of the opposition skated over that question, it could be for only one reason, and that is that the principle I have always maintained in this House that the majority is not the fanatical body of human beings which it was reported to be in the ministerial press of Quebec, but that it is a broad and generous majority, ready to give to its fellow countrymen all the privileges and rights that have been granted them, and if the leader of the opposition skated over that question in the Northwest it was because he thought or because he had found out that the elements which had been dominating the Conservative party on that question were wrong, that there was only one opinion, be it amongst the English-speaking and Protestant Canadians, or be it among the French-speaking Catholics, that the minority, whether it be in the Northwest, in Manitoba or Quebec should see its rights and all its rights protected. When these new territories enter confederation, as part of one or other of the provinces, I trust we shall accord to them a complete measure of justice, not a half-measure, and that all parties in Canada shall join hands in giving them that to which they are rightly entitled.

Now, Sir, I have come to that part of the policy of the government which is not to be found in the speech from the Throne. I regret there has been such long delay in publishing the revised statutes in the French language. I doubt if the work was pressed forward as it should have been, but now, eight months late, we have an assurance that the French version of the statutes will be ready at an early date. I know the Solicitor General too well to accuse him of being the cause of this delay, but I would not be doing my duty if I did not suggest to the Minister of Justice and to his successors in that office, that this should be the last time in the history of confederation when the compact of 1867 made between the two great races of Canada will be violated. I trust that in the next consolidation of the statutes, and all succeeding consolidations, the French and the English version will be published simultaneously. The right hon. the Prime Minister has declared on the floor of the House that the French language was on equal footing with the English language, but I have to express my regret that such has not been the case. I give as an instance the Intercolonial Railway in the province of Quebec on which conductors are employed who cannot speak a word of French. At the Levis station, where all the population is French, the notice of the arrival or departure of trains is posted only in the English language, although there is a penalty provided in the Railway Act for not publishing it in both languages in the province of Quebec. I am sorry to see the govern-

ment railway violating the law, and being a government railway we have no opportunity to sue it in the courts unless we file a petition of right and obtain a fiat from the Minister of Justice. Perhaps it will be sufficient to ventilate this grievance in parliament. It must be remembered that the Intercolonial Railway has half of its line in the province of Quebec, and that it gets almost three-quarters of its revenue from that province. It is therefore only just that the language of the people who have the largest part of the burden of that railway on their shoulders should be accorded recognition. I make these remarks without any bitterness; I make them because I conceive it my duty, and because I think the matter has been overlooked by the Minister of Railways. I trust that in the future the travelling public who speak French will be better treated by the government, and that in all the departments of government the French language will be placed on an equal footing with the English. And when the government departments do use the French language, I trust they shall use the French language and not the Iroquois translations which are circulated throughout the country and outside the county, to the great chagrin of the French Canadian people.

One other point, and I conclude. Last session we had a most unfortunate incident, which is known throughout the country as the Fowler incident. If that incident was not threshed out on the floor of parliament, it is not the fault of what has been called the independent Liberal party in this House. This year we are threatened with an incident of the same kind. The other day the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Pugsley), speaking at the Russell Theatre, is reported in the Montreal 'Herald' as follows:

> The audience expected a fighting speech, and they got it. Mr. Pugsley renewed the accusation he has several times made about the existence of a corruption fund in Montreal in 1904, and this time gave the dates and the amounts of money sent into one New Brunswick constituency, $20,000 of it a couple of days before the election, when so large a sum could not possibly have been used for any but illegal purposes. He did not name the riding, and he did not name the bank through which the money was sent, nor the persons who sent or received it, but he made it quite clear that he was ready to do all three if urged sufficiently by the opposition. In fact the thing was put so straight, and with such appearance of confidence, that it is difficult to see how the opposition can overlook the challenge, unless motives of prudence prevail over all others.

Well, Sir, last year, we tried to get the member for Kings (Mr. Fowler) to speak, but unfortunately, first, the majority of this House, then a technicality, overruled us. I trust that this year no technicalities will be invoked, and that no majority will prevent the Minister of Public Works from speaking. If he has anything to say he should say it now. For the sake of the reputation of this parliament we should stop the practice of throwing from one side of the House to the other, challenges to bring to light immense scandals and deeds of corruption, and then when brought to the proof, as was the member for Kings last year (and as I hope will not be so with the Minister of Public Works this year), their authors sit down and say nothing. For the good name of the country, the Minister of Public Works should not wait to be forced to speak, and if he does wait, I think he should be forced. That 'La Presse' deal, and what is known as the Blair-Russell affair should be threshed out. We have heard a good many things about them in the press; prominent men have been accused of misdeeds, but all we know of this mysterious affair is that 'La Presse' was sold to the syndicate and that Mr. Dansereau was sold with the plant. If the Minister of Public Works knows more, if he knows of any corruption, it is his duty to himself, it is his duty to the country, it his duty to the Liberal party, it is his duty to the government to bring these facts to light. If he does so, then I as a Liberal promise him my support; my honest and humble support. If, on the other hand, there is nothing to be said, all this talk should cease immediately. We should have no more of these tactics, such as were resorted to by the Trojans who stood on the ramparts to challenge the Greeks to combat, and then ran away when their opponents advanced. If these charges of corruption be true, we cannot have clean politics in this country.

If there is one thing above another which we want in this country, it is precisely clean politics, because clean politics produces clean government. Let us therefore do our utmost for clean politics. Let us also not forget, Mr. Speaker, that our country is for the sons of this country; that Canada is for Canadians. Let us not forget that in this country there are no more victors or vanquished, no more majorities or minorities, but only Canadians, all with the same rights, that is, the rights guaranteed to them by the constitution of 1867 and by the spirit that has been put into that constitution by our forefathers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall take my seat. I have nothing to add, except, perhaps, one word; that is, that I shall try as a member of this House to follow the example which was given to me by a man who has disappeared from this House—I mean the ex-member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa. He has fallen in the battle, but he has fallen like a man. He has fallen for his principles and for what he believed was for the good of the people and of his country. He has fallen for the policy he has maintained in this House, that is, the principles of justice, truth and liberty. I hope,

Mr. Speaker, that I shall be able, with my humble means, to follow the example he gave to me when he was in this House, and that I shall never rise before this parliament for any other cause than that of liberty, truth and justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The Minister of Public Works.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, in spite of much urging, in spite of much what you might call baiting on the part of members on both sides of this House it seems almost impossible to bring the Minister of Public Works to his feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You must not be too impatient.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I have no doubt that the castigation which the hon. gentleman received to-day at the hands of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) requires some little time for cogitation on his part before he can make a reply. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice of this House to allow the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne to pass with comparatively little criticism. This fact, however, has been seized upon by certain Liberal journals throughout the country who have endeavoured to make party capital out of the same by claiming that everything was going so satisfactorily under the government, that the opposition could find little or nothing to criticise or comment upon adversely. Undoubtedly, had the opposition during those years seen fit, in the exercise of their duty, to subject the various speeches from the Throne to a fair amount of debate, these same journals would have raised the hue and cry throughout the country that the opposition were obstructing the business of the House. On this occasion it was considered that the government were especially vulnerable by reason of their many sins of omission and commission, and it was considered that the debate on the address was one of the few occasions on which a member might exercise considerable latitude in discussing not only the subjects dealt with in the speech, but also the omission from the speech. On this occasion also, by reason of the remarkable speeches of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, who travelled very far afield and went out of their way, leaving almost untouched the subject-matters mentioned in the speech from the Throne in order to make stump speeches on the Halifax platform of the leader of the opposition—by reason, I say, of this fact, the opposition decided that they were willing to meet them even on these grounds, and give matters a full, clear and legitimate amount of discussion. During the last few years the dominant note in the various speeches placed in the mouth of His Excellency has been the prosperity Canada has been enjoying. At the same time you will look in vain in any of those speeches or in any speech delivered by any cabinet minister, either inside or outside of the House, or in any speech of any of their followers, for such an expression as 'the prosperity which prevails throughout the world.' Not, Sir, that this expression could not have been truthfully applied; not that this would not have been a fair description of the condition of affairs universally existing throughout the world, but it was designedly left out lest it might detract from the credit arrogated to themselves by the government in their attempts to lead the country to believe that our prosperity was indigenous to Canada and the result of Liberal statesmanship. But now that the pinch of hard times is upon us, now that the prosperity consequent on good crops and high prices has received a temporary check, now that many of the manufacturing industries are running on half time or with a smaller number of hands, now that the farmers of the Northwest are holding their grain at great risks of its being destroyed rather than part with it at unremunerative prices, now that money is tight in the country, what are the words placed in the mouth of His Excellency by the government of this country? Here they are:

> The Dominion has been blessed by a long series of prosperous years, and, though at the present moment its business is being restricted by the financial stringency which prevails throughout the world——

And so on. How very consistent these hon. gentlemen are! They endeavour to take all the credit for prosperous times, but when the opposite condition of things is upon us they try to unload the responsibility and attempt to leave the impression that it is but a reflection of the condition prevailing in every country of the world. Now, Sir, it is undeniable that the prosperity which we have had in recent years has been universal in its application, and it would be a strange thing indeed if a country situated like Canada, blessed by Providence with its magnificent resources—its splendid agricultural wealth, its immense forests, its teeming fisheries, its growing manufacturing industries—did not enjoy her full share of prosperity. But to the condition of financial stringency which we are suffering from to-day I claim that the same terms cannot be applied, that it is universal in its application. It is true, Sir, the country to the south of us has been hit even harder than we have been. That is but paying a just tribute to the soundness of our financial institutions and our more conservative business methods. But it is also an undeniable fact, patent to us all, that Germany, France and England have sent many millions of dollars to this continent in order to relieve the financial stringency prevailing on this continent—money that would not be allowed to de-

part from these countries were they suffering the same degree of financial stringency that we are suffering on this continent.

The government and its friends are very anxious to take credit for the financial prosperity, but certainly want to divest themselves of any responsibility for the opposite condition of affairs. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in a budget speech delivered in this House some few years ago, declared that we were then on the crest of the wave of prosperity, that we could not look for a continuance of the same for any length of time, and that already there were clouds on the horizon indicative of the approach of financial storms. What then was the duty of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in view of his own salutary warning. Was it not to reef sail and prepare the ship for the coming storm Was it not to apply the pruning knife and cut down all unnecessary and useless expenditure ? Was it not to reduce taxation and thereby lessen the burdens of the people and put the country in a better position to withstand the coming wave of adversity ? Has he done so ? No, Sir, quite the contrary. The expenditure of our country has nearly trebled since he came into office. Our taxation has more than doubled. The debt of our country, under which these hon. gentlemen claimed the people were groaning, when we had a Conservative administration, has increased by millions of dollars instead of decreasing. Surpluses so called have disappeared as if by magic, and in no instance has the hon. gentleman displayed that spirit of prudence and wisdom which we might expect from any judicious Finance Minister under the circumstances. 'Taxation is an evil that nothing but the absolute requirements of the government can possibly justify.' Such was the dictum of Sir Richard Cartwright in former days. No doubt the House will recognize this well known phrase, these words of wisdom, which came from the mouth of that gallant knight in those days when he was a member of the opposition. Yet that hon. gentleman is still a member of this administration which has taken millions of dollars annually out of the pockets of the people more than was necessary to meet the requirements of even this more than extravagant government. Had this money been expended judiciously, there might have been some justification for the expenditure. But what has become of it ? Much has been utilized for the bribing of the people with their own money. Much has been spent in building useless wharfs and breakwaters ; constructing expensive public buildings in villages and towns where they are certainly not needed, and where the revenues from these expenditures certainly do not warrant them ; in purchasing from party friends millions of dollars of supplies without tender, and this by these great sticklers for contract by tender in days gone by ; in paying large and exorbitant prices and making huge fortunes for the middlemen ; in paying out to the North Atlantic Trading Company from the hard earnings of the people, for bringing in immigrants which it had not the slightest thing to do in securing and many more the country would be better without. The members of which company are so sensitive about having their identity disclosed to the world, that they threatened self destruction, and were not to be taken alive. Far be it from me to advocate self destruction, but if these gentlemen be so particular about having their names proclaimed to the world, notwithstanding the fact that they made a contract, in which there was a clause binding them to do nothing contrary to the laws of the country in which they were to operate—if these men were to hide themselves behind the stool pigeons, in the form of office clerks, who represented them—if these men are so sensitive to exposure that they prefer a short cut to eternity, it would have been much better for the people of Canada had they carried that threat into execution before dipping into the Canadian treasury and taking from it some $400,000, which would have been a million dollars had it not been for the watchfulness of the Conservative opposition. These are some of the ways in which the money of our people has been frittered away, the want of which is so seriously felt by our people at present.

Surpluses are evils. They tend to extravagance. They are indefensible.

This is another well worn expression which I am sure the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), if he were here, would recognize. Many a day has that hon. gentleman's tones reverberated through this hall, hurling denunciations against the Conservative administration for the somewhat modest surpluses they then had, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) now says they were. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in giving voice to that declaration, seems, in view of subsequent events, to have been blessed with almost prophetic vision, but he does not appear to have benefited by it. We had on these very grounds an evidence and a singular illustration of the incompetency of this government. They had a wing added to one of our departments ; but by reason of its faulty construction, right in the shadow of the main parliament building, under the eyes of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) and his high priced officials, no sooner was it constructed than it tumbled to the ground in ruins. That work is indicative of the class of work going on under this Public Works Department from the Atlantic to the Pacific—this department which was presided over by a gentleman, (Mr. Hyman) who, for the last two sessions he was in charge, was in possession of a seat stolen in the city of London.

We had another exemplification of this incompetency in the collapse of the Quebec bridge, entailing the loss of millions of dollars besides the irreparable loss of many lives. I am strongly of the opinion that had the government taken proper precautions by having its own inspector on the grounds and by having the plans and specifications passed upon by its own inspector as well as the construction of same, much sorrow might have been alleviated, much destruction of life, and much loss of money.

The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), when he uttered these prophetic words I have quoted, no doubt had some dim anticipation of the Moncton land deal by which certain lands required by this government were secured by party friends at current figures and then sold to the government in the course of a few weeks at enormous profits.

No doubt he also could see in anticipation the subsidizing of the party press, by paying out annually hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purpose of polluting the fountains of information.

No doubt also he could see in the future the paying out of the treasury of Canada millions of dollars annually, in the form of bonuses, which he and his friends declared was a most vicious form of protection.

With such a mirage passing before his eyes, no doubt the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) spoke prophetically when he said that surpluses were an evil and tended to extravagance. When the crops are good, when prices are good, when money is plentiful, when trade and commerce is expanding, it does not require a master hand to guide the ship of state. The test of true statesmanship is to be found in the hour of adversity. Judged by this standard, how lamentably have the present administration failed. Contrast the activity displayed in the recent crisis by the American government with the apathy of this administration. While the American government grappled strenuously with the difficulty, this government did nothing to alleviate the hard times. By interviews in the press, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) endeavoured to excuse his inactivity and explained the difference between Canadian and American banking operations. But he was forced to take action by his own supporters. Rumour has it that a certain senator came from Manitoba to urge him to make the pretense of doing something to relieve the situation in the west and thus help the party. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), did take some action and make some sort of a pretense of activity, and thus gave an excuse to party leaders in the west for declaring that he was placing $10,000,000 to the credit of the banks for the purpose of moving the grain of the west to the head waters of lake navigation and thus take away all grounds of complaint. But wonderful to say that $10,000,000 is not forthcoming, and the moving of the grain is still handicapped by want of funds, and in the meantime the lake navigation is closing. Prices are taking another drop, as they always do at the close of navigation, and this serious state of affairs will be seriously intensified by the want of confidence in the Finance Minister's administration of our financial affairs.

If such a condition of affairs existed under a Conservative administration how the welkin would ring with charges of Tory incapacity and Tory incompetence! It is difficult to estimate the great loss that has been sustained by the people of the Northwest by reason of their not being able to find a ready market for their grain this fall. Owing to unfavourable climatic conditions, there was a great percentage of frosted grain this year, and on account of the lateness of the harvest many farmers were compelled to cut their grain on the green side, and it was only by finding a ready sale for such grain that it could be prevented from deteriorating. I know personally of cases where farmers hauled grain many miles to market only to be informed that the elevators could not find room for such grain, as so much grain was stored in special bins, and therefore these farmers were compelled to take the grain home again at great trouble and cost or to dispose of it at sacrifice prices. In the meantime the farmers were being pressed for overdue accounts by merchants, the merchants by the wholesalers, and the wholesalers by the manufacturers. I know personally of many men who have been refused their usual lines of credit or have had them seriously curtailed so that they could not obtain the money requisite for their legitimate lines of business. Then too, many farmers have been induced to hold grain in the hope of higher prices by reason of the fictitious reports sent out by the eastern papers, which were copied by many of the western papers, to the effect that the Finance Minister, in his zeal for the welfare of the financial institutions of the country was rushing to their assistance and placing at the disposal of the banks the treasury of this country; but when we came to investigate the condition of our treasury we found it was empty, the spendthrift had been there in advance. This is an exemplification of Liberal statesmanship, of the administration of a government who have boasted of their surpluses, but who have fallen down when confronted with the first serious difficulties of a financial character involving the interests of producers and business men—difficulties which might have been avoided or largely remedied if proper measures had been applied.

The speech from the Throne referred to the large revenues which the Post Office Department has been reaping during the last few years, and this question of the surplus in the post office seems to be a

favourite theme for Liberal orators and newspapers to dilate on. If surpluses in the past have been evils, as these gentlemen used to say, there is no department to which this can be better applied than the Post Office Department. That is a department which should not be run for surplus purposes, and if the Postmaster General will take my advice, after returning from paying his respects to the Emperor of Japan, he will follow the example of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and go to the west—and he will find many avenues where he can spend the surplus to the advantage of the settlers who are crying to-day for much-needed improvements in their postal facilities. If he cannot accept this invitation, let him read the press and he will find sufficient grounds of complaint, sufficient hardships endured and grievances requiring remedy, to keep him busy for some time, and if, instead of gloating over surpluses he endeavours to make the lot of the settler in the west more easy, by giving him much needed postal facilities, he will be making some proper return for the increased taxation levied on the people of this country by this government.

The government also propose to place telephones and telegraphs under a certain amount of government control by means of the Railway Commission. The only member of the Liberal cabinet as originally constituted, who was really sincere in his advocacy of state-owned telephones was frozen out of the cabinet by reason of his espousal of such a policy. However, owing to the growing sentiment throughout the country in favour of government ownership of such utilities, and especially owing to the stand taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), the government's hand has been forced in a measure, and so they have had to meet the demands of the people at least to a certain extent, and, while the Bill proposed does not go as far as government ownership, but merely places the services under a certain amount of control by the Railway Commission, that measure will be welcomed by the people, although it will not satisfy them. Evidently the government have not had the courage to follow in the footsteps of the Manitoba government and inaugurate a state-owned system, a policy which I am pleased to say has been adopted and followed in Alberta and Saskatchewan. This is only another exemplification of the progressiveness of the Roblin government in Manitoba, and it is likely to redound to the benefit of the people of that province. I am, Sir, greatly surprised to read the remarks of a fellow member from Manitoba on this question of government ownership. If there is one place in Canada where government ownership of public utilities is popular, it is in Western Canada, and especially in Manitoba, and I marvel at the hardihood, as I might almost call it, of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie in getting up and voicing such expressions as the following:—

In the town from which I come we have a certain amount of municipal ownership and operation, but I have never seen yet where the people were making any great profit out of their municipal undertakings.

Mr. Speaker, who is desirous of running our municipal 'phone system for the purpose of making any very great profit? Are not the people reaping the advantage by low rates? Do they not own their own plant? Have they not absolute control of it in every respect? The best evidence of this is to be seen in the hon. gentleman's own town of Neepawa, where the municipal ownership of telephones and electric light plant has been in operation for years and the citizens would not part with it on any account. That municipality is giving a cheaper service than is given anywhere else, and yet the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) says it is worthless, and he does not favour it. A compliment was paid to the hon. gentleman's town by Mr. Roblin in calling his fellow townsman, the Mayor of Neepawa, Mr. J. H. Howden, into his cabinet to take charge of the newly-created Department of Telephones and Telegraphs, where his vast experience of the municipal ownership system will be of service to the entire people of Manitoba.

The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) went on:

Under the conditions that exist in this country at the present time I do not think that the question of the government ownership and operation of railways, and possibly I might say also telegraphs and telephones, is worthy of consideration. I believe that a better system can be worked out. If we can couple private enterprise with government control, I am satisfied that the results will be much more satisfactory and profitable to the people of this country than any other system.

When did the hon. gentleman make up his mind to that fact? Not twenty-five years ago. I am not holding him to a declaration dating as far back as that, as the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) refused to be bound by a statement as old as that. Is it one year ago? The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) rightly exposed him in the House the other day. The leader of the opposition in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Brown, in the provincial campaign last March, declared repeatedly that he had a certain policy which would meet the requirements of the people of our province much better than the policy of the Roblin government, that whereas Mr. Roblin's policy embraced merely the government ownership of long distance 'phones, leaving the local exchanges to municipal ownership, he would go one better and provide for government ownership in its entirety. My hon. friend from Portage la

Prairie aided him, abetted him, encouraged him, spoke for that policy, canvassed on it and possibly may have got some votes on the strength of that appeal. In the face of this declaration of last March, I ask the hon. gentleman if he then considered such a system was not worthy of consideration If so, how humiliating a position he must occupy to-day—or is he of the lightning change variety, can he change his policy to suit the exigencies of the day?

Now, so much for government ownership. I am pleased also to see that at long last the province of Manitoba is promised at least a measure of justice in connection with the extension of its boundaries. But we have heard so many diverse reports as to the character of the proposed extension that we await with considerable interest the production of this Bill. I view with a certain amount of apprehension the concluding words of the sentence referring to this particular subject in the speech from the Throne. It says :

> Among the measures to be submitted to you is a Bill for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba and of other provinces.

What other provinces have to do in connection with the extension of Manitoba's boundaries, passes my comprehension. 'Tis true, the Prime Minister invited the governments of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan to come down here in conference and discuss the disposition of the district of Keewatin. I take it that the question of the boundaries of Manitoba is one between this government and the government of Manitoba alone ; and speaking as a Manitoban, I emphasize that opinion by reason of this fact, that when the last boundaries of the province of Ontario were affected it was distinctly stated that those boundaries were to be for all time to come. In connection with Saskatchewan, just the year before, this government had given them 250,000 square miles of territory, and why that province should be called in to decide as to the disposition of the district of Keewatin, I cannot comprehend. The member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) who seems to be more loquacious out of the House than he is in it, has already given two diverse reports as to the character of this proposed extension. The member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has referred to it. During the by-election in the constituency of Mountain, in the province of Manitoba, that gentleman took the platform and told the people there that amongst the Liberals themselves they had decided on the proper boundaries of the province of Manitoba, and that the northern boundary was to be the Churchill river, Saskatchewan and Manitoba to have equal access to the bay by way of the Churchill river, and a measure was to be introduced to that effect. The session went on and no Bill was introduced. During the last provincial election Mr. Brown, the leader of the opposition, stated publicly that he had a pledge from this government that a Bill would be introduced last session for the extension of the boundaries of our province, and he would not be at all surprised if that Bill were introduced prior to the provincial elections. The elections were held, no Bill. The session was ended, No Bill introduced. We have had the hon. member for Selkirk, within the past month, breaking forth in songs again, and this time he is reported in the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' the Liberal organ, as having said that a Bill would be introduced this session for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, and that Bill would provide that the northern boundary would be the 60th parallel, making it harmonize with the northern boundaries of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Now the hon. gentleman cannot be right in both these versions, and which is accurate ? I am somewhat sceptical of the hon. gentleman's right to speak with authority. We remember that the Prime Minister has seen fit to invite the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario to a conference to take into consideration the disposition of Keewatin. They came down, they placed their cases before the government, he stated their representations would be taken into consideration, and he would let them know the outcome. From that day to this, so far as my knowledge goes, the governments of those provinces have not been made aware of the decision of this government in that respect. If the statement of the hon. member for Selkirk is true, this is what happened. The hon. member for Selkirk, a private member of this House, who was not a member of that conference, has been taken into the confidence of a member of this government, to the neglect and slighting of the premiers of the other provinces who were invited here, and who are still ignorant of the proposed extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, or the proposed disposition of the district of Keewatin. However, I trust that when that report is brought down it will be found that the lands, the timber and the minerals there may be on those lands in that added territory, will be handed over to be owned by the province of Manitoba ; if not, that Bill will not be satisfactory to the people of our province, in view of the experience we have had during the last few years.

Now, there is a paragraph which refers to two of the ministers having been sent as special plenipotentiaries to France to negotiate the French treaty. I am not referring to this for the purpose of discussing the treaty, but judging by the able exposition of it by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Thos. Chisholm) I am almost inclined to the opinion that it amounts to a license to sell absinthe, wines, spirits and liquors in Canada. Whatever the treaty may be, I am afraid, so long as that gentleman's speech goes uncontradicted, and the government have not answered any of his State-

ments, that the people of Canada will make up their minds that the French treaty will be of very little value to them. I trust however that it may prove more useful to Canada than it appears on the surface. However, we will wait with interest the debate which will occur on this question. But I referred to the two ministers merely in view of the very natural curiosity of the people of this country to know who really compose this cabinet. In recent years there have been several changes in that cabinet, for divers reasons which I will not mention. But let any one compare the cabinet of 1896 with the cabinet of 1907, and he will see at once the sad deterioration that has taken place so far as quality is concerned. So far as quantity is concerned, we remember that while in days gone by the Liberal opposition severely condemned the Conservative government for having too many ministers and over-governing the country, as soon as the Liberal government came in they immediately went to work and increased the number of ministers by two.

I cannot admire the spirit of gratitude of the Prime Minister. He did not exhibit a marked amount of gratitude when, in 1896, he passed over his tried and true colleagues, those who had sat side by side and shoulder to shoulder with him during his eighteen long years of travelling in the wilderness of opposition, and who naturally looked for their reward when the plums came to be distributed. But the new Prime Minister said to them, in common parlance, go away back and sit down, you do not possess the requisites, you are not of cabinet material ; you may be all right as privates in the ranks, to do menial work, but when I make up my cabinet I will hie me to the provincial arenas. So he did, and he took in the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia, the Premier of New Brunswick, the Premier of Ontario and the Attorney General of Manitoba. He has recently brought into his cabinet gentlemen who did not even occupy seats in this House, notwithstanding his large following in the House, and conferred upon them cabinet rank to the slighting of his old supporters who had stood at his back for so many years. While I say that I cannot admire the Prime Minister's spirit of gratefulness in passing over his friends who have faithfully stood by him so long, we must say that in forming his first cabinet he had, comparatively speaking, a fairly strong government. But when we compare it with his present government we may well apply the scriptural quotation : 'There were giants in those days.'

Now, Sir, we are also promised some needed amendments to the Election Act. No doubt amendments are sadly needed for the purpose of remedying the disgraceful proceedings that have been carried on in our country during the last few elections. We have seen a trained band of experts in ballot switching, ballot substitution, ballot manipulation, whose duty it was to go round from constituency to constituency and rob the people of their franchise. Is it not enough to make every honest Canadian, irrespective of party, hang his head in shame when he observes the degradation of our political methods, and especially when he takes up the journals of the motherland and reads the uncomplimentary references to our Canadian political methods ? What a spectacle we had in this House only a few sessions ago ! We had evidence that the constituencies of Brockville and West Huron were stolen from the Conservative candidate by such methods. The leader of the opposition attempted to place the people in possession of this information. In the discharge of his duties he brought this matter to the House, and moved a reference of all these matters to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Prime Minister, apparently sincere, made a declaration of his willingness to have that done.

If a wrong was done he said I want that wrong remedied. If any one has been guilty of these crimes they should be brought to justice. The matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and a condition of affairs was revealed there, that, had the Prime Minister known it in advance, I venture to say that he never would have agreed to the adoption of the motion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. But the session closing before that matter could be completed, the leader of the opposition, the following session, renewed his motion and then what do we see? —the Prime Minister rising in his place— he had a new light in the interval, pressure had, no doubt, been brought to bear by some of his following to, for Heaven's sake, stop this exposure which was bringing disgrace not only upon the country but especially on the party and calling upon his following to vote down the resolution which he had agreed to the preceding session. When the Prime Minister of His Majesty's premier colony did that, we were inclined to ask ourselves the question: Are we in autocratic Russia or in democratic Canada ? We despaired for the future of our country. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to deplore as he did last year bribery and corruption and he especially condemned ballot switching, but, Sir, I hold that the Prime Minister as chief of the executive of this country, and his colleagues, have done more to lower the tone of political morality in Canada than any other man or men. Why do I say that ? Simply because the records of the country will bear me out in that declaration. He might have if he had brought the parties to the bar of justice at the outset saved a repetition of these notorious actions, but he threw the mantle of charity over them and he even protected those who were guilty of these crimes. Take St. James division, Montreal, where my hon. friend from Beauharnois

(Mr. Bergeron) had the seat stolen from him, where bribery was rampant, of the ordinary and the extraordinary kind, where perjury was resorted to and where personation was reported. Did the government place the Justice Department at the disposal of the gentlemen who were chiefly interested in exposing this wrong-doing? Not so, and it remained for my hon. friend from Beauharnois and his friends at great expense of time, labour and money to bring some of the more guilty ones to justice and place them behind the bars. Then the Justice Department got busy, and worked overtime in their efforts, and eventually they released from prison one of the chief culprits on the ground of failing health. We saw the Prime Minister's colleagues fleeing the country in order to escape personal service for fear that they would be brought before the courts of this country to answer for their political crimes and to explain how they had swept the province of Nova Scotia. They knew how they had swept the province of Nova Scotia by the most questionable methods and they were endeavouring to take advantage of a legal quibble to escape from justice. But there was one hon. gentleman from whom we expected something better, but whom bad company has rather spoiled, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who removed to another part of the British empire, but who, when he was brought back, took the witness stand and categorically replied to many of the questions that were asked of him : I refuse to answer on the advice of my counsel. If the hon. gentleman had nothing to hide, nothing to screen, I do not think he would have taken that position. What a contrast that is to the position that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition took when he went into the witness box and answered every question honestly and manfully, who had nothing to hide or screen, who had nobody to defend and who therefore answered every question like a man. I do not think that it is a comparison which is at all favourable to the Minister of Finance.

Then, again, we had the perpetrators of the thin red line outrage which we have heard considerable of in the province of Manitoba. I venture to believe that that was an outrage the parallel of which we have never witnessed in any province of this Dominion and which for audacity and boldness has never been surpassed in the history of our country. Returning officers, having had the clerk of the Crown in Chancery send to them the election lists, sent their lists in to be doctored, to be fixed, to use their own expression at the time, by whom ? by a judge of the land, an impartial tribunal ?—not so, but by a Liberal organizer of the province, Mr. Leach who kept a staff in Winnipeg working night and day for weeks striking out names and disfranchising Conservative electors by the wholesale. When these matters were brought to the public gaze, did the Dominion government step in and offer to prosecute the guilty ones ? Nay, nay. When in 1896 something was brought to their attention by the then Liberal government of the province of Manitoba, which refused to prosecute themselves and threw the entire expense upon the Dominion government, and when, in the constituency of Macdonald, they claimed that there were gross irregularities, they appointed several Liberal lawyers in the west to prosecute and they arrested a good many innocent men. Many of the deputy returning officers were arrested. They spent $10,000 upon that investigation. Although the bill sent in was $19,000 or $20,000, showing that these Liberal officers were out for graft then, the law officers of the Crown cut it down to one-half and the country spent nearly $10,000 without securing any convictions. But, on this occasion what did we find ?—the provincial government—like the Whitney government—doing their duty by placing the wheels of justice in motion. They brought these parties to book and no longer ago than three weeks when the assizes were on at the city of Winnipeg and when these cases were called, what do we see ?—a Liberal lawyer in Winnipeg appearing in court. In whose behalf ? He appeared to represent the Dominion government. What for ? For the purpose of prosecuting the persons accused of these crimes ? No, Sir, but for the purpose of defending them. Sir, I am sure it will considerably surprise the members of this House to know that the treasury of this country is placed at the disposal of these men who have been arrested for political crimes in the province of Manitoba. Then, again, there is not only this thin red line, but there are many others. You might take the Prince Albert case. While the government were not directly interested, indirectly they were because they failed to prosecute. A couple of new polls were opened and it was the duty of the returning officer to notify the Conservative candidate. He went away, mailed back to the Conservative candidate a notification of the opening of these new polls, then he came back, met the Conservative candidate and never let him know anything about these polls. The deputy returning officers were sent out to take the vote at these polls in the northern districts. Some of them had been in the employ of this government, they went out, they did not go near the place where they were advertised to hold the polls, but they sat down on the broad prairie 150 miles north of Prince Albert, pulled out their boxes and pulled out their books, entered 150 fictitious names—I believe the Rabbit family figured conspicuously amongst them —placed 150 fictitious ballots in the box every one marked for the Liberal candidate. They did not have the generosity to mark a solitary ballot for the Conservative can-

didate and then they came back to Prince Albert, their caps in the air, heralding a great victory, moral and otherwise, and especially otherwise. When this matter was brought to their attention, did the government put the Minister of Justice on the trail of the guilty parties? Not at all. What did occur was this: Through the efforts of private individuals these gentlemen were brought up and the Crown attorney, the representative of the Justice Department, appeared once more to defend the guilty who threw themselves on the mercy of the court, pleaded guilty and got off with a nominal fine. With that record staring him in the face a recount of the ballots was held. The judge holding that recount, notwithstanding that these men had pleaded guilty and had been fined, held that he had no official notice of this and counted every one of these 150 ballots.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, and in view of that I am not even a judge and I thank heaven for it, but while that may be in accordance with strict legal technicality, according to the technicalities of the law, there is no person in this House or out of it who will claim that this either was justice or common sense. They were advised that if anything were wrong they were to take it to the election courts of the land, and they acted on that advice. They took it to the Supreme Court presided over by five gentlemen, three of whom were appointees of this government, one of whom is a brother of the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), none of whom you may say, or some of whom, never had an important brief as lawyers in their lives before they were put on the bench. No high legal attainments had they; no practice at the bar. These three out of the five declared—although the judge advised that these cases be taken to the election courts—these three declared: We have no election courts in the province of Saskatchewan competent to try any election case. The other two judges, men of eminence at the bar, men of high legal attainments, men who have for years served the public in the capacity of judges and who have the confidence of the people, they ruled otherwise. But the majority was against them, and this is the kind of thing that is practically placing a premium on crimes of this character. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) spoke of some gross irregularities in the province of Manitoba in regard to voters' lists. I shall not now discuss the making of the voters' lists in that province by the respective governments, for that will come up on the amendments to the election law, but there are one or two remarks made by the hon. gentleman either through ignorance or because of an attempt to mislead the House that I wish to draw attention to. He declared that in the province of Manitoba the present government did exactly what their friends did at the last Dominion election; he said they drew a black line through the names. He was mighty careful not to say that the Conservative government disfranchised these men. What we complain about is, not that the Liberals drew a red line through the names, but that many of these voters were not placed on any other list and were disfranchised, and that among those who were placed on other lists many did not know to what poll to go because they were kept in the dark, while the Liberals were informed in advance as to the polls they should vote at. This is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) said with regard to the lists made by the present government of Manitoba:

> Owing to the fact that the polling division and boundaries do not coincide with those of the Dominion districts, it is necessary to make some changes in the voters' list.

If the changes had been made in the last Dominion elections, only in those places where there was absolute necessity there would be no fault found if the changes had been made honestly and by the proper party. But who was the proper party? Was it the Liberal organizer? Did the hon. member ever know in any province of this country of lists sent in by presumedly non-partisan returning officers being handed over to a party organizer to be doctored and tampered with? Would you expect to have fair play shown to political opponents by that process. The hon. member further says:

> In the list I have in my hand there is a polling division, and there are about sixty names on the list who do not belong to that division. To get a list of that polling division it is necessary to do that kind of work because the polling divisions arranged for by the provincial authorities overlapped. The provincial authorities in Manitoba have undertaken to go after the Liberals for doing just what they did themselves.

That is absolutely foundationless. The Conservative government of Manitoba did not do that. The Liberals did not merely draw a red line through the names, but, as I said before, they dishonestly disfranchised hundreds of Conservatives.

If they had any excuse for doing what they did in their own voters' lists it would be different.

And the hon. gentleman flourishes the list before the House and says:

> Here is a list of voters certified to by a judge. Those were entirely taken off the list, I understand, through instruction of the Attorney General of that province. And under the certificate of Judge Walker there is a list of voters in a certain polling division in Manitoba put on the list and certified to by Judge Walker, of Winnipeg, but under the instructions of the Attorney General, Mr. Campbell, they were all taken off and every one disfranchised.

Mark his words: Certified to by Judge Walker as a correct list and then under

instructions of Attorney General Campbell they were all taken off and every one disfranchised. The member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) asked: 'What was the reason,' and the reply of the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) was: We will come to that —but he failed to come to it. The member for East Simcoe said: Then there was no reason and the member for Portage la Prairie answered: No, no valid reason; they were just simply disfranchised. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the whole facts of the case and the members of the House can see how very different my true statement is from the figment of the hon. gentleman's imagination—all too vivid imaginaion as it is—which he pictured to the House. I have here the certificate which Judge Walker, who is chairman of the registration board for every constituency in the province of Manitoba, and I have here the certificate referred to by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. I will read that first. This is what Mr. D. M. Walker, the chairman of the registration board, certifies to:

Winnipeg, June 29, 1903.

I, David Marr Walker, chairman of the Board of Registration, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the names, residence and occupation of the persons appearing on registration register of registration district No. 2 of the electoral division of Springfield, added at the adjourned meeting of the Court of Revision held at Lac du Bonnet on the 24th day of June, 1903.

D. M. WALKER.

Now, how did that court of revision come to be adjourned. I will tell. The man who held the court of revision in this constituency was an ardent Liberal partisan who lives in Selkirk. That very fact is evidence that the Manitoba government cannot be so very bitter to their political opponents. They left it entirely in the hands of those who constitute the Board of Registration, of which Judge Walker is chairman, to appoint all the returning officers, and although there are forty constituencies, thirty-five of these constituencies were divided between nineteen Conservatives and sixteen Liberal revising barristers. Was not that a good proportion to give our opponents in view of the fact that they had only about eight members in the legislature? The court of revision was held under instructions of a proclamation sent out by the Attorney General's department, and the time and place were mentioned therein. That court of revision was held, and at the end of the day this Liberal official took it upon himself to adjourn the court of revision to another time and another place in order to accommodate a little bunch of his own political following in another district that he wanted to make sure would get on the list. He went beyond his powers and he went beyond the law, and Judge Walker would not give him the same certificate that he gave to every other constituency in the province of Manitoba and which read as follows:—

Winnipeg, June 16, 1903.

I, David Marr Walker, chairman of the Board of Registration, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy of the names, residence and occupation of the persons appearing on the several registers of the electoral division of Carillon, and duly qualified to appear as such as electors for the said electoral division.

D. M. WALKER.

Mark the words 'duly qualified to appear as electors;' I defy you to find in the certificate granted by Judge Walker to which the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) referred these words. The chairman of the registration board was of opinion that the adjourned meeting was illegal, and he referred the matter to the Attorney General's department, and that is the reason these gentlemen did not vote at the election, and that is the true version of the case, and it is an entirely different version from that given by the hon. member (Mr. Crawford).

Now, Sir, there are a few things this government has done outside of their election methods, and since I see the genial Minister of the Interior in the House—and he is getting more genial every day—I will touch him up a little on a few acts of his own administration. We have heard of certain men being kept in the employment of this government who are a disgrace to the country, and the attention of the people of Canada cannot be too often drawn to that fact in order that they may severely and justly punish this government when they seek their suffrage. We have heard of Philip Wagner; we have heard of Mr. Nixon, and we have heard of others who have been taken under the wing of the Minister of the Interior. It would appear that if an official of this government is an ardent political partisan, who is willing to commit political crimes, that constitutes a stepping-stone for him to preferment, or at least to increased remuneration.

Then, take the case of Mr. Nixon, the gentleman who was at the head of the land agency at Macleod. This gentleman, it was reported, had for some years been going astray, had been leaving the straight and narrow path, and had been appropriating to his own use the moneys of the people of this country, moneys that had been paid by people for their land, but had never been forwarded to the government and no account of which had been sent in. These things coming to the ears of the government and an inquiry being demanded, the same Mr. Leach who got his $3,000 position by reason of his operations in connection with the thin red line in Manitoba, was appointed to conduct the inquiry. He went to where Nixon operated, and in twenty-four hours found sufficient to justify him in reporting that there had been several hundred dollars of

discrepancies in Nixon's accounts, that he had manipulated the books and made improper returns; and he so reported to the government. What happened? The government closed the land office immediately, punishing the people for the crimes of their officer. It is true, they opened it again after a time, but in the meantime the people had to travel many miles to another land office to do their business. Notwithstanding the fact that Nixon was so reported upon by the government's own officer, he was given a better position at an increased salary, the government thus putting a premium on wrong-doing. Nixon attempted to put the blame on his own son, who was only fifteen years of age when the delinquencies were committed, and who was seldom in the office.

Another case was that of Mr. Philip Wagner, the special protégé of the Minister of the Interior, the gentleman employed as an interpreter for the immigrants coming to this country and knowing not our laws or our language, and in whom they trusted implicitly as a government official, while he was taking their money and appropriating it to his own use. Charge after charge was made against this gentleman, the Catholic missionary going so far as to tell the department that it was a disgrace to keep such a man in the employ of the government. At last he was arrested and sent to trial. On two counts he was convicted, and was sentenced to six months imprisonment with hard labour. A certain time after he was liberated the present Minister of the Interior actually took this man to his bosom and gave him another position at an increased salary. In that position he draws $1,200 per annum, although I believe he was only drawing about half that amount when convicted of his crimes. When these cases were brought to the attention of the Minister of the Interior in his own city of Edmonton, he stated, 'I am not going to go back on my friends.' This is the character of the friends that my friend the Minister of the Interior has fallen in with.

Take the case of the Thessalon postmaster, another gentleman who had been appropriating public money to his own use for several years. This also came to the ears of the government, and the Postmaster General of the time sent his inspector to investigate the postmaster's affairs. The inspector reported that a most disgraceful condition of affairs had existed, that this gentleman had for years been appropriating public money to his own uses, that he was $1,600 behind in his accounts, and he recommended that he should be dismissed. So glaring was the case that the Postmaster General dismissed him. But an election in the meantime came on for both the province and the Dominion, and this ex-postmaster who was an ardent politician and stump speaker, stumped the county for the Liberal candidates in both elections; and on the ground that one good turn deserves another, or more appropriately that one bad turn deserves another, the member for the riding brought all the influence he could to bear, and actually had that defaulter reinstated in his position, again practically putting a premium on crime. This brave postmaster, perhaps not having a son on whom he could lay the blame, blamed his daughter, whom he branded before the world as a common thief, and the government aided and abetted him in so doing.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is Leach doing now?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. He is Superintendent of Land Agencies at a salary of $3,000 per annum. All these people are well looked after; they receive their reward, and that is where the government make a mistake. They carry on operations of this character, and place themselves in the hands of these men who are guilty of infractions of the criminal law. They take them into their councils and confide in them their political secrets, as in the case of W. T. R. Preston, and when the public conscience arouses them from their apathy, they dare not dismiss them for fear of the disclosures of these people.

In view of the fact that the other matters which have come up for discussion in this debate have been fully dealt with by other gentlemen, it is not my intention to trespass on the time of the House at any further length on this occasion: but when the Minister of Finance and his leader twit the leader of the opposition on his platform, I can inform those hon. gentlemen that they need not quote any spurious resolutions that were never presented to the hon. leader of the opposition by the Young Men's Conservative Association of Winnipeg, saying that they were dissatisfied. That is pure fiction, pure myth. I can tell these hon. gentlemen that the hon. leader of the opposition's tour throughout the west has aroused the people to a sense of the notorious actions of this government as they were never aroused before. He has made a deep impression upon the people of the west by discussing public questions in a manner in which these hon. gentlemen are not in the habit of doing, for they preach one doctrine in the east and another in the west. That was not the course of the leader of the opposition. His platform as laid down in Halifax was the same platform that he advocated from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in the west as in the east. The people of the west are a sensible and intelligent people who know a good thing when they see it. They heard the leader of the opposition expound his policy. He did not make speeches of an entirely destructive character, but, true statesman as he is, while criticising his opponents' policy, he laid down his own policy as to the

principles which should guide a government in administering the affairs of this country ; and if the people are given a free voice in the next election, instead of having a comparatively small number of Conservatives in this House, as we have to-day, we shall have a large representation, and it will be hardly possible to find the supporters of the government with a microscope. I can tell the Finance Minister, in return for the implied and intended reproach in his remark that the leader of the opposition was trying to stir up strife and discord in the Pacific province by reopening the question of provincial subsidies and the question of Japanese immigration, after those questions had been settled, that a gentleman who lives in such a frail house himself should not throw stones. A gentleman who tried to take his own province out of confederation after that question was all settled, who tried to stir up strife, who tried to excite the people to discontent—such a man is the last who should cast a slur on the leader of the opposition or make the accusation against him that he was trying to stir up strife when he was merely carrying out the pledge he made before, and which stands to-day as on the day he made it.

Mr. E. PAQUET (l'Islet). (Translation.) I hope the House will allow me to make a remark with respect to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong).

It is my firm belief that Canada will some day carry out the free rural postal delivery wherever the country is sufficiently populated. I have the honour to represent a constituency wherein lay several settled parishes, the inhabitants of which are eight, ten and even twelve miles away from a post office. Under the prevailing conditions, I would ask the government to increase the number of post offices rather than establish rural delivery, in order to facilitate matters to our farmers, thereby fulfilling a long felt want among settlers. Under the circumstances, I am unable to vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lambton.

House divided on amendment, Mr. Armstrong.

YEAS.

Messieurs.

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—54

NAYS.

Messieurs.

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Bole,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish)
Clarke,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Grant,
Greenway,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Miller,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Parent,
Parmelee,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Na aimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—103.

PAIRS.

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Carvell,	Clare,
Telford,	Tisdale,
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),	Boyce,
Guthrie,	Pringle,
Paterson,	Porter,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Bergeron.
Talbot,	Leonard,
Bureau,	Forget,
Hall,	Wilmot,
Gordon,	Avery,
Knowles,	Lewis,
German,	Sproule,
Dyment,	Seagram,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Osler,
Galliher,	Fowler,
Pardee.	Bristol.

Amendment negatived.

On motion of Mr. Barker, debate was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House adjourns I would like to ask the Prime Minister when the committees will be organized. I do not think they have yet been called together for organization purposes and there is work ready for one of them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not usual to organize the committees pending the debate on the address, but immediately after the conclusion of the debate they will be organized.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I heard some suggestion of that kind and looked it up in 'May' this evening. I found the opposite rule prevails in Great Britain; the work does go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand for my part that the rule does prevail in this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not know that such a rule applied, but if it does, of course it should be observed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is true that usually the debate has not lasted for such a long period as it has this session, but as a rule the committees are not organized until the address has been adopted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not look up precedents, but I remember in one session, about 1898, the debate lasted for about four weeks, in respect to a proposed railroad to the Yukon. The Prime Minister will no doubt remember.

Mr. FIELDING. Were the committees organized?

Mr. PAQUET.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not look it up, but I did look up the practice in Great Britain, and I find they have no such rule there.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is a custom rather than a rule in our parliament.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 11, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

COPYRIGHT ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 28) to amend the Copyright Act. He said: This Bill I presented last session, but it did not get beyond the second reading. It is a very short amendment to the Copyright Act, and proposes simply to shorten and simplify the notice of copyright to be attached to any publication. It proposes to substitute the words 'Copyrighted, Canada, year.....,' by .....,' instead of the formula 'Entered according to Act of the parliament of Canada, in the year....., by....., at the Department of Agriculture.' This is a formula which defaces some publications, such as art post cards, and is besides very lengthy.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE FISHERIES ACT — AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Fisheries Act. He said: Under the law a fishery officer is ex officio a justice of the peace and has power to try fishery cases. In various parts of the country there is a common complaint that these officers are apt to make up their minds that some one has committed an offence against the Fishery Act. The officer lays the complaint before himself, then summons the defendant to appear before him. The officer is therefore the complainant and the judge. I am proposing to take away this jurisdiction and compel such cases to be brought before a stipendiary magistrate or justice of the peace.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 29) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill in part proposes to re-enact

what I proposed in a Bill I introduced last session, but which never got beyond the second reading owing to the session closing. I propose to enact what is commonly known as the compulsory voting clause. Bills to this effect have been introduced before and referred to select committees and been recommended by select committees, but failed to pass the House. The first clause deals with compulsory voting. The second clause is consequent on the first. It enacts that the day set apart for the general election throughout Canada shall be a public holiday, so as to give no excuse to any one for not voting. Clause three proposes to repeal all the clauses of the Election Act which require any deposit to be made by a candidate for election to the Dominion House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS TO NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What sums of money have been paid for advertising and printing, respectively, to the 'Sun' and 'Star' newspapers of St. John, N.B., the 'Chronicle' of Halifax, the 'Echo' and the Glace Bay 'Gazette', and the St. John 'Globe,' during the following periods, respectively: the fiscal years 1904-5, 1905-6, and from June 30, 1906, to date?

2. Is the printing so far as concerns the 'Sun', 'Star,' 'Chronicle' and 'Echo,' done in the job offices of these papers, or is it farmed out by these papers to other concerns?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It would not be convenient to give the information in the form of an answer. I would suggest to let that question stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. It stands as a notice of motion.

THE BOYLE CONCESSION.

Mr. AMES asked:

Has the Dawson Legislature memorialized the government of Canada regarding what is known as the Boyle concession? If so, what action has been taken in regard to the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). We have no notice of the receipt of any such memorial, but have wired to the commissioner at Dawson to ask if any such has been forwarded.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL—ENGINEERING STAFF.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked:

What changes, if any, have been made in the National Transcontinental Railway Commission's engineering staff during the current calendar year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). That information is being prepared by the commission, and I shall have it in a day or two.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

RELEASE OF GILLIS.

Mr. WARD—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Was a man named Gillis sentenced to be hanged some years ago at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, for the murder of one 'Callahan"?

2. Was this prisoner's sentence commuted to imprisonment for life? If so, on what grounds?

3. Was this prisoner removed from Dorchester to Kingston penitentiary? If so, for what reason?

4. When did this removal take place, and how long has the prisoner been confined at Kingston?

5. Has this prisoner been released? If so, when and upon what grounds?

6. From what source did the request for his release come?

7. Upon whose recommendation was this prisoner released?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Yes; in January, 1886.

2. The prisoner's sentence was so commuted. As to the grounds upon which such commutation proceeded, I am quite unable to answer, but the well established constitutional practice in that regard is that in general, the advice tendered to the Governor General in such cases is regarded as confidential, and not to be communicated even to parliament unless under very exceptional circumstances. Such circumstances would not appear to exist in the present case.

3. Yes; for disciplinary reasons.

4. In August, 1894. He was in Kingston penitentiary until his release in July, 1907, after (in all) over twenty-two years actual imprisonment.

5. He was released. The reply to question 2 applies to the latter part of this question.

6. From several persons interested in the prisoner who, from time to time during several years, urged his release. It is not the practice to communicate the names of memorialists or petitioners in such cases.

7. Upon mine.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT BOOKKEEPING SYSTEM.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount of money has been paid to the experts employed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to reorganize the system of keeping accounts for the department?

2. What are the names of these experts, their place of residence, and the sum paid to each?

3. Is their work completed?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. $35,499.56.

2.

W. B. Richards	$2,277 61
J. N. Gunn	182 12
W. F. Russell	2,310 89
Geo. E. Faucett	504 44
Kenneth Falconer, Montreal	7,032 04
L. R. Acton	1,180 64
F. H. Leland	5,861 65
Geo. Pare	1,378 26
M. L. Cooley	2,231 28
C. B. Annett	8 93
H. A. Marven	5,282 05
C. C. Schooley	7 14
S. Ketridge	3,407 55
J. J. Moorman	476 04
A. B. Murray	1,551 04
L. D. Conne	546 61
F. B. Whittet	1,524 95
H. H. Petze	1,044 48
H. Hipwell	2,275 55
J. R. Ellis	748 22
H. G. Whittet	846 06
H. B. Cross	73 38
A. T. Dowd	163 41
J. C. Stafford	2 14
A. L. Risley	36 42
R. A. Willis	6 43
W. C. Martin	7 49
C. H. Michalis	9 63
M. V. Finnicane	5 00
E. McGivney	90 52
E. C. Moulton	82 00
J. Meikle	58 50
S. E. Burton	25 12
M. C. Schelander	1 25
L. H. Lyden	3 50
M. L. Gettens	28 99
M. Cornely	26 00
H. Weighland	2 75
Miss F. Wilson	321 41
Miss G. Graham	264 41
Miscellaneous, which includes telephones and telegrams approximately.	176 95
	$42,062 85

3. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. A part of the question does not seem to be answered—the place of residence of each of these parties.

Mr. BRODEUR. The only one whose residence we have on record in the department is Mr. Falconer. We have not the addresses of the others.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps, then, that part of the question might stand.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have nothing in the department which shows the residence of these parties. In fact, the contract was made with Mr. Falconer alone, and he is the only man whose residence we know.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, 1907—EXPENDITURES OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What were the expenditures of the Canadian government in connection with the Imperial Conference, 1907, and how were they distributed?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

An appropriation of $8,000 was made and paid 'To provide for the expenses of the Prime Minister in connection with the Colonial Conference.'

A further appropriation of $16,000 was made 'To provide for the expenses of ministers in connection with the Colonial Conference,' from which the following payments have been made :—

Sir Frederick Borden	$4,000
Hon. L. P. Brodeur	4,000
Total	$8,000

WESTERN BLOCK EXTENSION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What was the total cost of the extension of the western block?
2. What was the total working space provided by the extension, and the total storing space, respectively?
3. Into how many working rooms was it divided, and how many clerks are provided for and now actually occupying these rooms?

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

1. $88,336.46.
2. Additional working space, 9,584 superficial feet, additional storerooms, corridors and staircases, 2,272 superficial feet.
3. Nine working rooms.

Number of clerks—

Public Works	21
Railways and Canals	15
Inland Revenue	11

YUKON TELEGRAPH—RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What are the receipts and working expenses of the Yukon telegraph system from March 31, 1907, to date?
2. What was the expenditure on capital account?

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

1. Receipts, $52,725.13 ; working expenses, $136,188.85.
2. No expenditure on capital account during that period.

Mr. FOSTER. That is down to date? What date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To to-day.

MARCONI COMPANY—PRESS BUSINESS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. For what newspapers is the Marconi Company doing regular commercial press business as per minister's reply to question asked December 4, 1907?
2. Is it true that the New York 'Times' has a contract with the company for a service to the exclusion of Canadian newspapers?

3. What has been paid up to date by the government to the Marconi Company, and expended in stations?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The Montreal 'Gazette,' Montreal 'Star,' New York 'Times,' and many other papers of which the names are not given.

2. The government is not aware of any such contract.

3. Constructing and operating—

1903-94	$10,414 20
1904-05	33,195 63
1905-06	86,777 90
1906-07	49,416 67
1907-08	33,191 96
	$212,996 36

FERRY WHARF, CHAPEL POINT, LENNOX ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Were tenders called for the construction of a ferry wharf at Chapel Point, Lennox Island? If so, when, and if on more than one occasion, state dates, and also state if advertisements for tenders differed and how?

2. Was any vote passed for the construction? If so, when, and for what sum?

3. Did the government make any survey for an approach on the Port Hill side, and at what point?

4. Were tenders called for such an approach, and at what point?

5. Is said approach to serve the purpose of loading vessels of light draft of water as well as a ferry slip?

6. Was any recommendation made by the government that the approach on the Port Hill site should be constructed at the end of the Port Hill road, as being more feasible and of better service to the public, and what decision has the government come to on this point?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Tenders were called for the construction of a ferry scow and for landing places on Lennox island, and on the shore opposite. The advertisement was inserted without change three times in weekly paper in July, 1907.

2. Yes. Supplementary estimates, 1907-08. $800.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. The landing places are intended for the use of the ferry scow only.

6. No.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION—DECISION OF SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. MACPHERSON asked :

1. Has the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, 'that it is not an offence for a Chinaman to enter Canada, and that the most the government can do is to sue them for the head tax of $500,' been brought to the attention of the government?

2. Was it the intention of the government to make it a criminal act when the legislation was passed that the Chinamen trying to evade the law would come under the Criminal Code?

3. Is it the intention of the government to amend the law so that there can be no question as to the intention of parliament, and that it will be a criminal offence to attempt to evade the Act?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) that no official record has yet been received of the decision referred to; and, until it is received, it would not be advisable to consider whether or not the operation of the existing law would be affected.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

How many and what nations will share in the rates of duty accorded to France by the new treaty, under the favoured nation clause?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). That information was given to the House at a previous session, and, I think, was substantially correct. Nevertheless I prefer not to give a list of the countries at this moment because it is desirable we should have from the imperial authorities a definite statement of their views in the matter. But, when we come to deal with the French treaty, we will give the information in more definite form. I think it is not wise that I should commit myself to any particular list of the countries at the present moment.

INSPECTION OF CANNED FOODS AND MEATS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

What counties at present in the Dominion are under inspection, reinspection of canned foods and meats, and carrying out the regulations attached to above Act?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The provisions of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, and the regulations made thereunder, apply to all the counties of the Dominion.

PAYMENTS TO IMMIGRATION OFFICERS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

How much money has been paid to date to James Waugh, of Chatham, and to James Perrin, who were appointed as local immigration officers for placing immigrants in Kent county, Ontario?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). James Waugh, $1,256; James Perrin, nil. This name is probably intended for James Pirie who has been paid $272.

PEAT FOR FUEL.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

Has the government taken any steps to ascertain (a) the quantity of peat available

for fuel in Canada; (b) the quality and probable cost of manufacture; (c) the names of companies now or at any time manufacturing; (d) and any other information in the possession of the government or any member or official thereof in regard thereto ?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. (a) Yes, concerning deposits favourably situated as regards transportation and markets. It must be understood that peat is very plentiful in Canada, and naturally all deposits have not yet been seen or estimated.

(b) Yes. See Bulletin on Peat and Mines Branch.

(c) Yes. See Bulletin on Peat and Mines Branch.

(d) An official of the Mines Branch has been in Europe studying the industry there. His report is now being prepared and will be submitted to the House during the present session.

BORING FOR COAL IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government undertaken any survey in boring for coal in Prince Edward Island ?

2. If so, (a) what progress has been made; (b) what is the report of the engineer in charge; (c) the cost of such survey, &c., and to whom paid ?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes. Dr. Ellis studied the island with reference to possibility of finding coal in 1902, and published his results in the summary report for that year, recommending locations for bore-holes. He was also there this summer to point out the most suitable spot for the first test hole.

2. None. No boring has yet been done. The government has offered to defray a portion of the expense, but so far has not been called upon.

VICTOR GAUDETTE, ADVOCATE, MONTREAL.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has Mr. Victor Gaudette, advocate, Montreal, been employed by any, and which, department of the government at Sorel, or elsewhere, at any time during the past two years ?

2. If so, for what length of time was he employed, what were his duties, and what compensation was paid to him for his services ?

3. Has Mr. Gaudette made any written report in respect of the matters which thus occupied his attention ?

4. If so, what is the nature of the report, and will it be laid upon the table of the House ?

Hon. L. P BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Mr. Gaudette was appointed to investigate alleged irregularities on the part of a foreman of works on Lake St. Peter.

2. His duties were as indicated, and so far two advances amounting to $600 have been made to him.

3. No report has yet been received.

4. When received his report will be placed on the table of the House

MR. HODGINS AND NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Has Mr. Hodgins, C.E., retired, resigned, or been dismissed from the service of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission ?

2. If so, on what grounds and for what reasons ?

3. Has any investigation been held, or is any investigation proposed in this matter ?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.

2. Services as district engineer on construction unsatisfactory.

3. No investigation has been held, and none is considered necessary.

INSPECTION OF FRUIT AND VEGETABLE FACTORIES.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

Is it the intention of the government to appoint inspectors in every fruit and vegetable factory in Ontario ? If so, when ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). No. A sufficient number of inspectors will be maintained to see that the provisions of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, applicable to these establishments, are complied with.

EX-JUDGE J. A. OUIMET.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT asked :

1. Has the Honourable J. A. Ouimet, former judge of the Court of King's Bench in Montreal, asked to be pensioned ?

2. How many years before making such request had he performed the duties of judge?

3. What reasons did he give in support of his request to be pensioned?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Mr. Justice Ouimet applied by letter of January 27, 1906, to be pensioned.

2. Nine years, eight months, eight days.

3. Ill-health, supported by the certificate of his physician, Dr. P. E. Mount, to the effect that he was afflicted with chronic cystitis.

PROHIBITION ZONE ON GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. AMES asked :

By whom and under whose authority was a prohibition zone created along the line of

the Grand Trunk Pacific east of Winnipeg ?
2. What was the original width of said zone ?
3. Has this width been reduced at any points along the line of construction ? If so, where ?
4. On whose demand was such reduction agreed to or made, and what reasons have induced the government to so act ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The Governor in Council, under authority of Rev. Stat. Can., 1886, c. 151, now part of the Criminal Code.
2. Twenty miles on each side of the located line, including the line itself, but excepting within the limits of incorporated cities and towns in the said area.
3. Yes, to five miles through the province of Manitoba and to ten miles through the provisional judicial district of Rainy River, in the province of Ontario.
4. Upon representations contained in resolutions of the municipal council of the township of Keewatin, Ontario, and the Board of Trade of the District of Rainy River, a petition from ratepayers of the said municipality, a resolution from the council of the rural municipality of Brokenhead, Manitoba, and in statements made by residents of the locality, confirmed (as to the territory within the province of Manitoba) by report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway that no necessity existed for continuing the prohibition throughout so wide an area.

RAILWAY STATION AT CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. What was the contract price for the construction of the new railway station at Charlottetown ?
2. Who was the contractor ?
3. What amount of money has been paid to the contractor on account of the said work to date ?
4. How much is yet payable to said contractor on said contract ?
5. What amount has been paid for extras to date ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. $58,900 with schedule prices for such other items as are not capable of being determined accurately in advance.
2. Emile A. Wallberg.
3. $66,784.99.
4. The department is unable to give the amount, that is yet payable to the contractor as the final estimate has not been made.
5. $7,884.98, up to date. There are no extras under the schedule. This is for additional work in foundations, drains and sewers, flooring and water-proofing basements with concrete, grading for and laying reinforced concrete platforms all at schedule prices as stipulated in contract.

EXPRESS CHARGES IN MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government received any complaints from the maritime provinces, and if so, of what nature, respecting express service to those provinces ?
2. Has the government received a copy of resolutions passed at the meeting of the maritime board in August last, asking for relief from burdensome charges imposed by those companies ?
3. Does the government propose to take steps in order to improve the service ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes. Following complaints on file with board.
   (a) Horace Hazard, Charlottetown, P.E.I., against Canadian Express Company's rates.
   (b) H. E. Baker, Company, Limited, Sydney, C.B., express rates on lobsters.
   (c) Thomas Potts, St. John, N.B., express rates on fruit.
   (d) Sackville Board of Trade, express rates.
   (e) North Queens Board of Trade, Caledonia Board of Trade, Maritime Express Company's rates.
2. Yes.
3. The question of tolls comes under the province of the Railway Commission.

ENTRANCE TO TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Has the government definitely decided to construct the proposed new western entrance to Toronto harbour ?
2. If so, when is it proposed that the work shall be commenced, and how long will it take in construction ?
3. What is the estimated cost of the work ?
4. When will tenders be asked for to do the work ?
5. Has the government engineer at Toronto completed his report on the said work ?
6. Has the government conferred with the municipal authorities of Toronto or the Toronto Board of Trade regarding the location, character or other details of the said work ?

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

1. Yes, subject to parliament granting the necessary appropriation.
2 and 4. The time of construction is estimated at three years.
3. Upwards of $400,000.
5. Yes.
6. Representations have been made to the Minister of Public Works by the Mayor of the City of Toronto, the President of the Board of Trade and representatives of the Harbour Board and Board of Control, regarding the location and character of an improved western entrance to the harbour.

STORES ON INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY LINE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). May I be permitted to call attention to an answer I gave on Monday to a question put by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. R. N. Walsh). The question was as follows :

1. Have any representations been made to the government regarding the stores or buildings placed on the Intercolonial boundary line ?
2. If so, what was the nature of such representations ?
3. Does the government intend taking any action in regard to their regulation ?

The answer I gave was :

The government have received no representations on this subject.

I have since ascertained there was a typographical error in the question ; instead of being the Intercolonial Railway line, it should read the International Boundary Line. I have to inform the hon. member that we have received from Rev. Dr. S. D. Chown, of Toronto, a communication on the subject. It appears that stores are built exactly on the boundary line, one part in Canada and one part in the United States, and when offences are committed in these stores they are difficult to reach and difficult to punish. The question is one of a rather delicate nature, and could only be effectually dealt with by treaty between the two governments.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Finance Minister whether he is prepared to say if the Budget speech will come on before or after the holidays. Some arrangement might be made in regard to it.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Until the conclusion of the debate on the address I would hardly be prepared to make any announcement on the subject.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I think we should be wanting in our duty to the people of Canada if we passed this resolution without further discussion of that paragraph in His Excellency's speech from the Throne which relates to the Quebec Bridge disaster and I propose, before I take my seat, to move an amendment on this subject. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to enter into any question of the legal liability of the Phoenix Bridge Company or of the Quebec Bridge Company for this disaster. This is not the time or place for such a discussion and, moreover, we have not yet all the facts that are necessary to be known in that regard. But, Mr. Speaker, I do propose to discuss the accountability of ministers for their connection with that great work and for the disaster which led to such loss of life, which, in a moment, without warning, sent some seventy or more men, all unprepared, to face their maker, which also hurled in utter destruction to the bottom of the St. Lawrence, a great national work which had taken years in production, which will take years to replace, and upon which have been spent millions of public money which might as well, or even better, have been cast into the sea. I say, Sir, that this is a national work and no one will dispute that it has been so treated by the government. No man can question that it was and is a work in which the people of Canada were and are deeply interested. It has been so treated by the government, and indeed, upon no other basis or consideration could any ministry have asked parliament to undertake the obligations which have been undertaken on behalf of the Quebec Bridge Company. A fair appreciation of the relative importance of the bridge as compared with the great transcontinental railway project may be had in this way : The estimated cost of the bridge—from $7,000,000 to $8,000,000—corresponds to the estimated cost of about 180 miles of railway, and if unfortunately the Quebec Bridge Company should be found accountable for the disaster, or if the Quebec Bridge Company should be unable to recover from the Phoenix Bridge Company, the money that has already been paid to them, the ultimate cost of the bridge will probably be $12,000,000, or equal to the estimated cost of fully 300 miles of railway. I think I need say no more to impress upon this House and the people the enormous importance to this country of the subject which hon. gentlemen opposite were dealing with when they guaranteed the bonds or securities of the Quebec Bridge Company. I may perhaps pause here for a moment to say—and I think that hon. gentlemen in the House will join me in what I am about to say—that I sincerely hope and trust that, apart from any question of legal liability upon the part of either company, the government has seen fit to see that substantial care has been taken of, and relief afforded to the people who were dependent upon the unfortunate men who perished in that catastrophe. I do not think that anybody would desire that the government should neglect what is their duty in that regard, although I do not pretend for a moment that there is any liability on the part of the government to these people. That bridge, Mr. Speaker, when completed, will be the greatest bridge in the world. The

eyes of men of science in all quarters of the globe have been upon it. Canada's reputation in regard to it has been at stake, and millions, I say, of the people's money have been pledged upon it. Most serious complications may arise and probably will arise if there shall be any serious delay in the completion of the bridge. It is a part to all intents and purposes of the transcontinental railway and should there be a gap or break in that railway on its completion by reason of this bridge being unfinished and the traffic have to be ferried across the St. Lawrence, the matter might be a most serious one to this country from that point of view alone. In 1903, the government had projected its plan for a transcontinental railway. It committed the country to that project before it entered into its arrangements with this bridge company. I say it was the government's project because, although, on this side of the House, we were in favour of an additional transcontinental railway, we objected and strongly objected to the particular plan and scheme of the government. Not a man on this side of the House would have opposed for one moment any such reasonable scheme as was proposed in writing to the government in 1902 by the Grand Trunk Railway Company under the signatures of Messrs. Cox, Hays and Wainwright. If that had been known to this House there would have been no delay, there would have been no hesitation, but we were not allowed to consider it. For eighteen months nearly—perhaps fully eighteen months—the government concealed the fact that any such proposition had ever been made to them. Every paper that the government had in connection with the scheme was demanded. The government professed to have brought down every paper, but although that proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway Company was in existence and in possession of the government the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) informed the House that all the papers had been produced, and it was not until eighteen months later that we heard a word about it. We would have been prepared to accept the Grand Trunk proposition. I do not want to be misunderstood on that point. I believe that the Grand Trunk Railway Company asked for a subsidy, much larger, probably, than they hoped to receive. We would have been willing, everybody I think would have been willing, to subsidize them most handsomely, but it was not necessary to give them a subsidy in the precise form they chose to put in that paper. But, Sir, the government having committed the country to that transcontinental railway project, the Quebec bridge, which had always been an important work for this country, became doubly important because it became really a part of the transcontinental railway scheme itself. When completed the bridge would have formed the great thoroughfare for all the railways centreing about Quebec. It would have been the highway for all the produce of the west to Europe, it would have been, under the government's scheme, the natural outlet from this country for all the products of the great Northwest. Therefore, the moment the government had been committed to its transcontinental railway project it became doubly important that every care should be taken in the construction of that bridge.

What was the condition of the Quebec Bridge Company at that time? Anybody who takes an interest in that question will find it all fully set forth in the Act of 1903, chapter 54. There you will find the complete details of the financial position of the wonderful Quebec Bridge Company which seems to have lived and prospered under the wing of this government. The Quebec Bridge and Railway Company was incorporated some 20 years ago with power to construct a bridge across the St. Lawrence river at or near Quebec. It was authorized to issue capital stock to the extent of $1,000,000, and it did not neglect, in procuring its charter, to have inserted that well known clause, of which railway and bridge promoters are so fond, enabling the company to issue its stock as paid-up stock to persons who perform certain services for the company. Up to 1903 the company had received subscriptions for only $200,000 of the stock with which to construct this immense work and upon that stock, up to the autumn of 1903, the stockholders of this Quebec Bridge Company had paid only $65,585.70. Whether any of that $65,000 was paid in cash or whether it was all issued for services we do not know, but we do know that in the arrangement made in October, 1903, with this government not a word seems to have been said about the existence of that stock in money. In any case, with that beggarly capital of $65,595.70 the company boldly started out to construct the greatest bridge the world has known; a bridge, Sir, estimated to cost between $7,000,000 and $8,000,000, apart from the loss by the disaster which is alluded to in the speech from the Throne. Probably the promoters did not, as you may guess, rely much upon that paid up capital of theirs; that would hardly have paid the directors' fees, I fancy, during the time of the existence of the company. They got bonuses from different sources; from the province of Quebec, $250,000; from the city of Quebec, $300,000, and from the Dominion government, $374,353, a total in hard cash of $924,353, and in 1903 that money had all been spent except about $9,000. Out of nearly $1,000,000 which they had received as gifts they had in hand, apparently, about $9,000. They had constructed, according to the statement appearing in the statute to which I have referred, some approaches to the proposed bridge and they had finished the sub-structure and work had been begun on the su-

perstructure. They had expended in part payment for the work done $914,862, out of the cash subsidies, thus having, to give the precise figures, $9,491 in hand, plus, of course, the little capital if that existed. But they had not paid in full for all the work done; they were still, they say, in debt $779,550, which included some bonds they had sold. They had sold bonds for $472,000, and what do you suppose they got for them? This great company, engaged in constructing this great work, sold their bonds for $283,279, just about sixty cents on the dollar; and their alleged paid up capital represented about 86 cents only for every $100 that the work required. That was a most extraordinary position for such a company, and I have no doubt that these bonds were never sold for cash at all; they were probably given over to some contractor at 60 cents on the dollar on account of his work.

That, then, was the company's position and the government knew it, because they had the statements before them. They were in debt $779,550 and they had assets, allowing the balance of the subsidies and the possibly paid up stock, of $75,076, leaving their net debt, in October, 1903, $704,473.30. That is, this bridge company was on the wrong side by over $700,000, and had not one cent with which to proceed with the superstructure. They had to face a money market which was rapidly increasing in stringency, as the Finance Minister knew because he admitted it in his speeches upon the railway problem. The bridge, if they could build it at all, was likely to cost $7,000,000, or $8,000,000, and, having regard to the possibility of an accident, such as has occurred, might cost $12,000,000. That was the position of this company when the government undertook to deal with it. The company was on the rocks, stranded, helpless, thoroughly bankrupt, and yet in that condition, and knowing well the importance of this great work, hon. gentlemen opposite undertook to guarantee the company for $6,678,200.

One would have thought that would be the last thing that any sensible man would have imagined the government could have been asked to do. I venture to say that there is not one hon. gentleman sitting behind the government who, if he had been asked under those conditions to advise the guarantee of nearly seven millions of money for that company, would have listened to it for one moment. I do not believe there is one hon. gentleman, responsible to the people, who would have advised the giving of that guarantee, or who would have hesitated to take advantage of the condition into which the company at that time had fallen and assume the work and build it as a national work. What an opportunity that was for the government. They had launched out on a great railway undertaking which was to involve the country in some 150 millions of money. In the middle of that work was a river requiring a great bridge. Here was an utterly bankrupt company, with only $65,585 of capital, and even that apparently not in existence, and they allow that company to continue in control of work on which so much depended for the business interests of this country. They knew that they had only to say to Mr. Parent, the president of this Quebec Bridge Company, that he could go on with the work if he chose, but he could not get any more public money, and Mr. Parent would have come down and would have been glad to have the government take it off his hands. The people would willingly return to the company their $65,000 threefold if they wanted it. It was a big question. The country would have been glad to get rid of the company almost on any terms; but Mr. Parent was a friend of the right hon. leader of the House, both a political and a personal friend, and he was able to come here to Ottawa and secure what I think he must have hardly expected. A very singular feature of the transaction occurred at that time. The House had been sitting for eight long months, from March until the end of October in that year 1903. On the 19th of October the government entered into a contract with the Bridge Company, which, with all the facts I have stated, is set forth in the statute to which I have referred. The contract was signed by the hon. Finance Minister on behalf of Canada and by Mr. Parent on behalf of the bridge company. In that contract it is recited that the estimated further cost of the bridge, including the debt owed by the company, was $6,866,882. The government made one stipulation: they stipulated that the bridge company should issue $200,000 more of stock, and have it paid up, so as to recoup to the company the discount on the bonds that they had issued; and on this bankrupt company agreeing to do that the government undertook to guarantee the securities of the company to the extent of $6,678,200.

Mr. HAGGART. Did that include the bonds they had issued?

Mr. BARKER. That included their floating debt and the bonds. Their total debt including the bonds was $779,550, but they were to make good to their own company the discount on the bonds by issuing $200,000 of stock and getting it paid up. As I say, that contract was signed on the 19th of October by the hon. Finance Minister and by the right hon. leader's political and personal friend, Mr. Parent, a partner of one of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues in the government. We can understand how Mr. Parent was able to introduce himself to the Finance Minister. Within five days after that agreement was signed, the Act confirming it was rushed through both Houses of parliament.

Now, I would like to know if there is one hon. gentleman who sits behind the ministers who will dare to go before his constituents next year and justify or excuse that contract. I do not ask what they will do here, no doubt they will vote that it was all right; but I ask, does any hon. gentleman feel in his heart that he will be prepared to go before his constituents next year and justify or excuse the government for entering into such an agreement as that with a bankrupt company dry on the rocks, with not a dollar to bless itself with, in connection with the greatest bridge in this world, costing millions? And that was done by the Finance Minister as perhaps he would buy a horse or a cow in a hurry. I think probably he would take more trouble in getting an estimate of the value of the horse or the character of its owner. The only explanation I can see is, that this contract was one characteristic of this government—it was a deal with a middleman. Every business consideration would have led the government to undertake that work themselves, to see to the financing of it, to keep control of it until the end, and then to operate it as the great connecting link between all the railways centering in the great city of Quebec. But no; the middleman had to be satisfied, and he was satisfied to all intents and purposes.

One would have thought that Mr. Parent had enough on his hands, as president of the bridge company, in looking after that immense work. One would have thought that the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would have been content with what he had done for his friend, but the right hon. gentleman was not content. Not considering whether Mr. Parent had more to do, in watching and supervising the construction of that bridge, than he was able to perform, the First Minister coolly appointed him Chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, with the handsome snug salary of $8,000 a year. We have heard of certain gentlemen having a pull, but Mr. Parent evidently had a great pull somewhere.

It may be interesting perhaps to show what a nice thing this Chairmanship of the Transcontinental Commission is. We can gather a pretty fair idea of it by looking at the Auditor General's Report for the nine months' expenditure to the 31st March last. We find that these Commissioners have obtained an official car, and in connection with that official car the people have had to pay during those nine months $13,026.21. The details are given in the Auditor General's Report, page W—283. They started off by getting a car from the Railway Department for $8,000. That car, of course, being only fitted for an ordinary mortal, or perhaps for a minister of railways, must be fixed up. It was remodelled and refitted at a cost of $1,400. Then they paid $290.50 for dishes, tea cups and saucers, &c. They also bought for the car table linen, bedding, carpets and sundry articles, $1,673.90. They did more They had their bedsteads, but they wanted mattresses. They got hair mattresses and they had mattresses remade and they got a large chair and some folding tables and mahogany cabinets, and for all these they paid $393.95. But they were still not satisfied. They wanted the porter of the car to be properly fitted up to represent them at the back door, so they got a cap for the porter. What do you suppose they paid for it? $5. It was not a silk hat.

Mr NORTHRUP. A night cap.

Mr. BARKER. That would pay for a good many night caps. It is a cap for the porter, and it cost $5. I shall not go through all the items, for there are too many, but they all foot up to $13,096.21. You can understand what a nice position Mr. Parent has, and I wonder if he had similar comforts in connection with the bridge company. At all events, he gets $8,000 a year for presiding as Commissioner in connection with the Transcontinental, and the Lord only knows what he gets in connection with the bridge company.

The entering into such a contract as I have described was indefensible, but that is not the most serious part of the matter, because that meant simply money. Section 12 of the agreement is in these words:

> The plans and specifications for all the work to be undertaken shall be submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council, and the said undertaking shall be completed not later than the 1st December, 1906.

By section 14 the government have the right to appoint three directors of the bridge company. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that the contracting party, the one who puts stipulations of that kind into a contract, assumes an obligation to those he represents. By inserting those provisions in the contract the government assumed a very responsible duty towards the people. They took an important power. As between the government and the people, that contract imposed on the government the obligation, not merely to make sure that the plans were all that they ought to be, but that hour by hour and day by day, during the construction of that work, there should be experts on the bridge to see that the plans or specifications were not in the slightest degree shirked and that everything was done which the builders of the bridge had contracted to do. Not only that, they should have had an expert there who, when he saw from time to time, in the course of the work, that modifications might be necessary, would be competent to advise the government and have those changes made. There

was this further circumstance that, in the absence of such competent expert there might be delay in remedying anything going wrong. In the case of any mishap or casualty, instant action might be necessary, and any hesitation or delay might be ruinous. In the progress of the work a hundred contingencies might arise requiring the most prompt attention. The government should have foreseen that in the absence of proper officials and competent authority something terrible might happen, as it did. And who was likely to be the loser? The people of this country are providing the money. If the Quebec Bridge Company have been neglectful, if their officers have been incompetent, that company is not worth sixpence. This country is providing all the money, and you might as well try to take the breeks off a highlandman as to get anything off that company. The Phœnix Bridge Company must have been paid very large sums on account of their work. If the money is to be recovered from them, the Quebec Bridge Company or the government will have to go to the United States and sue for it, and I suppose, after long litigation, we might, or might not, get a judgment, and get the money.

That is the position we are in. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) referred to this subject, and in doing so quoted from the 'Scientific American,' which, as everybody knows, is one of the most capable engineering journals in America. having certainly no superior. The writer of the article in that journal says:

It is evident, however, from the statements of the consulting engineer, that the enterprise laboured under two serious drawbacks——

Now, the first of these drawbacks, I understand the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to say Mr. Cooper, the consulting engineer, does not admit—the insufficiency of money. I will not refer to that further. But the writer in the 'Scientific American' goes on:

The consulting engineer's detailed story of the discovery of the eccentricity in the bottom chord; the making light of it by the engineer in charge; and the tardy and roundabout measures taken to stop all further additions to the weight on the bridge, read more like the story of the building of some county bridge than the record of the erection of the greatest work of bridge engineering of the century.

And there you see, I say, the direct result of this unfortunate arrangement made by the government with the Quebec company.

Later in his speech, as reported at page 53 of 'Hansard,' the leader of the opposition said:

What I ventured to ask was whether or not the plans had been approved by order in council, as provided by the Act of 1903.

To this the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said:

As to that I cannot say, but I presume that the law has been observed.

The right hon. gentleman says also that they had to act upon the report of the engineer; I suppose the engineer of the Railway Department—or was it the architect of the Public Works Department? And had the engineer who passed the plans annexed to this agreement, which was got through so hastily, as little time to study the plans as parliament had to study the agreement? It would be very interesting to know that. Now, I venture to say, there is no chief engineer of any railway in Canada or in the United States who would dare to assume the responsibility for settling the plans for such a work. I venture to say that if the right hon. gentleman had asked Mr. Schrieber in those days to approve of these plans that gentleman would have declined the responsibility. I venture to say the chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk or the chief engineer of the Canadian Northern would have declined to accept such a responsibility. During late years, since bridge building has taken the form of iron and steel structure, the engineering for such work has grown into almost a distinct profession. The men who design these bridges, who undertake the criticism of the plans and specifications, are experts who give their whole time and thought and attention to this class of work, and the ordinary engineer on a railway never interferes with it. I know that of my own knowledge as to engineers. I have seen it stated in the press, and it may have appeared in some of the evidence taken by the commission, that the Deputy Minister of Railways, Mr. Schrieber, advised the government to employ a competent expert to superintend the work on the bridge, and it is said that the government passed an order in council in accordance with that request, and that later they cancelled that order in council. Now, I do not assert this as a fact, but I have seen it stated in the press, apparently as taken from evidence given somewhere. But we have the extraordinary fact that the Prime Minister does not know whether there was such an expert or not. When he is asked a question by the leader of the opposition his only reply is that he presumes the law has been complied with. I would not be understood as stating that there was no consulting engineer. Mr. Cooper, of New York, a very eminent engineer, was employed—by whom I do not know, whether by the Quebec Bridge Company or by this government. But he was not employed to go to the works, to stay upon the work, to watch its progress from day to day, as was necessary for any proper supervision. Mr. Cooper is, as I have said, a very eminent engineer. But he is a man of seventy years of age and in feeble health, unable to leave New York. When this catas-

trophe was imminent, Mr. Cooper could not go up to Quebec and visit the bridge. The man in charge had to rush off to New York to see Mr. Cooper and explain the position to him. And Mr. Cooper, instead of going up to see for himself, had to accept the description given by another engineer, and on that basis give advice. And this, apparently, was the expert whom the government or the bridge company employed. We all recollect what occurred at the time. There were gentlemen on the bridge who were informed that there was something wrong with one of the beams. Notwithstanding that, the unfortunate men who perished were allowed to go on working on the structure. An immense machine used for carrying heavy loads on to the bridge was allowed to roll out with its load, endangering the defective work. There was not a man there, apparently, competent to decide and act. The bridge company had nobody to do what was necessary; the government had nobody—it was everybody's business, apparently, and therefore nobody's business. And the bridge went down and the unfortunate men were hurled into eternity.

I do not wish to take up time unnecessarily or to go into everything that might well be said in discussing this matter. I have only to say this, that I was astonished when the question was asked of the minister and he had to make the reply: He was unable to say, he presumed the law had been complied with.' Possibly the right hon. gentleman may have thought there was something in the Railway Act that governed this matter, or perhaps in the Act respecting public works; or he may have thought the law was in the Act relating to the Receiver General. But he had in his mind that there was something in the law. One would almost imagine that he had never heard of the agreement. Not a word about the agreement, not a word as to whether they had complied with and carried out the intention of the agreement. He simply answered, I cannot say, I suppose the law has been obeyed.' Now, the Finance Minister was particularly responsible for that guarantee, and it came rather more in his line. Then this was a great railway bridge to connect all the railways entering Quebec, and one would have thought that the Minister of Railways would have taken some little interest in it, and found out something about it so that he could have prompted the right hon. gentleman and told him what to say. And there was the Minister of Public Works. Surely such a bridge as this was a great public work, though not technically under his charge. Now, when these four gentlemen, the right hon. the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works, had been sitting together around the table in the Privy Council not so many days ago, and cautiously settling what His Excellency would be asked to say about this catastrophe, surely they might have taken enough interest in the subject to ascertain, a most obvious thing, what had been done on the part of the government for the safety of the workingmen and to see that the work was properly supervised. Evidently not one of them thought about it, they were absolutely indifferent to it. The only answer we get is: 'We cannot say, we suppose the law was complied with.' Did any mortal man ever hear of four responsible persons giving such an answer to such a question? There they sat, a wretched quartet, knowing nothing, not even taking the trouble to know, although aware that they would be questioned in this House. Mr. Parent probably could have told the Minister of Finance if he had chosen to ask him. The Minister of Public Works I think could have found out something. They could have sent for Mr. Parent and found out. If the government had not appointed an expert themselves they might at least have found out what Mr. Parent had done. Millions of public money had been spent, and hundreds of lives in jeopardy. Millions have been lost and lives have been lost, and these gentlemen quietly settle the speech of His Excellency, and do not ask one word that every sensible man would have thought it necessary to ask.

Mr. Speaker, I have somewhere read that every country is governed as it deserves. If that be really so, and if Canada be no exception to the rule, what can she have done to deserve such government as this?

I beg to move in amendment to the address:

That the said motion be amended by adding to the proposed address to His Excellency the Governor General the following paragraph at the end thereof:

We desire to express our respectful regret that more adequate reference has not been made to matters of public interest alluded to in your Excellency's gracious speech, and that other matters of grave public concern have altogether escaped mention therein, and especially that the allusion in your Excellency's gracious speech to the collapse of the great bridge in course of construction across the St. Lawrence river omits any reference to the unfortunate and unbusinesslike conditions under which that great national work has been carried on.

We especially deplore the loss of life on that occasion, and we also deplore not only the destruction and loss of millions of capital, but the serious delay in a great work which forms an essential part of the National Transcontinental Railway, and we greatly regret the unbusinesslike arrangements and absence of efficient control in the public interest with regard to that work.

Mr. SPEAKER. In regard to the first portion of this amendment, I am inclined to think that it is a clause which cannot

again be introduced in an amendment to the motion under consideration. The House has apparently passed upon that subject on the disposition of a former amendment. It does not refer to any matter of definite consequence, but it is a repetition of something which has been disposed of already on a former motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Accompanied by a different illustration.

Mr. SPEAKER. It does not say the illustration refers to that portion at all. However, for the moment I am not able to decide absolutely that it is out of order, but I would like that point to be considered in dealing with the next amendment, if there is to be one. The question is on the amendment.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would not enter into the question of whether this amendment is in order, and I would not desire to take any advantage of the point if Mr. Speaker should decide that the amendment was out of order. I feel, however, that we are not called upon at the present moment to make any extended remarks in regard to the very important question to which the hon. gentleman has referred, the principle reason being that this is by no means the time for a discussion in the line on which the hon. gentleman has addressed the House. We are at the beginning of the session. It is a well established principle under constitutional government for an address to be presented to His Excellency in reply to the speech from the Throne, and while hon. gentlemen who may be sitting to the Speaker's left have an undoubted right to move any amendment they please, it is a well established custom of parliament that you do not attempt to discuss public questions generally, with a view of calling for a vote upon them before the House is placed in possession of the information which might be necessary for a consideration of the whole matter. I think the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is open to the suspicion that he is very much afraid that when the papers in connection with the Quebec bridge are brought down, he will find no cause for complaint against the government; and therefore he hastens to find fault now, before the report of the commission of inquiry is brought down, and before the House has a single document before it.

The hon. gentleman found it extraordinary that when he put the question to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister—were these plans approved by the Governor in Council ?—my right hon. friend said : Well, I cannot say offhand, but I presume the law was complied with. My hon. friend made merry over it. He said : The Prime Minister does not know and the ministers around him do not know. The hon. gentleman might ask a question about five hundred orders in council which no minister could answer at the moment. If the hon. gentleman had been in earnest in his desire to obtain information of that nature, he would have put a notice on the paper and allowed of an opportunity to make an investigation. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) put a passing question to my right hon. friend—fair enough in its way—I do not complain of it—whether these plans had been approved of, and my right hon. friend gave an answer, but my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, I presume, if he attached importance to it, would have given notice of his question. He asked the question, legitimately enough, and then passed on to other things, but the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) dwells upon it as evidence of gross neglect on the part of the Prime Minister that he could not answer a question offhand as to one of five hundred orders in council which may have been passed since the date of the contract referred to. What are the facts of the case ? Years ago it was recognized that it was necessary to have a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec. A company was incorporated for the construction of the bridge. My hon. friend treats that company as being from the beginning a company of straw ; he has made merry at its expense, he has treated it as a bankrupt company and has said everything that is bad of it. That company is composed of some of the most respectable citizens of Quebec and I venture to say that my hon. friend would not go down to the city of Quebec and make the statements concerning the gentlemen composing that company which he has rashly made on the floor of this House to-day. The government of the province of Quebec——

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. BARKER. Is he arguing that these gentlemen in Quebec are responsible for that bridge ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am arguing that they are responsible for everything concerning the company of which they are the directors, and when the hon. gentleman sneers and jeers at that company and treats them as a bankrupt and worthless company, I say he is attacking the standing, the reputation and the character of some of the most reputable men in the city of Quebec. If my memory serves me—and I think I will be excused if I do not go into the matter very fully—we have not the details, we have not the information at this moment when we are expected to discuss the question,—but speaking very hurriedly and without looking at

the books, my recollection is that the province of Quebec contributed $250,000 towards that bridge. That does not indicate that they regarded the company as being worthless, or as being composed of men of straw. The city of Quebec contributed $300,000 in cash and placed it in the hands of the company to assist in the construction of the bridge. Surely that does not indicate that they regarded that company as being a worthless company. The parliament of Canada, without a division, agreed to contribute $1,000,000, in cash towards the construction of that bridge. Again I am speaking from memory, but my recollection is that not a voice was raised in this House against the passing of the Act to give that company $1,000,000. Yet to-day the hon. gentleman treats this company as a bankrupt, worthless concern and does everything within his power to condemn it and make it appear ridiculous in the eyes of the country.

This great enterprise was undertaken by these gentlemen in the city of Quebec from high-minded and patriotic motives. They desired to advance the interests of their city and of their province. They were men of high standing; some of them were men of large means, and surely it is not fair to treat these men as being animated by any other purpose than that of carrying on a great public work which was going to be a benefit to the city of Quebec, to the province of Quebec and to the Dominion at large. Before they began work they had the aid of the city of Quebec, they had their private capital, whatever it may have been, they had the aid which the government of the province of Quebec had given them and they had the grant of this government—$1,000,000—out of which we have actually paid something less than $400,000. I submit that this is an indication that this was not a worthless and bankrupt company. The company was a company of serious, high-minded men animated by the patriotic motive of doing something for the good of the city, the province of Quebec and the country at large. Like other companies they found that the obligations laid upon them were more than they were able to meet. They found that the enterprise was a costly one, as the work went on they found difficulty and they came to this government for further aid. The government agreed to come to their aid. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) says that when we granted that guarantee it was the last thing that any sensible man would vote for. Every man in this House voted for it. The one member who has the right to qualify that statement is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who made a speech in which he questioned the wisdom of the course that the government was taking, but even he did not record his vote against it and the records of parliament show that this vote was carried through this House without any division. I submit that it is not fair and decent treatment, after what has happened to come in at this eleventh hour and say: No sensible man would vote for it. If our foresight were as great as our hind sight, a great many things that we have done would be left undone. But when the government brought forward that scheme for guaranteeing the Quebec bridge bonds it was a scheme which, with the exception of a single hon. member, commended itself to the judgment of the House. The hon. gentleman says that it was rushed through the House. The records will show that there was no objection on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite in point of time. The hon gentleman did not ask that the matter be held over; it was a large and important question and they would have had the right to a reasonable delay, but the fact is that so far as the records show the hon. gentlemen conveyed the impression that they wanted to help the Quebec bridge and they allowed the matter to pass with only the little remonstrance that came from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. We did not bring that guarantee before the House without some good reason. Long years ago estimates were made by competent railway men which went to show that the earning power of the bridge would probably be sufficient to pay the interest on its cost, and in later years we had further estimates made. The hon. gentleman has referred to Mr. Schreiber; Mr. Schreiber would not do this and Mr. Schreiber would not do that. Mr. Schreiber made a report—it was either made by Mr. Schreiber or was confirmed by him—to show the volume of traffic that would pass over that bridge and the effect of the report was that, taking the probable volume of traffic and making a fair and ordinary charge for every car which passed over the bridge, the interest on the cost of the undertaking would be earned and the government would be protected absolutely against loss. We had the reports of railway experts and either Mr. Schreiber made a report himself, or, at all events, it was made by the Railway Department of which he was the chief engineer.

The hon. gentleman said that no engineer would approve of these plans. If we were discussing this question with the proper information before us, if due notice had been given of a motion in this House, and if the papers had been brought down, we would be able to go into all the details of this matter, but in so far as I had any knowledge of the transaction in connection with the Quebec bridge nothing was ever done in reference to the engineering of the bridge that was not done with the full approval of the chief engineer of the Railway Department. My hon. friend has asked me: Was this or that plan approved by the Governor in Council. I could not tell him without

looking at the records, and I will have to answer him as my right hon. friend did when he said that he presumed the law was complied with, but I know that at every step in the matter in connection with the bridge Mr. Schreiber, as chief engineer of the Railway Department, was consulted, and I am satisfied that when the report of the inquiry comes in and when other information is brought before the House, it will be shown that in so far as engineering matters were concerned no step was taken at any time by this government without the full and cordial approval of Mr. Schreiber, the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals. I do not wish to continue the discussion of the question now. The hon. gentleman has not given the House any information, the hon. gentleman confesses that he has not the information, he says that he has heard this and read that, but he does not know whether it is true or not. Nevertheless, he undertakes to discuss it. Surely my hon. friend will see that in these matters it is not enough to have read something in the newspapers, but in all fairness when we are asked for reasons he should make his motion in this House so that we would have the information before us and, in the absence of that information, for the hon. gentleman to get up and make the attack that he has made to-day upon the Quebec Bridge Company and all connected with it, I say is not fair and not reasonable and the hon. gentleman's speech in that respect will find no response in the city or province of Quebec, or in the mind of any fair minded man in any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). At this stage of the debate I would not feel justified in taking up a great deal of the time of the House, but I must say that I was happy to second the resolution of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and I rise as a member representing a constituency in the province of Quebec to say that the resolution has my very hearty approval, that I approve it in every part, and that I am perfectly certain, contrary to what has just fallen from the lips of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), that a very large majority of the people of the province of Quebec and of the city of Quebec, of whatever political complexion, will approve of our bringing this matter early to the attention of the House, and will approve of the spirit and terms of this resolution. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is the workman of the eleventh hour. We know, Sir, that the workman of the eleventh hour was rewarded just as the workman of the first hour was. In this instance the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has rendered an important service to the House and to the country and to our own province by calling early attention to this matter. What are these papers that will be brought down and that will throw any additional light upon what my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) has stated, upon his clear statement of facts, so far as we know them, without any doubt, at the present moment? There are no papers that will do that. We will no doubt get a report in due time, and a very expensive report, from some engineers, men who will couch in technical terms a report of the cause of this dreadful calamity, which many of us will not be able to understand, but what we do know now is that that bridge has been destroyed and that a large number of lives have been uselessly sacrificed through the want of care, the negligence, the inattention of the government in this matter. What we want to guard against, what we must guard against, is a repetition of what has too often happened since I have had the honour of a seat in this House: At the end of a session, when it is impossible for the House to take up with any care an important vote of money, we are called upon to either refuse our adhesion to the vote or else to pass it, as in the instance referred to by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in the last hours of the session, without any explanation, without any discussion and without those data which are absolutely necessary in order to make efficient legislation on a matter of this importance. I was glad, for two reasons, that this resolution was moved by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). It has too often been said in the province of Quebec that this great public work was not countenanced by members of our party from other provinces. This resolution lays down the principle which was enunciated long before 1896 by the Conservative party that it looked with favour upon this enterprise, that it considered it as a national work and was anxious to support that enterprise by all the means in its power. There will be an end of those remarks that have too often been circulated in our province. Secondly, it sets forth the neglect, the carelessness, the unbusinesslike manner in which this work has been so far carried out, and it will, I trust, have the effect of preventing any recurrence of this unbusinesslike way of carrying out public works, at least in respect to this enterprise. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said that the member for Hamilton treated the members of the Quebec Bridge Company as men of straw. The hon. member for Hamilton never uttered any such remark. We all know that there are very few gentlemen of the city of Quebec really interested in this enterprise. There are some gentlemen whose names are excellent and who have no doubt contributed their small quota to the paid-up capital of this company; but, as a matter of fact, I assert that this company in reality is composed of four or five men at the utmost who have contributed an

extremely small sum of money to the capital stock of this company, but who have taken hold of that enterprise with the most unpatriotic motives, motives of personal gain and private interest, and by furthering their own views, their own motives and their own aims, have effectively been the cause of the very grave disaster which has befallen the enterprise and which will cause a great loss of money to this country, and will retard quite unduly and unnecessarily the completion of what was to be, not only a national work, but a work of very particular importance to the province and city of Quebec. I submit that a work which was to cost anywhere in the vicinity of $10,000,000 should never have been undertaken by a private company. There is no doubt that in the beginning, long before 1903, the work was started by a company. It received encouragement from the city of Quebec and from the province of Quebec. We ourselves readily voted at the time a subsidy in support of that company, but at that time, as members who were here then will remember, we were given the assurance time and time again by the Minister of Finance that this company would itself contribute a very much larger amount than it really did to the carrying on of this work.

Mr. FIELDING. No; I dissent from that

Mr. MONK. But my hon. friend has a way of interpreting the reports of 'Hansard' to which I cannot absolutely give my adhesion. When my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) referred to the debate in this House in 1903, which took place a few hours before prorogation, and says that I was the only one who on that occasion opposed this engaging of the responsibility of the country for such a large amount, he was mistaken, and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. FIELDING. Who else dissented?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend on my right, the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), expressed exactly the same views, and there are other members, if my hon. friend will refer to the debate, who followed the same course. The debate has almost a prophetic character. It was not necessary to be a seer or a prophet to see what was going to happen when these arrangements were made, and it was in our power only to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance and the government to the extreme danger of that undertaking, as we were entering into it. My hon. friend will find that Mr. Clancy, the leader of the opposition and other members, although the session was almost closed, said enough to intimate to the government that although it was impossible at that time to oppose the assistance being given to the company, because then conditions had changed, the Transcontinental Railway had been decided on, and this work had to be constructed and would form part of the Transcontinental Railway itself, they disapproved of the government's action. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) admitted it himself in the speech he made on that occasion; and when asked, as he was, why, since it was a national work which we would have to assume sooner or later, which we must within three years take over or pay for, we did not at that time assume the responsibility of the work, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will see what an uncertain and unsatisfactory answer he gave.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will allow me, I have been looking over the record and I see that several questions were asked. One hon. gentleman did express his dissent, but I was speaking from the record that showed that no vote was taken. I had that in mind.

Mr. MONK. It is childish, Mr. Speaker. It resembles the speech which my hon. friend made on the address the other day when, instead of taking up seriously as Minister of Finance the present financial stringency and showing what steps the government has taken, if it had taken any, to meet that very difficult situation, he entertained us during half an hour on the doings of John Doe in the province of New Brunswick. An argument such as my hon. friend has made cannot be made seriously to any man who takes the trouble to look at the debate which took place on the 22nd of October, 1903. My hon. friend says that no vote was taken. There is enough time lost in this House, Mr. Speaker, without our calling for a vote under the circumstances shown by that debate. Now, what is the position? During the ten or twelve years that I have been in this House I have observed my hon. friend very closely. Even to-day he defends the government very lamely, but if hon. gentlemen will take up the record of 'Hansard' for that 22nd of October, 1903, they will see that my hon. friend very reluctantly brought those resolutions to the notice of the House. It is impossible to observe the manner of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the House and not to distinguish easily between those cases in which he is really enthusiastic and satisfied with his case and the speech he delivered when the House was in committee in 1903 on the resolutions guaranteeing those bonds. What was the reason? Sir, if we take up the record of that session we find some very strange things. It is not necessary to have the wisdom of a Nestor in order to read between the lines and see what took place in regard to the Quebec bridge during that year. In the very inception of the summer we had a Bill, which was sanctioned on the 10th of July, 1903, respecting the Quebec Bridge Company. The company at that time, as my hon. friend

from Hamilton has truthfully stated, was absolutely bankrupt; there is no doubt about it. This is no reflection on Mr. Price, of Quebec, or any of the other gentlemen who were connected with the company. But the company came here slyly, and with the assistance of the then Minister of Justice, had its charter amended. At that time it had received $300,000 from the city of Quebec, a quarter of a million from the provincial government, and nearly $400,000 from the Dominion government, and it had a capital of $200,000, with $65,000 paid up. My hon. friend from Hamilton concedes that that money was paid up. I do not believe it was. It is my belief that there was never any money paid up of the capital stock of the Quebec Bridge Company, and until those papers which are so important, which are going to change the situation completely from what we have had to-day from my hon. friend from Hamilton are brought down, I will continue asserting that there never was any stock paid up in that company. Gentlemen of undoubtedly respectability lent their names——

Mr. GEORGE PARENT. I for one can tell the hon. gentleman that I paid for stock in the company, the full amount of the shares.

Mr. MONK. Well, it was probably a present from the hon. gentleman's father. At any rate, there have been time and again questions asked in this House and in the Senate, and the answers to those questions have always been evasive. Under these circumstances I shall be gratified to know that in reality some money was actually paid in cash for that stock. That was the situation in the summer of 1903. The company had received all this money; it had spent it all. It owed over $700,000, and what assets had it? A couple of piers, if they were completed then, on each side of the river; that is all. The company came here and secured a statute, which was sanctioned on the 10th of July, 1903, giving it very extensive powers—a kind of all-embracing capacity for everything that could by the greatest stretch of the imagination be connected with it. It was given power to generate and distribute electric energy, to build tramways almost everywhere to construct ferries, to acquire patents, to build wharfs, docks, telephone and telegraph lines, to own and control terminal lines and to make arrangements with all the railways coming into the city of Quebec. In fact, the effect of the legislation then obtained was to give this company the right to control all the approaches to the bridge and from the bridge into the city of Quebec—the approach from the north end to the Canadian Pacific Railway and from the south end to the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk, and the approach from the bridge itself, which is some distance outside of the city of Quebec, down to the centre of the city. From a bridge company that was designed to build a bridge at Quebec and nothing else, it became a company having for its object to exploit the whole neighbourhood. I have no doubt that about twenty years ago when the company was formed, and these gentlemen became connected with it, it was regarded as a company that was only to bridge the river at Quebec. But in 1903 it became a necessary link in the transcontinental railway system, and this legislation was passed evidently to compass all the ends which could be brought within the purview of the company. At that time, it must not be forgotten, Mr. Parent was Prime Minister of Quebec, mayor of the city and president of the bridge company.

I do not wish to malign Mr. Parent. He is a man with qualities, a man of business, and not long ago he was knifed by a portion of his party in the province of Quebec. In that respect he has my full sympathy. After the Quebec Bridge Company had obtained these powers and had obtained an extension of ten years for the building of the bridge, after the stockholders had paid up this $65,000 of stock—if it ever was paid—what happened? At that time, in July, 1903, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) also, and the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick), very well indeed knew that this company was absolutely incapable of prosecuting the enterprise. They knew that parliament would have to be called on to vote a very substantial assistance; but these gentlemen were silent altogether until the late autumn, in the session's last hours, when parliament was about to be prorogued. This was, in my experience of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), his hour of temptation and struggle. I do not think that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has been absolutely fair to the minister, because I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) did make a battle against the absurd, ridiculous and absolutely indefensible scheme which was finally adopted. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) baulks sometimes. He balked on that Northwest question, concerning which he asked the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) a few days ago if he had not expressed his opinion in the Northwest.

Mr. FIELDING. Did my hon. friend never balk?

Mr. MONK. I did, I admit, but I have not the faculty of afterwards, on being circled and coaxed, negotiating the obstacle. In this instance my hon. friend did not display that gracefulness in negotiating the obstacle which I have seen him show on certain other occasions. We need only refer to his speech, when he defended these resolutions in committee, just before proroga-

tion—and you need not read between the lines—to see that he had struggled against this absurd and ridiculous system, and had finally given way, because, in the dying hours of the session, he placed the scheme before the House and said practically: 'There it is; I have given way; and I think you had better give way also in order that we may be able to prorogue the House.'

I do not wish to unduly detain the House, but this is a matter upon which I think the resolution of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is most timely. If we are not careful, if we do not take up seriously this question, we shall see repeated our experience of 1903. At the very end of the session, we shall see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) coming down with his scheme and saying to us: Now, are you going to refuse assistance to this undertaking or are you ready to give it, and let us prorogue the House? I want to guard against that. I have given a notice of motion which calls for information in connection with this enterprise, and for my part I shall not give my consent to any continuance of this folly—because that is what it really was—unless we undertake that work and prosecute it as business men who have at heart the interests of the country and not the advancement of the fortunes of a few individuals.

What characterized that scheme? The company had no assets. We have had no accounting of how these vast sums which were given the company were expended. There was no accountability, no responsibility, and there is none to-day. We stipulated, it is true, that the plans should be subject to the approval of the government. That is what we do whenever we grant a subsidy, but were those plans ever submitted for approval to men really competent? Ordinary engineers are not competent to examine the plans of such a vast and unprecedented structure. What really was done, I have no doubt, is that the plans were passed the department, as a matter of course, without careful examination, without any written report. Will the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) say when the engineers of the department found themselves confronted with the plans for the execution of a work, of a kind the equal to which is not to be found in the past—will the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) say that the government engineers gave the plans that careful examination which such an immense enterprise exacted? Was there any written report to the government in detail? Did this government, when it was pledging the credit of the country to the payment of these immense sums for the construction of this bridge work, take the trouble to consult an expert, a specialist? We pay $25,000 and $30,000 to lawyers to attend commissions; we give immense sums to commissioners who are called upon to investigate. Would it have been such an extraordinary measure of precaution for the government to have spent $2,000 or $3,000 or even $4,000 in order to have these plans passed upon by really competent men, men in the old country who are skilled in such construction? Nothing of that kind was done. We parted also with the control and supervision of the work. It was surely most important that we should know, when we were paying $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 for this structure, that it was being constructed according to the plans and specifications? But there was nothing of the sort. I can scarcely credit the rumour to which my hon. friend refers, namely, that an order in council was passed naming an engineer to supervise the work and that the order was subsequently cancelled. But of one thing there can be no doubt, and that is there was no supervision.

Neither was there any examination of the past accounts of the company. What would have happened had this great disaster not occurred? There is not a business man or any man of common sense, who will look at the charter of that company, as it was adopted in July, 1903, who can fail to arrive at the conclusion that if the bridge had been safely built, we would have to pay, on taking possession of it, millions of indemnity over and above the amount subscribed by the government. All these side undertakings were authorized by parliament. The company would have to be indemnified for the terminals it had built and the arrangements it had made in that connection. I know that there is a stipulation in the deed of agreement that when the government took possession, it should indemnify the stockholders, by giving them ten per cent over and above the amount of their stock plus five per cent interest from the time the stockholders paid for their stock. But there is nothing in that agreement, I say, which would prevent that company from urging other claims. Moreover, it had the power in virtue of this agreement, of contracting any new obligations it wished to contract, with the consent of the government. But, outside that restriction which was in the deed, I say it was a pit of claims. We should have had to pay large indemnities even outside the amounts fixed in the deed of agreement as to guarantees. And the ultimate effect was to have the work carried on by an irresponsible company. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was quite right in saying that, because there was nothing to ensure the company's responsibility. I say we would have been obliged to pay at least twice the amount which the bridge would have cost normally if the work had been supervised and carried on by the government itself.

Now, just to give an instance of the enormous waste into which this system had led us, I do not think I am mistaken when I say that the contractors for the substructure were paid by stock, with a discount of

40 per cent. And I do not think I am mistaken when I say, that, ultimately, when the guarantee of the government was given these contractors, or somebody, profited to the extent of the whole of that discount. It became their profit—a profit of 40 per cent on $300,000. When the government guarantee came in, there was an upleap of this security of 40 per cent which benefited somebody—I suppose the contractors who were the holders. When we made the agreement on the 19th of October, 1903 it was provided that before the guarantee was entered into the company would have to subscribe $200,000 of new stock and pay it up. The object of that obligation placed upon the shareholders was to cover the discount on the bonds. That discount amounted to, if I am not mistaken, to over $188,000 which went into the hands of somebody. That was a sheer loss of money under the circumstances, because, if we had undertaken the work ourselves there would not have been that discount. But the object of obliging the company to pay up $200,000 more worth of stock was to cover this discount. Was that stock paid up ? And, if it was not paid up, where did the amount of over $188,000 come from to cover that discount ? We must have full and detailed information on that point. But I say that, at the present moment, I have very grave doubt indeed as to whether that stock was really subscribed and paid up. And I will await the statement to that effect from the right hon. the Prime Minister before I will believe it. Because, the moment it was conceived in the province of Quebec, and in that little restricted group who were to benefit by this singular and unbusiness-like way of carrying on that enterprise—the moment it was known that the transcontinental was going to be built, that it would require this bridge and this link, a dead set was made upon the government and upon the treasury of the country in order to enrich that group of individuals, to the injury of the country and of the enterprise.

Now, Sir, we recognize that the Quebec bridge is a national undertaking. Nothing that has fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) can be interpreted otherwise than in the sense that we have always recognized, and particularly recognize now, that this work is a national undertaking ; that we must carry it on. But I say also that it is the duty of parliament under the circumstances, in view of this great disaster that has supervened, to be fully and thoroughly informed as to the affairs of the company. We will not shirk our duty ; we will carry it out. We will terminate that enterprise, but I for one will not give my adhesion in the future to any scheme which places third parties between the government, or the country, and the enterprise. The work will have to be done under our own supervision. It will have cost us dear ; because I have no doubt that, whatever may be the report, the company itself has no resources. I am told that the bridge company which has undertaken this work is not itself ready or capable of meeting this immense loss. But I have no certainty as to that. At any rate, there is not a man in this House who doubts that we shall have to pay a much more considerable amount than we undertook to pay in 1903, in order that this work may be finished. In the province of Quebec we are peculiarly situated. We have special conditions, special privileges ; and, to my mind, that very fact imposes upon us special duties. Here is a great national work. It is situated near the old city of Quebec. It is destined to benefit the whole country, but, no doubt we are all glad that it should benefit that section of the country especially. But, I say, it is our duty, under these circumstances, in view of these very special facts, that the work should be carried on honestly, with due regard to proper principles of government, with economy, and in a way which will meet absolutely the approval of the House and the country.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker : It is to be regretted that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), who as he himself said, is sometimes a balker did not balk on this occasion rather than give his countenance to an attempt to make political capital out of a great national calamity. The destruction of the Quebec bridge is a national calamity—the hon. gentleman himself says so, and so does everybody else. I venture to assert that if that calamity had not befallen, this motion in amendment would never have been placed in your hands. The gist of the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is simply a censure of the government for having dealt with the Quebec Bridge Company instead of undertaking to build the bridge itself. I followed the hon. gentleman's speech pretty closely, and I think I am not mistaken in saying that the only fault he, at this moment, lays at the door of the government is that the government itself did not construct the bridge but endorsed the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company and left the work in its hands. If this was a wrong policy in 1903 that was the time to attack it; if it was good policy then it has not become bad policy since. The session of 1904 passed and we heard no criticism against the government on this score. The session of 1905 passed and no censure of the government was proposed on this score. The session of 1906 passed and at this session also we heard not a word of censure against the government on this account. The session of 1906-7 passed in the same way. It is only now, at the beginning of the session of 1907-8, that, for the first time, it is proposed that the government shall be censured for this mode of

constructing the bridge. And why? Simply because in the meantime there has been a great calamity which has destroyed life and has been the cause of the loss of much money and much valuable time.

Mr. MONK. It has brought out the fact that there was no supervision or careful examination of the plans.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The very words the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) now uses are the strongest condemnation of his attitude. How does he know that there was no proper supervision of the plans? A commission has been appointed to investigate this matter and tell us where the blame lies. The fault may have been in the plans; it may have been in the supervision; it may have been in something else. But, certainly, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has no information and will not know the facts until the report of that commission is before us. Still, the hon. gentleman is not above censuring the government though he does not know the facts and though the facts are at this minute being investigated. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the gist of the offence which is charged against the government is that they did not carry on this work as a government work, but entrusted it to a company. I am surprised that my hon. friend should have spoken as he did of that company, that he should have cast slurs upon it, that he should have questioned its motives and its honesty. The hon. gentleman is aware, or he ought to be aware, that some of the directors of that company are men whose characters are above reproach; that they are some of the best men, not only in the city of Quebec, but in the whole country. I have not all the names at my disposal at this moment, but I have several in mind. First of all there is Mr. Parent, the chairman. Mr. Parent is a gentleman of undoubted business ability, of undoubted integrity. He has been in the limelight for many years; he has been accused, but he has come out triumphantly out of every accusation brought against him. Next to Mr. Parent in influence perhaps is the Hon. John Sharples, a member of the Legislative Council of Quebec, one of the ablest businessmen in that city, whose family has been connected for generations with the lumber trade. Moreover, the hon. gentleman should not forget that Mr. Sharples is not a member of the party to which I belong, but a member of his own party. Another name is that of Mr. Gaspard Lemoine. He also is one of the ablest men in the city, and enjoys the highest reputation for honesty; his character is above reproach. Again, if I may say so to my hon. friend, if it be any certificate of character, Mr. Lemoine also belongs to the Conservative party. Another name is that of Mr. H. N. Price. He also is a well known business man of the city of Quebec, and if the fact will remove any of the objections my hon. friend has to the board, I may mention that Mr. Price is also a member of the Conservative party. Another one of the directors was Mr. Dobell, a former member of this House and of this government, a most respected gentleman, whose character was above reproach. Another director was Mr. Audette, head of the firm of Thibaudeau Bros., and one of the most respected men in the city of Quebec. Now, Sir, would the hon. gentleman dare to say that these gentlemen I have mentioned, Mr. Parent, Mr. Audette, Mr. Price, Mr. Lemoine, and Mr. Sharples, would be guilty of any such offences as he has mentioned? Does he believe that these gentlemen, whose business reputation is of the very highest, would have been guilty, as he said in his too hasty and inflammatory remarks, of attempting to plunder the treasury in the summer of 1903 when it became known that the Grand Trunk Pacific was to be constructed? Sir, such language is intolerable in this House; such language is not worthy the hon. gentleman, it is beneath his dignity. He ought not to have spoken in that way of men who, if I may say so, are his equals in every respect.

Mr. BERGERON. Were these gentlemen, whose names have been mentioned, original directors of the company? Could the hon. gentleman say when they were appointed to that position?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as my information goes, these gentlemen have been connected with the scheme, I will not say from its inception, but for ten years at least, I think they were connected with the company in 1899. I speak under correction, but I am sure my information will be found absolutely correct. Now we might have adopted the plan suggested by the hon. gentleman and made this a government work. But though we might have done so, I am sure that everybody at that time in this House, everybody on these benches at all events, believed that the work was confided to gentlemen who were absolutely reliable, and that these gentlemen who were then active directors of the company would properly and honestly expend every cent of that money. I have no reason to believe the contrary. The hon. gentleman has made a speech which he should have made upon another motion. He wants to have an investigation held upon the manner in which the bridge was constructed. I have no opinion to express upon that question. But I have only to say that the observations he made would come more properly on another occasion. I must say that the hon. gentleman has spoken on this occasion with a levity which greatly surprised me. He stated that the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was justified because lives had been lost through the want of care, through the negligence of the government. Why, Sir, what warrant had the hon. gentleman to speak in that way?

Mr. MONK. I base that allegation on the fact that the government failed in its supervision.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What evidence has the hon. gentleman on which to make that statement? The fact is that immediately after this fatal accident took place, the first thing we did was to appoint a commission to investigate this very fact.

Mr. MONK. After.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course after; how could it be before? The responsibility for this accident rests somewhere. It may rest upon the government, and we will see that in due time. It may rest upon the plans, as being faulty and defective; it may rest upon the supervision. But the responsibility rests somewhere, and at the present time a commission of competent engineers, competent men whose efficiency has not been questioned, is engaged in finding out where the responsibility rests.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the right hon. gentleman inform the House just what supervision there was on the part of the government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I believe there was ample supervision. The hon. gentleman wants to make a point that the government had no engineer there. I do not know, I cannot say.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether there was one or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can say that Mr. Hoare was the engineer appointed by the Quebec Bridge Company. The Phœnix Bridge Company had one or two engineers on the spot also, whose business it was to supervise from day to day the work of construction. I do not know what more supervision could be had even if there had been no engineer there on the part of the government. The Phœnix Bridge Company, with two or three engineers on the spot, had every interest to see that the work was properly done, and so far as I know, the work of construction was very well done by the company; that is so far as the material was concerned. Then the engineer of the Quebec Bridge Company, Mr. Hoare, was a competent man. All these engineers were there from day to day to see that the work was properly done. The hon. gentleman said he was not sure whether the plans had been approved. Why, Sir, neither any member of this government, nor the hon. gentleman himself, had he been a member of the government, could pass any opinion upon a plan when presented to him. What can you do in a matter of this kind? The hon. gentleman stated very properly that an ordinary engineer, a railway engineer, would hardly be able to pass upon plans prepared for a bridge of such magnitude. This was a special work. Well, we do know that every one of these plans had been approved by Mr. Cooper, who, as the hon. gentleman said himself, is a man of recognized ability and an authority upon bridge construction. It will be shown later on, that the plans prepared by the engineer of the Phœnix Bridge Company had been submitted to Mr. Cooper and approved by him. Now it will be shown whether or not the engineers made a mistake.

Mr. HAGGART. Were the plans drawn up by Mr. Cooper?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My information is that they were not drawn up by Mr. Cooper, but by Mr. Szlapka, and were afterwards submitted to Mr. Cooper and confirmed by him. That is the information I have, but, of course, as to that I speak by hearsay; I do not know, but we will know presently when we receive the report of the commission. That is all I have to say on this occasion as to these matters. It seems to me that nothing could be more unfair, nothing could be more unjust——

Mr. MONK. May I ask my right hon. friend if Mr. Cooper was acting for the government or for the bridge company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Cooper, as I understand it, was acting for all parties. He had been the recognized authority, and he was certainly acting for the Phœnix Bridge Company and also for the Quebec Bridge Company. That is all the information I have on this subject at the present moment. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), a moment ago, taunted me because I did not answer a certain question at the moment when it was asked of me by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Does he expect me to carry in my mind all the orders in council that I have ever signed? It is simply absurd, and I repeat what I said a moment ago, that nothing could be more unfair or unjust than the attempt which has been made to cast a slur upon the government when the hon. gentleman or no one else knows anything in particular about this case.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, a new doctrine has been laid down in this House by the Hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who have just spoken, and that is that an item which is mentioned in the King's speech, and in which attention is drawn to some particular subject, is not a fitting question for discussion because a royal commission has been appointed to inquire into it. That certainly is a new doctrine. The King's speech draws attention to the catastrophe that happened in Quebec, to the fall of this bridge and to the loss of life that resulted. We are within our strict rights in discussing

that matter to the fullest extent, and it is a new doctrine to place before this House that because the government appoints a commission we are not to discuss the subject until the commission pleases to report upon it. What has become of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility? Under the old rule laid down by the members of the present government when they were in opposition, the ministry, no matter whether they had knowledge of it or not, were responsible if an accident happened. I had the charge laid often against me that because some official in my department, when I was Minister of Railways and Canals, had committed a wrong, had connived at a theft, or done something or other of that kind, the responsibility should be placed directly upon the minister who had in his employ such a person. Certainly that is the correct doctrine. The ministers are directly responsible, and upon them devolves the responsibility of showing how and why this catastrophe happened. When, in 1903, the right hon. Prime Minister brought down his scheme for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the completion of the Quebec bridge became an absolute necessity. We were all favourable to it. We gave all the powers to the government that were necessary for the purpose of acquiring the bridge. The government, previously to the passing of the Act, had entered into an agreement, which was embodied in the Act of parliament, vesting in them the control and management of the bridge. They had, first of all, to approve of the contract, they had to place the bridge under the supervision of an engineer and the control and management of the bridge were vested by Act of parliament in the government of the country. What are the facts of the case ? As to the company, no imputation has been made as to the character of the individuals who compose it. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has been accused of casting such an imputation upon them and the right hon. gentleman asks : What has he to say about Mr. Sharples ? what has he to say about the late Mr. Dobell ? He has never made an attack upon any individual at all. What he stated was that a bankrupt company which could not go on and build the bridge came to this House, and in saying this he only used the words of the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), who stated so when he introduced the Bill. He stated that they were unable to go on and complete the undertaking and he was obliged to introduce this Bill to the House. What were the facts in reference to the bridge company ? They had $900,000 and they had $60,000 alleged to have been paid in as subscriptions for the capital stock of the company. The $900,000 was composed of contributions by the city of Quebec, the province of Quebec and the Dominion government. They sold their bonds or securities upon the undertaking, which realized sixty per cent of their value. There was owing to the contractors who were building the bridge, $700,000. The amount they had altogether realized was in the neighbourhood of $900,000, and the indebtedness of the company when they came to this government was $700,000. We agreed to guarantee bonds for the purpose of completing the bridge to the extent of nearly $7,000,000. On what condition ?—on the condition that the contract and plans should be approved by the government and that the control and management of the undertaking should be placed in the hands of the government from the day of the passage of the Act. It is true the company had a subsidiary interest in it under the agreement which was that after a certain amount was paid in the form of interest the residue belonged to the company. It is not at all probable that this agreement would ever result in anything being payable to the company. Virtually the absolute control and ownership of the bridge passed with the Act of 1903 to the government of this country. One of the conditions was that the bonds which had realized sixty per cent were to be supplemented by a paid up capital of $200,000 for the purpose of making up the deficiency between the selling price and par value of the bonds. We have no means of knowing in what form that was done. Perhaps the contractor who was owed $700,000 for his work on the foundation of the bridge would be very glad to subscribe $200,000 for the purpose of getting in $500,000 clear. Is there any one in this House who believes that the company itself, being a bankrupt company, and there being no possibility at all of any amount of money being returned to it, paid out of its own pockets $200,000 in order to get $500,000 from the government of the country to pay some contractor ? Is there a possibility of it ? Does the right hon. gentleman himself believe anything of the kind ? The fact of the matter is that it enabled the contractor by subscribing to the capital stock, to obtain payment of the balance that was due him of $700,000 less $200,000 by entering into a scheme of that kind.

The effect of the agreement made with the government at the time was that the control and management of the affairs of the bridge was vested in the government owing to the advances made to the company. As to the ministerial responsibility in such cases, I have some recollection of arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite and of inquiries that were made in reference to expenditures of that kind. I remember perfectly attacks that were made on us when we were on that side of the House upon such matters, in which it was stated that in the case of any expenditure by any official or any act by a company controlled by the government there was ministerial responsibility until the matter was explained. But now we are told that

we are not to discuss the matter because it is the subject of a royal commission appointed to inquire into it. Why debate on any subject might be prevented in this House if the government appointed a royal commission to inquire into it. We are told that we are not to discuss the Quebec bridge catastrophe because a royal commission has been appointed, but we do know that the bridge fell from engineering faults in the design, as stated in the evidence given by Mr. Cooper. It is known anyway that it fell and we certainly have a right of inquiry in the subject. The matter is mentioned in the speech from the Throne and we certainly have the fullest right to discuss the subject.

What are the facts? This expenditure upon the Quebec bridge which was supposed to be, under the contract, in the neighbourhood of $6,900,000, plus the amount expended on the approaches to the bridge, was in the neighbourhood of about $1,700,000, and what position are we now in in reference to the ultimate construction of that bridge? Is the whole superstructure to be redesigned and erected of a more solid character by the government of this country? What are we to do with reference to it? The bridge which was supposed to cost the country seven or eight million dollars will cost in the end twelve or fourteen million dollars. This is one link in the National Transcontinental Railway which we were assured by the right hon. gentleman who leads the government would not cost the country over $13,000,000! The expenditure on the Quebec bridge alone will exceed the limit set by the Prime Minister as the cost of the entire Transcontinental railway. There should be some responsibility. I have not heard a statement from the government as to the methods of approval of the plans and specifications by the government engineers and the government. What reason have the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals given to the government? What is the report to the government in reference to the supervision upon that bridge? Surely the government engineers approved of the plans or the government would never have entered into the arrangement with the contractors. As this subject is mentioned in the speech from the Throne, this information should be given; this House should have the fullest information in the possession of the government upon this subject. Yet we are told that we must not discuss this matter because a commission has been appointed to inquire into the matter. It may be mentioned in the speech from the Throne, it may be a question of notoriety from end to end of the country, but this House is not to discuss the matter because there is a royal commission, which may take any time it likes to consider the matter and report. I never heard a greater absurdity stated in this House. We have a right of discussion before a royal commission reports upon the subject. The only tribunal whose existence would prevent discussion upon a subject of that kind is a commission appointed by this House to inquire into the matter. You cannot burk discussion and inquiry by appointing a royal commission to inquire into any catastrophe or any of the faults of the engineering or expenditure of the government. We are entitled to an explanation from the government with reference to the catastrophe at Quebec, nothing can stifle our right of inquiry, and for those reasons I support in the heartiest manner the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker).

Mr. BARKER. I would like to be permitted to correct some dates which I quoted. The agreement was dated on the 19th of October, the papers were laid on the table of this House the next day, October 20; on the 21st the government gave notice of a resolution on the subject; on the 22nd the Finance Minister moved the resolution on the subject and on the 22nd the Bill was passed through all the stages in this House.

Mr. LANCASTER. And when did the House prorogue?

Mr. BARKER. The House prorogued on the 24th, but the Bill had to go to the Senate in the meantime.

House divided on amendment, Mr. Barker.

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Lennox,
Ames,	Macdonell,
Armstrong,	MacLaren,
Avery,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Barker,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Barr,	Marshall,
Beattie,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Bennett,	Monk,
Bergeron,	Morin,
Blain,	Northrup,
Borden (Carleton),	Owen,
Chisholm (Huron),	Paquet,
Christie,	Perley,
Clements,	Reid (Grenville),
Cockshutt,	Roche (Marquette),
Crocket,	Schaffner,
Daniel,	Smith (Wentworth),
Elson,	Staples,
Foster,	Taylor,
Fowler,	Wilmot,
Haggart,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Henderson,	Worthington,
Herron,	Wright (Muskoka)—50.
Jackson (Elgin),	
Lake,	
Lalor,	
Lancaster,	

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Aylesworth,	Law,
Beauparlant,	LeBlanc,

Beland,
Black,
Bole,
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Grant,
Greenway,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Miller,
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Pickup,
Power,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne's),
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—96.

PAIRS.

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Gervais,	Lewis,
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),	Boyce,
Telford,	Tisdale,
Carvell,	Clare,
Guthrie,	Pringle,
Paterson,	Porter,
Robitaille,	Sproule,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Osler,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Pardee,	Kemp,
Dyment,	Ward,
German,	Hughes (Victoria),
Boyer,	Leonard,
Pickup,	Ganong,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Broder,
Bureau,	Forget,
Gordon,	Bristol,
Bickerdike,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Wilson (Russell),	Brabazon,
Ratz,	White,
Hall,	Maclean (York, S.),
Talbot.	Seagram.

Amendment negatived, and main motion (Mr. Hall) agreed to on division.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved :

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself in a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved :

That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself in a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

ESTIMATES FOR 1908-9.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING delivered a message from the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker as follows :

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1909, and in accordance with the provisions of The British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, December 11, 1907.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the message of His Excellency, together with the estimates, were referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a statement showing : 1. The amount of each temporary loan made by the government since January 1, 1907.

2. The name of the lenders, date of loan, time or duration, rate of interest.

3. The total amount of current temporary loans outstanding.

4. The total amount borrowed by the government on temporary loans from banks in Canada since March 31, 1907.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, documents and papers relating to Chinese seeking admission to the public schools of British Columbia as students, and relating to the remission of head tax on such persons.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all correspondence, instructions or communications sent by the government of Canada through the Secretary of State or otherwise, to Sir Henri Joly de Lot-

binière, as Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia, during the years 1905 and 1906, respectively.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all writs, forms and instructions issued and used in and for the purposes of the several elections for Dominion constituencies in the year 1907.—Mr. Barker.

For a return showing the number of immigrants secured and located by Mr. M. C. Dunne, of Yarke, in the county of Lennox and Addington, the names of each such immigrant, his age, the names of the respective parties with whom they are located, also the township in which such party resides; also the amount of money received by the said M. C. Dunne from the government for his services in salary, commission, or both; also the amount of moneys received by the said M. C. Dunne, respectively, from residents in the said county of Lennox and Addington for his services in securing the aforesaid immigrants.—Mr. U. Wilson.

For a return showing the number of immigrants secured and located by Mr. N. B. Miller, of the town of Napanee, in the county of Lennox and Addington, the names of each such immigrant, his age, the names of the respective parties with whom they were located, also the township in which such party resides; also the amount of money received by the said N. B. Miller from the government for his services in salary, commission, or both, also the amount of moneys received by the said N. B. Miller, respectively, from residents in the said county of Lennox and Addington for his services in securing the aforesaid immigrants.—Mr. Wilson.

For a return showing the timber lands sold or leased by the Department of the Interior subsequent to the date of those included in sessional paper No. 167a, brought down to the House on the 9th of April, 1907; the description and area of such lands, the applications made therefor, the notice of advertisement for sale or tender, the tenders received, the amount of each tender, the tenders accepted, the name of the person or company to whom each lot was sold or leased, and the name and address of each person or company to whom any of such leases have been transferred.—Mr. Ames.

For a return bringing the information as contained in sessional paper No. 167b, brought down April 26, 1907, up to date.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing: The expenditure by the Dominion government on (a) wharfs; (b) harbours and river improvements; (c) dredging; (d) public buildings; for each year since 1896, in the counties of Digby, Yarmouth, Shelburne, Queens, Lunenburg and Pictou, Nova Scotia, specifying the works by name, with amounts expended thereon.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing, in respect of timber berth No. 1279, all applications, correspondence, reports, advertisements, tenders, leases, transfers or memoranda of any description.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all correspondence in connection with the application, granting. operation or renewal of license and lease conveying the privileges of fishing in Cedar, Moose, Cormorant and Clearwater lakes; also a copy of said license and lease.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing the total amount of money paid yearly from the year 1892 to December 1, 1907, on each of the following accounts:—

(a) Salary of Governor General.

(b) Travelling expenses of Governor General.

(c) Expenditure on Rideau Hall, capital account; expenditure on Rideau Hall, maintenance; expenditure on Rideau Hall grounds, capital account; expenditure on Rideau Hall grounds, maintenance.

(d) Expenditure on furnishings of all kinds for Rideau Hall.

(e) Expenditure on any other account in connection with the office of Governor General.

(f) Expenditure on any other account in connection with Rideau Hall and grounds.—Mr. U. Wilson.

For a return showing: 1. The names (a) of members of parliament, and (b) ex-members of parliament who have been appointed to the Senate by the present administration, distinguishing between classes (a) and (b), giving the date of retirement in class (b) and date of appointment in all cases.

2. The names of members of parliament and of ex-members of parliament appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown by the present administration, distinguishing between the two classes and giving dates as in paragraph one mentioned.

3. The names of senators and ex-senators appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown by the present administration, distinguishing between the two classes and giving dates as in paragraph one mentioned.—Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, reports, opinions of the Department of Justice, memoranda, papers and documents; also of all plans or route maps relating to the proposed new eastern entrance of the Grand Trunk Railway Company into the city of Toronto.—Mr. Macdonell.

For a copy of all correspondence, contracts and appointments of overseers in respect to Port Burwell harbour, in the county of Elgin, Ontario, since January 1, 1907. Also a return showing pay-sheets, amount of new material used, from whom purchased, of all day or contract work on the said harbour, giving names of overseers and whom appointed for the same.—Mr. Marshall.

For a return showing a summary of stock, implements, chattels, grain, hay, roots and all other kinds of fodder, with their value, for the years ending December 1, 1906 and 1907. Also the amount paid for all kinds of live stock, their kind and number, the amount paid for all kinds of feed, giving the kind, the amount of all kinds of product sold, and their kind ; the amount paid for all kinds of grain and seed for distribution for the same years, on the Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa. —Mr. Jackson (Elgin).

For a return showing: 1. How many drill halls have been constructed or are under construction by the government since 1896.

2. In what localities these buildings have been constructed, and the cost of construction in each case.

3. What military organizations exist in the respective localities in which these drill halls have been erected, and the numerical strength of each such military organization.—Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing how many applications were refused for permission, as granted by order in council passed on the 16th of May, 1906, for sawmill owners to cut timber—Mr. W. J. Roche (Marquette).

For a copy of all reports received by the government from each of the special immigration agents sent to Great Britain and the continent of Europe, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Wilson.

For a copy of the order in council appointing Honourable J. A. Ouimet as judge of the Court of King's Bench, as well as a copy of all correspondence, reports, medical certificates and order in council concerning his being pensioned.—Mr. Lanctot (Laprairie).

For a copy of all communications, reports, correspondence, or other papers, between the Department of the Interior and any of its officials, and A. Samovici, H. Bolocan, and any other person or persons in regard to the northwest quarter-section 20, township 22, range 13, west second meridian, including applications for cancellation, protections, homestead inspectors' reports, &c.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing reports of commissions, boards of inquiry, inspections, reports of individual officers, to the government or any member thereof, including reports from the comptroller, commissioner, or any officer or member of the Northwest Mounted Police, the Dominion Rifle Association, or any member thereof, or any rifle association or club, or any member thereof, or to the commandant, or any member of the Bisley team, regarding the efficiency of the Ross rifle, to date. —Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing: 1. How much money has been expended to date on the Royal Mint, for construction and equipment, respectively.

2. The sums required to complete on both accounts.

3. The officers and employees, and at what yearly salaries, are required to man the institution.

4. The face value of copper and silver and gold coinage obtained by the government per year for the last ten years, and what it has cost the government therefor.

5. The total profit on coinage in the ten years.

6. The amount of coinage it is in contemplation to issue in 1908, and in what denominations.

7. Who is to make the purchases and fix the price of bullion necessary for the use of the Mint.

8. Upon what system the officers and employees of the Mint are appointed, promoted and dismissed.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all contracts between the Ross Rifle Company and the government, or the Department of Militia, for the supply of rifles, ammunition and other articles, and all orders in council, correspondence, reports, documents and papers, relating to such contracts, and the subject-matter thereof, and to the operations of the company, and to its dealings with the government, or any of the departments, including the Department of Customs, and the Bank of Montreal, or any banking institution. —Mr. Worthington.

For a copy of all correspondence received by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the inspection of meats and the regulations in connection with the inspection of Meats and Canned Foods Bill.—Mr. Clements.

For a return showing the number of civil servants who have been appointed by the present government since June 7, 1896, their names, salaries, and the department in which each such is employed; also, the total number employed each year since June 7, 1896.—Mr. Clements.

For a copy of all correspondence, inclosed clippings, agreements, statements, &c., between the government or any member thereof, and especially the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Militia, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and one F. E. Williams, of St. John, New Brunswick; one W. H. Trueman, of St. John, and any other person or persons whatsoever in relation to the establishment of a bait freezer and cold storage established in St. John, New Brunswick. —Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, statements, papers, orders in council, and proclamations respecting the setting out of limits for prohibition of the sale of liquors along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific under the Public Works Construction Act.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence between the government of Canada and any of its ministers with reference to the establishment of a fast line of steamship communication between Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand, and Canadian ports.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing: 1. The names of all persons employed at any time during the years 1905, 1906 and 1907 in the several and respective branches of the public service at Ottawa, who at the time of engagement were not on the civil service list.

2. On whose recommendation each such appointment was made.

3. What the duties of the several persons were; the date of the employment; the wage or salary, and any increase therein.

4. How long such persons have been in the public service, and what their absences have been during said three years.

5. If now on civil service list when examination was passed.—Mr. Barker.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, papers, memoranda and reports relating to the retirement, resignation, or dismissal of Mr. Hodgins, C.E., from the service of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission and the grounds or reasons therefor.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Departments of Marine and Fisheries and Justice of Canada and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia or any official acting under this authority in connection with the suit in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia of the King by Dr. Tait, of Cheticamp, in the county of Inverness, Nova Scotia, versus William Ancoin.—Mr. McLennan.

For a return showing: 1. How many employees there are in the departments at Ottawa, giving the number in each department separately.

2. How many of such employees are on the permanent and how many on the temporary lists.

3. How many on the temporary list who have been employed for more than a year.

4. How many employees are on the permanent and how many on the temporary list who have neither passed the civil service examination, nor obtained a B.A. degree.

5. Also showing what the corresponding numbers were in the year 1896 in each of above cases.—Mr. Northrup.

For a return showing the number of fishing licenses issued by the government for any of the lakes in the province of Saskatchewan, to whom issued, and on what lakes.—Mr. T. Chisholm.

For a return showing what complaints respecting the inadequacy of postal service or delays therein, or respecting lack of or defects in postal facilities or means of communications, have been received by the Post Office Department since the 1st day of January, 1907, and the general nature of such complaints.—Mr. Armstrong.

For a return showing: 1. All promotions that have been made to the rank of colonel in the active militia during the past year, with names,

2. The nature of service, merit or seniority justifying such promotions.

3. The record of war services of such officers.

4. Previous to the gazetting of such promotion the positions held by such officers on the seniority list of the colonels.

5. The number of lieut-colonels who were outranked or superseded by such promotion, with their names and services.—Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing: 1. The number of officials of the government, civil or military, or officers of the active militia who perform services in any way connected with the manufacture of rifles for the government by the Ross Rifle Company.

2. Their names, ranks and duties, and the amount of their individual salary or remuneration.

3. The total amount (apart from contract cost of rifle), or expenditure by the government with the Ross Rifle Company, including any bonus loans, inspections, cost of testing, commissions, or expenditure of any kind, with the individual amounts.—Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing: 1. What harbours or rivers in the province of Ontario tenders were invited for dredging work by the Department of Public Works during the present year.

2. The names of the successful tenderers at each of the said places for which dredging tenders were invited in Ontario in 1907, and the prices asked by each party respectively.

3. Amounts of the tenders respectively of the different persons tendering at each of the foregoing points.

4. Also at what points new tenders were invited, and when the first tenders were accepted.—Mr. Bennett.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Might I renew the question I put to the Finance Minister? One of the difficulties having been negotiated, perhaps I can get some information from him as to what we may expect.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It is only fair that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should have the information. I had anticipated that the budget would come on before the Christmas adjournment. But our plans have been somewhat disarranged by the protracted nature of the debate, I think I had better say to my hon. friend that the budget will not come on before Christmas.

ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say to the Prime Minister that, there being no difficulty now in the way of carrying on the business, the committees should be called together for organization at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow or the day after?

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 12, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 30) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill is intended to amend section 196 of the Railway Act, and to repeal and also amend certain sections between section 196 and section 214. These sections make up that portion of the Act which concerns the exploration of lands to be acquired for purposes of railway construction. The principle involved in this Bill is the shortening of the interminable delays in these expropriation proceedings and the diminution of the enormous amount of costs incurred by the parties interested through the execution of the existing law. The Bill provides for the appointment of experts instead of arbitrators as at present. The experts are to be appointed in the same way as the arbitrators under the existing law, but difference comes in in the definition of the powers and duties of the experts to be appointed under this proposed amendment. The experts are appointed by a judge; and, within a delay fixed by the court, make their report as to the amount of indemnity to be given to the parties whose land is to be expropriated. The powers of the arbitrators are defined in section 201 of the Act. Under this Bill subsections A, B, C and D of that section

are not substantially affected. But the change proposed to be made is in relation to the proceedings to establish the value of the expropriated property. Under the present system, the arbitrators appointed by the judge go through the country hearing evidence as to the value of the lands affected, sitting in one place one day and in another place another day, being served by a clerk, employing a shorthand writer and bringing witnesses before them. After a delay of six months or so, and after they have heard contradictory evidence as to the value of the land—a question of fact—they render judgment. This is sent to the clerk of the court and is subject to appeal in the ordinary form before the civil courts. The costs involved sometimes amount to $7,000, $8,000 or $9,000—and, when the proper time comes, I shall bring before the House some instances to prove the existence of grave abuses against interested parties under the existing law. This Bill provides that the powers of the experts shall be limited. They will have power to require the production of books, papers, plans, specifications, drawings and documents relating to the matter before them, and to enforce the attendance of the depositaries of those papers. They will have no right to take verbal or written evidence as to the value of the lands to be acquired; they judge for themselves the value of these lands, and make their report to the judge as already stated, in a determined delay. If the parties interested agree to the conclusions of that report, a judgment is rendered, and, this judgment being accepted by both parties there is no appeal. If after the report has been made to the court within the delay fixed, one of the parties will not accept the conclusion, he asks the judge to proceed in the ordinary way as in civil matters on trial. In that case the judge hears the case and renders judgment. After the judgment has been rendered and served on the parties, an appeal is allowed if the amount in question is over $600, as provided by the existing law, the appeal being to a superior court according to the laws of the province in which the case arises. This is a much simpler and more expeditious method than the present. Under the existing system, three arbitrators are appointed who hold two or three sittings a day for which they receive from $6 to $10 a sitting, who pay a clerk and a shorthand writer and whose proceedings involve the costs of bringing twenty or twenty-five witnesses or experts on each side, although two or three could specify the value of the land, which, it may be, is only an acre or two. In sections 6 to 14 the words 'arbitrator' or 'award' are replaced by the word 'expert' or a 'report of experts' in order to enable the law to be understood.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 31) to amend the Fisheries Act.—Mr. Sinclair.

QUESTIONS.

THE BOYLE CONCESSION.

Mr. AMES asked:

Has the Dawson legislature memorialized the government of Canada regarding what is known as the Boyle concession? If so, what action has been taken in regard to the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No reply from Dawson has yet been received.

TUNNEL TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

Has the Hon. the Minister of Finance done anything, if so, what, to obtain the information referred to in reply to a question in the House of Commons on the 11th day of April last as follows, and also the nature of the information obtained, if any?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We already have considerable information on the subject. Whatever further information be necessary in order that we may be fully informed as to the approximate cost of the tunnel or bridge should be obtained, and efforts will be made, so far as our engineers are available, the coming season to obtain a report. I shall do my utmost to get such information at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. LEFURGEY. Through the engineers of the department or special experts?

Mr. FIELDING. I think we have sufficient engineering skill in the various departments, but if the services of our engineers are not available undoubtedly we shall have to obtain expert opinion outside.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The hon. member has moved for a return which will probably cover this question. A report is being made, and will be presented to the House.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF MINISTERS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What is the amount of travelling and other expenses paid since March 31, 1907, to date, to each of the following ministers: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Frederick Borden, Hon. W. S. Fielding, Hon. L. P. Brodeur, and Hon. Sydney Fisher?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In addition to the expenses of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Frederick Borden and Hon. L. P. Brodeur, in connection with the Imperial Conference, as already stated, the amounts paid to date are as follows:—

Sir Wilfrid Laurier	$ 63 75
Sir Frederick Borden	729 65
Hon. W. S. Fielding	1,142 75
Hon. L. P. Brodeur	507 69
Hon. Sydney Fisher	939 14

LEASE OF LAND TO NEW BRUNSWICK COLD STORAGE COMPANY.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. What was the cost of the land now leased to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company at St. John, New Brunswick, by the Intercolonial Railway?
2. What was the cost of trestle work and sidings to the property of the above company?
3. On what terms is the above land leased to the said company, and for what length of time?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. $8,415.29.

2. Trestles and tracks put in, in 1901-2, $5,200, which were built prior to any consideration of the cold storage plant, and were, and are now still used for general railway purposes, Mr. Likely's timber mill being served therewith. Additional sidings recently completed, $4,200 approximately.

3. Leased to R. J. Graham at the rate of $250 per annum, dating from 1st July, 1907, to 1st July, 1970, afterwards assigned by him to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, limited, and by them to the provincial government of New Brunswick, and sublet by the provincial government of New Brunswick to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, Limited. Lease calls for construction of cold storage building within one year, from date of lease and stating provisions with respect to the shipping of freight on Intercolonial Railway.

LAND GRANTS TO SOUTH AFRICAN VETERANS.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked :

What steps have been taken by the government to carry into effect the resolution passed by this House on December 10, 1906, to set apart grants of Dominion lands for those residents of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, who took part in the South African war, 1899-1902?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). A Bill to conform with the resolution mentioned is in course of preparation.

PIANOS FOR SPEAKERS OF COMMONS AND SENATE.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Have any pianos been ordered, purchased or rented for the chambers occupied by the Speaker of the House of Commons, or the Speaker of the Senate, during the last four years?
2. If so, where were they manufactured, and by whom?
3. From whom were they obtained, and at what prices, or on what terms?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). No piano has been purchased for the rooms of the Speakers of the Senate or the House Commons. A piano has been rented sessionally for use in said rooms, as follows : 1904-5, Orme & Son, $10 per month; 1905-6, C. W. Lindsay, $5 per month ; 1906-7, C. W. Lindsay, $5 per month ; 1907-8, Orme & Son, $5 per month. The Senate piano is supplied by C. W. Lindsay at a monthly rental of $10 during sessions. There is no information in the Sergeant-at-Arms' department as to where these pianos are manufactured.

LOAN OF AUGUST 17, 1907.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What proportion of the 500,000 pounds loan, August 17, 1907, has been discounted outside the Bank of Montreal, London?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). £380,000.

Mr. FOSTER. At what banks ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the names. Speaking from memory, I think it is not usual to give them, but I will look into that. I think there were several.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS TO PROVINCES.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. On what dates do the subsidy payments to the various provinces become due under the British North America Act, 1907?
2. Have all the provinces been paid the subsidy due at last due date?
3. If not, what sums are yet owing?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. The grants and allowances payable under the British North America Act, 1907, are due on the 1st January and 1st July in each year ; but, in the case of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the annual sums payable in lieu of debt and in lieu of public lands under the Alberta and Saskatchewan Acts are still payable on the 1st September and 1st March in each year, inasmuch as the British North America Act, 1907, does not affect these allowances.
2. Yes.
3. No sums are now owing.

FRENCH TREATY AND MOST FAVOURED NATION TREATIES.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

To what countries, by virtue of the most favoured nation treaties, will Canada be obliged to extend the concessions made to France in the treaty now before the House for ratification?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). For reasons stated yesterday, I would rather not give the list of the countries, but of course the treaty will apply to those countries which are recognized as favoured nation countries.

Mr. FOSTER. Any special objection to giving the list ?

Mr. FIELDING. I gave the list the previous session, and it is possible that some of those treaties expire from time to time.

It is a matter of imperial concern, but I will ask for the latest up-to-date list. I do not care to commit myself to the list until I get the information. I think probably the information already before the House will be found to be substantially correct. Of course, the information will have to be given when we proceed with the treaty.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE LAW IN THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What were the instructions given to the mounted police in the Yukon by the Minister of Justice or the Department of the Interior with reference to the enforcement of the Sunday observance Law?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). No instructions on the subject have been given to the mounted police by the Minister of Justice or his department, but in reply to inquiries from the comptroller of the force two letters were written to him by the Deputy Minister of Justice stating the opinion of the department as to the duties of officials and course of procedure under the statute.

Mr. FOSTER. Can those letters be brought down with a formal motion?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They will be brought down.

COMMISSIONER CONGDON OF THE YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What investigation was made by the government in the case of Congdon, late Commissioner of the Yukon, and will the government lay the report thereof, if any, on the table of the House?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The report of our investigation held last winter by Mr. A. Power, of the Justice Department, will be laid on the table.

THE STEAMER 'SPEEDY.'

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. From whom was the steamer 'Speedy' purchased by the Department of Public Works, what was the price, and when was the vessel purchased?

2. Was she in commission during the seasons of navigation of 1906-1907? If so, where, and what services did she perform?

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

1. Purchase made in June, 1904, from Charles G. Conn, for $35,000.

2. Yes, on the St. Lawrence and upper lakes, performing inspection and towing service.

MOTOR CARS FOR INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. How many motor cars were built for the Intercolonial Railway, where built and by whom, and what was the cost of each complete?

2. How many of these cars are in operation, and where?

3. Did the tests of these cars prove satisfactory and economical? If so, which cars?

4. Is it the intention of the government to adopt these cars for branch lines of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, if so, when?

5. Are any more of these cars being built, if so, where?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Four cars. Three were built by Rhodes, Curry & Company, Amherst, N.S., and engines built and installed in Intercolonial railway shops at Moncton, and one built at Budapest, Hungary. Cost of three former, $18,600 each, and of the latter, $16,000.

2. Two of these cars are in operation; one between St. John and Hampton, N.B., and one between Halifax and Windsor, N.S.

3. Tests have not been reported upon to the department, as certain difficulties developed in the way of balancing, which will take some time to work out.

4. It depends upon the results secured by the operation of the motor cars on the Intercolonial.

5. None.

EXCISE ON TOBACCO.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce immediately a measure to amend the Inland Revenue Act so far as tobacco is concerned?

2. Will a uniform colour be adopted as regards revenue stamps in connection with the tobacco trade?

3. Is it intended to change the basis of excise taxes on Canadian grown tobacco?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The subject is at present under consideration.

DREDGING ON MATCHEDASH BAY.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Was any dredging done at Fesserton on Matchedash bay during the season of 1907?

2. What dredge performed the work, if any was done?

3. Was the work let by tender? If so, how many parties tendered?

4. What price was paid, and was the accepted tender the lowest?

5. Who was in charge of the work for the department, what was his remuneration, and upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

6. Where did the inspector come from?

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

1. Yes.

2. 'No. 4, A. F. Bowman.'

3. Yes, five, including Mr. Bowman.

4. 13 cents; Mr. Bowman's tender was the lowest.

5 and 6. Mr. J. W. Gendron was in charge from the 8th to the 21st of June, when his services were dispensed with. He was succeeded from the 20th of June to the 30th of September by Mr. F. O'Gara, and from the 1st of October to the end of season by Mr. E. Valiquette, the latter two gentlemen being from Ottawa. The salary paid in each case was $3 per day. I presume Mr. Gendron was a local man.

BRITISH COLUMBIA IMMIGRATION ACT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked:

In the event of the legislature of British Columbia re-enacting the British Columbia Immigration Act along the line of what is commonly known as the Natal Act, will the government of Canada continue their previous policy of advising its disallowance?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This question will have to be considered if it ever arises.

STRANDED POLISH IMMIGRANTS AT ST. THOMAS, ONTARIO.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

In the Ottawa 'Free Press,' November 28, 1907, the following item appeared: 'Twenty-four Poles from Detroit are stranded at St. Thomas, Ontario, as a result of an old game worked on them by an agent of an alleged employment bureau in Detroit.' Has the above matter been brought to the attention of the Immigration Department? If so, what action, if any, has been taken?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Yes. Michigan Central Railway upon an order from Superintendent of Immigration returned them to Detroit.

With the leave of the House I wish to lay on the table the papers in connection with this question.

SNAG BOAT ON RED RIVER.

Mr. STAPLES asked:

1. Has the government a snag boat on the Red river at or near the town of Selkirk?
2. If so, when was this boat built, and on whose recommendation was it built?
3. For what purpose was this boat built, and what has it cost?
4. Has it performed any work for which it was constructed? If so, to what extent?
5. How many persons have been employed on said boat?
6. Who are the persons that have been employed on the boat, and how much have they respectively received?
7. Does the government contemplate making any change in this boat?
8. If so, of what nature and for what purpose, and will it be used in the future?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.
2. Completed in spring of 1907.
3. Removing snags and generally deepening waterways.
4. Not yet.
5 and 6. No crew yet engaged.
7. Yes.
8. The vessel is being converted into a combined suction and clam shell dredge.

I have no answer as to what the boat has cost. I presume that my deputy, on account of the fact that the boat is yet under construction, has not given me the answer. If the hon. gentleman desires to know what it has cost up to date I will get the information for him.

MR. DAVID WOOD, TEULON, MANITOBA.

Mr. STAPLES asked:

1. Has David Wood, of Teulon, Manitoba, performed work of any nature for the government?
2. If so, of what nature was the work, and how much remuneration did he receive for the same?
3. Has he acted in the capacity of caretaker for the government?
4. If so, in what particular, how much did he receive therefor, and what were his duties?
5. Does the government own the building he was caretaker for?
6. If not, who is the owner, and how much rent has the government to pay?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.
2. Immigration agent. $10 per month.
3 and 4. As agent he is also caretaker of the immigration building at Teulon. The amount mentioned above is his total salary.
5. No.
6. David Wood. $15 per month.

PAYMENTS BY MR. J. S. HOUGH AND MESSRS. HOUGH, CAMPBELL & FERGUSON.

Mr. AMES asked:

What is the nature of the transactions referred to in volume 1 of the Auditor General's Report for 1907, on page 494, under the caption 'Head office, land sales, Lethbridge, J. S. Hough, $88,752.41; Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, $26,438.99'?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The payments made by J. S. Hough and by Hough, Campbell and Ferguson of the amounts referred to in the Auditor General's Report were made for and on behalf of some ninety-eight applicants for permission to purchase coal mining lands in the province of Alberta, for whom Mr. Hough and this firm of solicitors were acting. The payments were those prescribed by the regulations governing the sale of such rights.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRAIN SERVICE BETWEEN CHARLOTTETOWN AND MURRAY HARBOUR.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Has the government decided to place two trains a day on the railway route between

Charlottetown and Murray Harbour? If so, when is the service to begin?

2. Is the Railway Department, or the government aware that the postal service along the route of the railway is inadequate and very unsatisfactory to the whole section of the province?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The business does not warrant any increase in the train service at present.

2. No doubt additional service would be appreciated, but the financial conditions would not appear to warrant it.

SUTHERLAND RIFLE SIGHTS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Crocket—asked:

1. How many Sutherland rifle sights have been purchased or ordered by the Department of Militia and Defence to date?

2. What has been the total cost of the sights so ordered?

3. To what rifles are these sights to be adjusted?

4. Are they to be used with the Ross rifle?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1. 36,000 have been contracted for.

2. No payments have been made to date on account of the sights.

3. The Lee-Enfield.

4. Under consideration.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Stanstead owing to the death of the sitting member, the late Henry Lovell, Esquire. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. MACDONELL. I wish to call the attention of the government to certain returns.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is impossible for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell) to do that except by compliance with rule 37.

Mr. MACDONELL. I merely wish to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is only a question it is permissible.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like to ask the government why certain returns asked for—two on the 8th November, last, and two on the 8th January of the present year—have not yet been brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to send me a note I will try and get them.

POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the hon. acting Postmaster General (Mr. Fisher) to the fact that a letter mailed to me from Gananoque—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask a question. I want to ask the hon. minister how it is that a letter mailed to me at Gananoque on the 10th December is only received by me this morning at nine o'clock. Although it is post marked as having been received at the office here at 12 o'clock last night—that would be nine o'clock last night—I only got it this morning. That is two days from Gananoque to Ottawa, and I want to ask the hon. acting Postmaster General if some better arrangement could not be made to have our mails delivered. I will send the acting Postmaster General the envelope.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he will have the information in regard to the French Treaty ready for us at an early date?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly before we separate?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, before we separate, and we will possibly be able to proceed with it. As to that I am not quite sure. But at all events the information will be available.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) asked me to allow this Bill to stand until Monday. I am quite willing that it shall stand.

Order allowed to stand.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LANCASTER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, this matter is one that is in no sense new to this House and if it were not for the, I may say, extraordinary position taken by the Senate in regard to this Bill last session, I would feel that it was out of place to speak at any length upon the subject, but, in view of the position taken, I think that perhaps it is my duty to—at a little length, discuss the matter in this House. The matter sought to be remedied by this Bill is a long-standing

evil in the country, it is so admitted by every hon. gentleman in this House and it is so admitted by every senator who passed upon the Bill last session. The matter has been dealt with by this parliament at every session since the last general election. In the year 1905 a Bill was introduced dealing with the remedy that is sought to be accomplished by this Bill now before the House. The Bill was not in the same language as the one now before the House but the subject matter dealt with was the same although a remedy of a somewhat different kind was proposed. It was discussed here and it went to the Railway Committee of this House. It was dealt with day after day at that session by the Railway Committee, thoroughly discussed, arguments heard pro and con, all that the railways could say against the Bill when they were opposing it vigorously was said and at last the House concluded, the suggestion following of the then Minister of Justice, the present Chief Justice of the Dominion of Canada in the Supreme Court, that the remedy that was proposed by me at that time was not the proper remedy although the evil was well known to every member of the House to exist. That Bill proposed that every level crossing in every thickly peopled portion of the cities, towns and villages of this country should be protected by a watchman to warn people of approaching trains. It was said that that was not the proper protection, that there might be other protection that might be equally good and gates as well as watchmen were substituted. At the next session of parliament I again brought in a Bill and to show that I was trying to meet the views of those who differed from me I re-drew the section so as to provide that they should be protected by watchmen or gates. That Bill went to the Railway Committee, it was dealt with again, one might almost say ad nauseam to such an extent was the opposition made by the railways and so much time, in my humble opinion, did they take unnecessarily in trying to make black appear white and in endeavouring to convince the representatives of the people of this country that there was no harm in them converting, as some of the newspapers say, level crossings, in some parts of the country, into a mere shambles. That Bill was drafted, it was discussed in the Railway Committee, it was brought back to this House and upon a motion to go into committee, the Railway Committee having reported against it, it was contended by some hon. gentlemen that I should leave the question of protection open, that some protection other than that provided for by the Bill would probably answer and that all we should do was to enunciate the principle that some protection was required and then leave it to the Railway Commission to say what that protection should be.

Again, having respect for the hon. gentlemen in this House, and believing that in the multitude there is wisdom, I withdrew the Bill. Although we may not all agree upon party political questions, I believe we are all interested in doing what we can for the welfare of the country, and having respect for the opinions, the prejudices if you like, of the hon. gentlemen who had voted against the Bill at a previous session, I again introduced it in 1906 without the provision that there should be a watchman at the gates, but asking the House to assist me in saying who should devise what proper protection should be. The then Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) realized, as he always did, that the Bill was designed to remedy an existing evil and he had it referred to a special committee composed of Hon. Mr. Lemieux, Hon. Mr. Aylesworth, Hon. Mr. Emmerson, Mr. Macdonald of Pictou, Mr. Lennox, the late lamented Dr. Stockton, and myself. The railways were heard at great length before that committee and the evidence of engineers and railway experts was taken. The Bill I had introduced was not recommended by the committee, but on the suggestion of the Minister of Railways a Bill was reported to the House which, if passed, would result in remedying the evil. The Bill which I now have the temerity to present, notwithstanding what the Senate said last session, is in the same form as that suggested by the Hon. Mr. Emmerson. I have accepted it as being a well intended disposition of the matter. In the session of 1906 the special committee reported that Bill to the House, it was adopted unanimously by the House, it went to the Senate and the Senate thought in the dying hours of the session they should not pass it. Then last session, the House knowing the history of the Bill during previous sessions, considered it duly and again passed it. Let me point out to hon. gentlemen that the law as it stands to-day is absolutely nugatory; the clause in the Railway Act which by this Bill I am seeking to replace is absolutely of no effect. The present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court when Minister of Justice admitted that the section is a mere dead letter, and no doubt that fact had its influence on the Hon. Mr. Emmerson in suggesting the amendment he did. The clause at present reads:—

> No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act, or unless permission is given by some regulation or order of the board.
>
> The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.

Now, that means that trains are allowed to pass through these thickly peopled localities at a speed exceeding ten miles an hour so long as they comply with the other provision of the Railway Act, but it so happens that there are no other sections of the

Railway Act dealing with thickly peopled portions of cities, towns or villages. As Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, when Minister of Justice admitted, the clause as it stands is nonsense. It is futile, it is misleading, it gives people to think that there is protection at these dangerous places when as a matter of fact there is not, a point which has been settled in the case of Mackay and the Grand Trunk in the Supreme Court of Canada. The amendment which I have the honour to propose to-day is word for word the same as that recommended by the Hon. Mr. Emmerson, when Minister of Railways, except of course that the date at which it is to come into operation is necessarily changed. It was always thought that the railways should have a year's notice in order that they might make arrangements to comply with the provisions, and hence in this Bill I purpose giving them a year's notice in advance. Now, this is the clause which the House has unanimously for two sessions agreed to:—

Section 275 of The Railway Act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :—

275. No train shall pass over any highway crossing at rail-level in any thickly-peopled portion of any city, town or village at a greater speed than ten miles an hour, unless such crossing is properly protected, or unless such crossing is constructed and thereafter duly maintained in accordance with the orders, regulations and directions of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and of the board in force with respect thereto. The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate that it deems expedient.

2. The company shall have until the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine, to comply with the provisions of this section.

All sorts of ridiculous arguments prevailed on the Senate to throw out the Bill, but I am asking the House to again send the Bill to the Senate, which branch of the legislature will, I hope, now come to the conclusion that the 214 members of this House know what they are doing when they pass a Bill of this kind after four years mature consideration. There were two objections made in the Senate last year, one of which was that the legislation was hasty, that it was sprung upon the country, and that the members of the House of Commons had not taken due care in passing it. I do not know what the hon. gentlemen of the Senate would say was not hasty legislation. During the seven years I have been in the House I do not know of any Bill that has had one-tenth of the consideration and attention that this measure has had. In the year 1905 the Bill was read a first and second time, it was referred to the Railway Committee which is composed of about two-thirds of the members of the House, and counsel for the railway companies had an opportunity of being heard ad libitum. It was then reported to the House, discussed fully upon the floor of the House, but it was not passed because it was suggested that a different remedy might be devised in the following session. The second year it went through the same routine; it was referred to the Railway Committee and again dealt with in the House. The third year it was sent to a special committee on the theory that seven or eight members could give special attention to it, and that special committee consisted of three cabinet ministers; a member from the government side ; two able gentlemen from the opposition side, in addition to your humble servant who is perhaps not entitled to be so described.

That committee, irrespective of their party affiliations, had in view the united object of dealing with this question in a manner most in the interest of the whole people of Canada. After careful and impartial consideration a report was presented by that committee, drawn by the then Minister of Railways; that report was adopted by the 214 members of this House and is the basis of the legislation which I have now placed before the House. I ask the House to consider the statement of the Senate that this legislation was hasty, as the most preposterous joke that that body, which is very fond of joking, has got off on the members of this House in many years. It shows what a lobby of railway counsel will accomplish. Before the special committee in 1906, one of the objections of the railways to the proposed Bill was that there were a lot of orders by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, a body which was superseded by the present Railway Commission, dealin with these crossings; there had been a great deal of ligitation to establish the meaning of these orders and the railways contended that they should not be put to the expense of obtaining duplicate orders from the Railway Commission. Mr. Emmerson, the then Minister of Railways, thought there was some foundation for this claim and inserted in my Bill, which he re-drew and which is the Bill now before the House, a provision that orders made by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council should stand, and be subject only to new orders by the Railway Commission; that is, if nothing was done in regard to them the orders would stand. With this provision the railways would no longer have the right to complain of unnecessary expense. This legislation was unanimously adopted by this House and again adopted last year; it went to the Senate, and, repeating what they were told in the lobbies by the railway counsel, we find the senators objecting that we in this Chamber did not know what we were doing, because we had used the words 'Railway Committee of the Privy Council' a body which had been abolished. They might as well have said that a decision of the old Court of Queen's Bench or the old Court of Chancery is no longer good because

the present High Court of Justice has not decided the same thing over again. It simply shows what can be said if it is not desired to pass a Bill in the public interest. Counsel for the railways insisted on the objection to the Bill that it would not continue to them the protection of the old orders and when that provision was inserted to save them expense, they got the senators to say that this provision showed that our legislation was hasty and that we did not know what we were doing. The 214 members of this House have unanimously agreed in two consecutive sessions that this legislation is just what the people want These members, coming from all parts of Canada, are the best judges of what the people want, as was correctly said by the Hon. George W. Ross, when speaking in the Senate last year in support of the Bill, in opposition to the majority of the Senate. His speech will be found at page 910 of last year's Senate 'Hansard,' and I commend it to the attention of hon. members of this House, as Mr. Ross has recently come from the people and has not forgotten their wishes. If the Senate had returned the Bill to us with an amendment and said : We do not think that is the right remedy and will suggest another in its place, I could perhaps agree that there was some excuse for their course ; but when they do not amend that Bill as they should under the constitution and propose an alternative recommendation to this House, admitting that they cannot suggest any better remedy for the evil than this, and can offer no other reasons for their rejection of our proposal than that the legislation was hasty, the proper course for this House to adopt is to send this Bill back to them every session and let them wrestle with it until they understand it, and either suggest a better remedy or back down and say: We cannot suggest anything better and therefore leave this matter to be dealt with by your 214 members of the House of Commons. I have here 50 pages of evidence taken before the Railway Commission in 1905 at the instance of the railways. No evidence was taken on behalf of the people, none was necessary; hon. gentlemen in this House knew the evil, knew what the people wanted, but the railways had to give sworn evidence to show that the hon. gentlemen in this House did not understand what they were talking about, and were proposing, according to the Senate, hasty legislation. Members of parliament knew what the evidence in favour of the people was, from five minutes' conversation with their constituents. On the expression of opinion, unanimously coming from the ranks of both sides of politics and all over the country, the House concluded to pass the Bill as it now is. Then before a special committee of seven, an equal quantity of the evidence of engineers was given showing the difficulty and showing it to them to what end? In order to prove that if the railways put up gates and appointed watchmen to open and close them, that would cost so much money as to cripple the companies, and besides it was not necessary in all cases. If we made the railway companies do the ideal thing, if we made them abolish level crossings, that, they claim would financially ruin them. They pretended that electric bells might be sufficient at certain places and that some particular crossings, although within the territory described in the Bill, did not need any protection at all because of the peculiar advantageous geographical position and that in such cases all that was necessary was the warning signs: 'Railway crossing.' This Bill, therefore, was so drawn that they need not do either the one thing or the other, provided they got permission from the Railway Commission to dispense with either. Should they be able to convince the Railway Commission that a certain class of crossings did not require any particular protection, that certain other crossings required only electric bells and certain others required only watchmen, and that others again required to be taken off the level either by an overhead bridge or by a cutting beneath the level, all they have to do is to comply with the order of the commission. That is just what this Bill calls for. It establishes the principle that the railway companies must protect the public, but they can go before the Railway Commission and, on proving to the satisfaction of that body, that a certain class of crossings do not require protection, they are not bound to go to the expense of providing it. Where then is the injury or the unfairness to the companies of such legislation? All they have to do is to convince the Railway Commission that a certain kind of protection is all that is necessary and the Railway Commission will issue an order to that effect.

But to come back to first principles, who owns the public highway ? Who has the first right upon the public highways in cities, towns and villages ? The railway companies do not lease these highways or buy them. They are the King's highways, belonging to the King's liege subjects, and the railway companies are permitted, by a general clause in the Railway Act to cross these highways without paying any compensation. Whenever they cross private properties, they have to pay compensation for the usage, but they are allowed to run freely, without paying any compensation, over the King's highways. But, it is said, we must have railways and we must give them the privilege of crossing the public roads. That is all very well ; but we do not want these companies to be allowed to kill people when crossing these highways, which they are allowed to use, absolutely free of toll or rent or any other compensation to the people who own them. Is it too much to ask, under these circumstances, that these companies shall protect the public at

these crossings in such a manner as the Railway Commission think is necessary ? That is the object of this Bill. Without this Bill, neither the Railway Commission nor anybody else can compel these companies to protect their crossings. I find that the railway companies have induced the newspapers to say that this Bill is a measure to compel the railways to reduce their speed to ten miles an hour. Sir, it is no such thing. I might as well be charged with introducing a Bill to hang people because I want people to be hanged who have committed murder. If the railway companies be not willing to go to the Railway Commission and have such orders made as the commission, in its judgment, deems it advisable to make, if these companies defy public opinion and will not ask the Railway Commission to declare what sort of protection is needed at level crossings, then they must be under the penalty of not running faster than ten miles an hour, at these crossings, so that people may have some chance of escaping being run over. If these railway companies will not do anything to prevent the destruction of lives at these level crossings, it is something terrible to say to them : At all events, if you will not do that, you must run slow enough to give people a chance to get out of your way. As the Hon. Geo. W. Ross said in the Senate, the speed of railway trains is all the time increasing.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a debate in the other House, and it is a well known rule of parliamentary law that is not permissible.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose I can refer to the action of the other House. The Senate, has, by its action, practically said that this legislation is not necessary, or rather it has said——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not like to press too strongly but it is laid down explicitly in Bourinot as the unwritten law of parliament that no reference can be made to a debate in the other House :—

It is a part of the unwritten law of parliament that no allusion should be made in one House to the debates of the other chamber, a rule always enforced by the Speaker with the utmost strictness. Members sometimes attempt to evade this rule by resorting to ambiguous terms of expression—by referring, for instance, to what happened in another place, but all such evasions of a wholesome practice should be stopped by the Speaker, when it is evident to whom the allusions are made.

I think we had better strictly follow that rule.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not want to break the rule by any means or device.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That rule is not always strictly followed in the British House of Commons. For instance, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman referred directly to proceedings in the House of Lords on a certain Bill and moved a resolution regarding it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice I have cited seems to be the practice followed under our procedure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is absolutely necessary to refer to proceedings in the Senate when Bills come back to us from that body. It may not be necessary to refer to their debates, but we must refer to their proceedings.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule laid down seems to be that an hon. member cannot take the debates of the other chamber and quote from them. No reference to what has occurred in the other chamber can be made. That seems to be the rule laid down in our practice.

Mr. LANCASTER. Am I at liberty then to read verbatim what the Hon. Geo. W. Ross said in the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is permissible to quote from the records of the Senate.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is the Senate debates to which I am referring. The Hon. Geo. W. Ross said :—

I had the honour of supporting this measure when it came first before the House, and am of the opinion still that it is a good Bill. My hon. friend from Montreal says it is not well drafted, and in proof of that assertion he compares this Bill with the Railway Act. I understand the Railway Act, as it is now on the statute-book, is practically the same as the Act passed in 1903. This Bill now before us went before the House of Commons in its present form in 1906 and also in 1907. It passed through the hands of two different Ministers of Justice, the highest legal authority in the House of Commons or in the country, extra judicial of course, and of the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and the present Minister of Justice, Mr. Aylesworth. As to the members of the House, I would assume that they would see that the Bill was consistent with itself. I would assume that their opinion should carry a good deal of weight. It does with me. I would assume that they would not allow a Bill to go through the House inconsistent with itself or that was badly drafted, or in any sense a bungled Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) permit me ? I find in Bourinot, page 479, a statement of what may be referred to.

It is perfectly regular, however, to refer to the official printed records of the other branch of the legislature even though the document may not have been formally asked for and communicated to the House.

I do not know whether the document from which the hon. gentleman is quoting is the official printed record or not. I should think not from its appearance. But, if he assures me that it is the official printed record, of course, I accept his statement.

Mr. LANCASTER. I should have thought that the House would take my word for it.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the point would be whether 'Hansard' is the official record in the strict parliamentary sense.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not sure that it would be. I do not care to press the matter unduly in this particular instance, but I think the practice is as I have stated, and should be followed as carefully as possible. It may be suggested that the printed 'Hansard' would be the official record. I cannot say as to this at the moment.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is some repetition of what I stated, but I do not want to embarrass the question at issue with a debate on a point of order. This is too serious a question for me to jeopardize by attempting anything of that kind. I do not therefore, wish to take any chance on what would be right for me to say, because it is hard to argue a case if you are in doubt of your right to say what you wish to say on the subject. I do not think that my case is so weak, either, that I have anything to gain by running the risk of diverting attention from it.

Well, since what has happened to this Bill has happened, the press of this country has spoken. Boards of trade and other municipal institutions have expressed their opinion ; coroners' inquest juries have dealt with it. You can hardly pick up a newspaper but you find one or other of two things. In one day's newspaper, you will find that a person has been killed at one of these level crossings, and in a newspaper a few days after that you will find an expression of opinion from some tribunal other than the Senate declaring that the legislation which was introduced last year and thrown out by the Senate, should be passed. Let me read, for instance, the resolution of the Board of Trade of Toronto, passed as soon as this Bill was adopted in this House and sent to the Senate :

Resolved that the council of the board of trade heartily endorses the Bill introduced by Mr. E. A. Lancaster in the Dominion House to provide for the proper protection of level railway crossings in cities, towns and villages, and trust that it may become law.

There is an expression from the citizens' point of view, and that from the board of trade of the largest city in the province of Ontario. Similar resolutions have been passed by boards of trade in other places. Now, I have here a newspaper published in the interests of the farmers—'The Farmers Advocate,' published in London, Ont. It has an article headed 'The deadly level crossing.' This article says :

Mr. E. A. Lancaster, M.P., for Lincoln and Niagara, has, for the fourth time, we believe, introduced his Bill in the Canadian parliament for the protection of the lives of the people on level railway crossings.

I would just interrupt the reading of this article there to say that this paper knows that this legislation was not hasty, but that for four years it had been discussed, as I have said.

It proposes that, after January 1, 1908, railways must protect their crossings in the thickly-settled portions of cities, towns and villages, or else slow down. Newspaper scribes treat the subject with more or less frivolity, describing the measure as a 'hardy annual,' a 'perennial plant,' and so on. Last year the Bill was incorporated in the General Railway Act, but was amputated in the Senate, that graveyard of not a little legislation in the interest of the people. Meanwhile, the railways have gone on remorselessly killing the people and destroying horses and rigs, evidently bent on making time records at all hazards. The list of these accidents during the past year has been appalling. Success to Mr. Lancaster's Bill.

Now, let us go a little further west. I take up the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' and find the following article :

MISCHIEVOUS INTERFERENCE.

The Canadian Senate, in the dying hours of the present session is supplying in its own acts sufficient reason for its reformation. Yesterday it distinguished itself by vetoing Mr. Lancaster's amendment which prohibits railway trains from running faster than ten miles an hour over level crossings in cities, towns and incorporated villages.

This is a railway reform which Mr. Lancaster has advocated for some years, and which he finally succeeded in inducing the House of Commons to endorse. Why the Senate should stand in the way of a piece of popular legislation of this kind is not apparent. It is assuredly flying in the face of public opinion when it refuses to co-operate with the lower House in such an essential measure of public safety.

The level crossing is a menace to public life under any circumstances. In congested communities it is a veritable death trap which every year claims hundreds of victims in Canada and United States. If the level crossing cannot be abolished in cities, towns and incorporated villages, or if it cannot be protected with gates or watchmen, then it is surely desirable that railway companies should limit the speed of their trains as proposed in Mr. Lancaster's amendment.

Nothing could be fairer than giving railways the option of protecting their crossings, or of reducing their speed at crossings where protection is not afforded.

The newspaper quite understands the fairness of the legislation as it gives the railway company the option of going to the Railway Commission and getting an order authorizing them to reduce the speed if they would rather not go to the little expense of making the crossing safe.

The House of Commons interpreted the overwhelming force of public opinion when it endorsed the Lancaster amendment, and the Senate made out an exceedingly good case

for its reform, or its abolition when it declared that railways should continue in the right to convert public crossings into shambles.

Now, I take up another newspaper in Ontario, published at Galt, where a coroner's inquest inquired into the death of the driver of a horse and buggy over a level crossing :

The jury returned the following verdict : 'Your jury find from the evidence submitted that the late Frederick Reid, of Goderich, came to his death by being struck by a Grand Trunk train while crossing the Waterloo road on Friday, September 20, 1907; also that on account of the great number of accidents at level crossings we would recommend the Railway Commission to consider the advisability of having them abolished.'

This newspaper writer evidently thinks that the Railway Commission has the power to control these matters. The Railway Commission, of course, has no right to do so, and will have no right to do so unless the Act is amended. The point is good as it stands, but if we amend the Act as proposed, and as twice unanimously declared for by this House, the Railway Commission can act. But the quotation I have given helps to show how the newspapers regard the matter. Now, those are the things that have been urged against this Bill that, it seems to me, can no longer be urged.

I have taken up a good deal of time, and I apologize for it. But in extenuation, I plead the importance of the matter to this country as well as the strong feeling I have upon the subject and also my duty out of respect to the two hundred and fourteen members of this House who supported this legislation. I ask this House again to pass this Bill and send it to the Senate for their concurrence.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I think I ought to be credited, to a certain extent, as the cause of the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) this afternoon. Possibly, had I had time to communicate with him before the House met to-day, we might have been deprived of his eloquent and earnest address. It is said by some people that many ardent protectionists by day are very busy freetraders at night. Those of us who urge strongly that the speed of trains shall be limited are among the gentlemen who always want to take the fastest trains that run. And, perhaps, there is no class of men in Canada who are more clearly on record in that regard than the members of the House of Commons, who, when they found that their passes were not good for the fastest trains, those that run through cities, towns and villages at breakneck speed, almost rebelled in order to have their passes made good on those trains. Sometimes our acts outside this House are not wholly consistent, perhaps, with the Acts we pass in this House. However, this question of level crossings is one that deserves very serious consideration. I am sure that my hon. friend did not mean to bring undue pressure to bear on me when he quoted as positive proof in substantiation of his contention the words of my old friend Hon. G. W. Ross. It is a pleasure to me to know that he is an apostle of Mr. Ross, in this respect at least.

Now the question of level crossings and their dangers is one that will not down in this country. The accidents that happen, not only in Canada—because perhaps Canada is as free as any other country, if not freer than some other countries, in that respect—forces this matter on our consideration. I am not one of those who cry out against corporations, or against railways because they are run by corporations. We have to remember that we urged, and coaxed, if I may use that word, some of these railway corporations to invest their money, and their money has been invested for years, for which they have got little or no return, in some cases. But that is no excuse for any laxity in protecting the rights of the people. The question of transportation is one of great importance, and the methods of moving people to and fro is one of great interest to the people themselves. But the paramount interest, to my mind, is the protection of the lives of the people. This may be regarded by some as a small matter, but to my mind it is not a small matter. We have throughout the country districts, leaving out anything which this Bill touches at all, many crossings that are very dangerous. Every member of this House can call to mind some crossing in his own constituency, the approach to which is very dangerous to the travelling public. While it would be rash to go to the extent of insisting that something should be done at these crossings all at once, I am in hearty sympathy with the movement to approach the subject gradually, and take in thickly settled parts, such as cities, towns and villages. While saying this, I have no desire to encroach upon the rights of the railways. We have now a commission and that commission is to be enlarged. It has been proved heretofore that the duties placed upon that commission have been so onerous and so numerous that the members have not been able to perform them, and if we placed this work upon that commission with its present number, we would perhaps burden them unduly. But it is the intention of the government, with the approval of this House, which I believe will be unanimous, to enlarge this commission and provide that these complaints shall practically go to the decision of the commission, and the orders of the old Privy Council will be included as well, to avoid certain injustices that might otherwise be done. I do not wish to make any further remarks, only to say that I concur in this

Bill, and I will consent to the second reading, without its going to the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume this Bill is in the same terms as the Bill passed last year by this House, with the exception of the date ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Exactly. The only difference is that it will come into force in 1909 instead of 1908.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the expression 'thickly peopled portion of any city' might be a difficult one to interpret, though I cannot suggest anything better.

Mr. LANCASTER. That has always been in the statute, though the point has been discussed a good deal in the Railway Committee. But those words have been in the statute since 1859, and have been the subject of a judicial interpretation, and we think it better to leave them.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CO-OPERATION.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 5) respecting Co-operation.—Mr. Monk.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Will my hon. friend consent to have this Bill postponed until the return of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) ?

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Will he soon be back ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is too much to ask me at this moment. I presume the Bill will go through.

Mr. MONK. The reason I ask is that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) was the chairman of the special committee which investigated and examined this Bill with great care last year. He took a lively interest in it, and concurred absolutely with the recommendations of the committee, in fact it was he who prepared the Bill. It appears from that report of the committee that the measure is one which should be adopted without delay. The Postmaster General having concurred in the Bill as it was amended by the committee, I would not like his prolonged absence to prevent the passage of the Bill, for reasons which it is unnecessary for me to state now. You might let it stand to-day, with the understanding that if my right hon. friend thinks fit, it shall stand over until after the Christmas vacation.

Mr. GRAHAM

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the return of my colleague were to be, as the hon. gentleman thinks, unreasonably late, the Bill might be proceeded with at the present time.

Mr. MONK. Will the right hon. gentleman consent to leave it on the Order Paper as it is ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

HOURS OF ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew) moved:

That it is desirable in the interests of good legislation that the rules of the House of Commons should be amended so as to provide that the hour of adjournment of the House of Commons should (excepting on extraordinary occasions to be decided by the government), be fixed, when there are evening sittings, at not later than 10.30 p.m.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for no radical change, for no very drastic measure. I am merely asking that the machinery which is now in motion should have some regulating device so that it should not run perpetually but come to an end some time earlier in the night than it does now. Before proceeding further perhaps it is right that I should explain what is meant by an extraordinary occasion. In reference to this I would refer you to what took place in the session of 1903 when we were passing the Railway Act. When we came to a certain portion of that Act we found that even the officers of the House were at a loss to know just exactly what was the mode of procedure which we should adopt. We then had several conferences with the Senate, we went backwards and forwards several times before we came to an arrangement, and the House finally adjourned about 1 or 1.30 o'clock next morning. This certainly would come under the head of an extraordinary occasion, and it would be left for the government to say what is or what is not an extraordinary occasion. What are the reasons for asking for this change? Take for example the case of a member who is anxious to discharge his duties faithfully and intelligently in the interest of his constituency and in the interest of the country ; what has he to do ? As a general thing most members are on three or four important committees. These commence in the morning, say, at ten o'clock, and one will perhaps be over at eleven. Then, the member will go to a meeting of another committee and remain there from 11 until the adjournment for lunch. Then he comes back to the sitting of the House at three and he remains here until six o'clock when the House adjourns for dinner, he comes back at eight o'clock and remains here perhaps until all hours of the morning. Under such circumstances what chance has that

member, if he is anxious to discharge his duties faithfully and well, to inform himself on the various subjects which he has to legislate upon? Take, for example the present session there are some very important measures to come before the House. There is this treaty with France which we will have to look over very carefully, there is the transportation question which will require the most earnest consideration of this House and there are other things of great importance that we will have to inform ourselves upon. If we have such hours as we have at present what time has any member to qualify himself or legislate properly on these questions? If we were to meet, say at nine o'clock, or ten o'clock in the morning—I do not see why we should not meet at half past nine—then meet again at two, the same as we do on Wednesdays now, then meet at the ordinary hour of eight o'clock and adjourn at half past ten o'clock, we would have far more time to do our work, and it strikes me that the work would not only be better done, but perhaps more quickly done then it is at the present time. It is not only the private members who have these difficulties to contend with, but if the private members have these difficulties how much more are the difficulties which the Prime Minister, the members of the government and the leader of the opposition have? Our leader is not as young as he used to be. We all have every confidence in his ability. We are looking forward, every one of us, to years of service for us, we want him still to carry our banner and to carry it to victory, but if we exact the very last ounce of strength from him by requiring him to sit here all night, how can we expect that he will remain at the head of affairs for years to come, as we hope he will? He has to be here and watch every movement; he has to be here every hour in the day, or should be while the session is going on. How is he to prepare addresses? He is expected to speak on every subject. How can we expect him to do all this and do it faithfully and well. The members of the government are in exactly the same position. They have to receive deputations and they have to speak on almost every subject that comes before us. We cannot expect Herculean tasks from these men because they are human as well as ourselves, and why should not we restrict the hours and give them a little more chance to prepare themselves for the performance of their duties? Take the case of the leader of the opposition. He is, perhaps—and I am not going behind the boards to say it—one of the best members we have in this House—certainly one of the best members they have on the opposition side. I am not afraid to say it; I am proud of the leader of the opposition. We must have a good opposition. An opposition is a fine thing for a government because a government is sometimes too strong unless it is held in check by a good opposition. It is apt to do things which are not exactly right. I am anxious that we should have a good, strong, competent opposition, and I hope that the present leader of the opposition will be maintained in his strength so that he can conduct his party not to victory, but to a long period of usefulness in this House. I remember that not only last session but the session before, the leader of the opposition became completely exhausted by the labours that were exacted from him. He had to go away for a week at a time to recuperate, and he came back with renewed strength. I do not think we should exact such labours from the leader of the opposition as to exhaust his strength in the performance of his public duty. Scarcely a session passes but one or two of our members are called away suddenly by death for the very reason that they are required to exert themselves for too long a time and too late into the night. The majority of the members of this House are not accustomed to late hours; they are men who have been born and brought up in a Christian country. We work during the day and rest during the night, and I do not see why we should depart from that good old rule.

It is not only the government, the opposition and others that I am concerned about, but what about the officers of the House? Take for example, the little pages, thirteen in number, who range in age from 10 to 13 years. Should we not look after their interest too? We have a law on the statutes of Ontario defining what a child is. It says that a child is a person under the age of 14 years. The age of these little page boys range from ten to thirteen years, and they consequently come under the category of children. This law also states that no child shall be employed in any factory in Ontario for more than six hours a day and not more than 60 hours in a week. But in this great factory of words and phrases we violate that law and compel these little boys to stay here from 12 to 16 hours a day, and when we have morning sittings they remain here double that time. These little page boys are orphans or the sons of widows, and they are here only because necessity compels them to be here, and when the session lasts six or seven months these boys are deprived of the opportunity of going to school. Is it not time we should take this into consideration as well? What about the other officers of the House? What about the reporters, and in that I include not only the 'Hansard' reporters, but the reporters in the gallery, who, although they are not officers of the House, are a most valuable adjunct, and they should be considered just as well as any one else. When we have sat here all night or until six o'clock or seven o'clock in the morning, what about the reporters?

Their labours are not ended even when the House rises; they have to prepare the reports for publication, revise them and see that everything is all right, and they are obliged to remain here for an hour after we go home. Is this just, is it right, is it fair? should we not consider this? Let me draw attention to one other thing which I noticed particularly during the long session of 1903, and there is nothing like bringing these things down to the concrete. The deputy clerk, Mr. Laplante, had to stay here all the time during that session and the sittings were protracted every night until after midnight. The result was that at the close of the session Mr. Laplante was not able to stand upon his feet and he was told by his physician that as soon as it was possible he must get away and recuperate; it was not medicine he wanted, but rest, absolute rest. Now, have we the right to exact this from the employees of this parliament? Is there no limit to our personal liberty? Personal liberty has its limits. For example, I have the right to swing my arms in any direction; that is my personal liberty. But if I swing my arms too close to John Jones' nose my personal liberty stops there and John Jones' liberty begins. Have we the right to exact such labours from the members of this House as will render them incompetent for perhaps all the days of their lives. I say no. I think the government is to some extent responsible for this, and that they should aim to put an end to existing conditions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to another thing. It is said that if we should venture to do this terrible things may happen; that the session will never come to an end, that we will be here for the whole year, that there are lions in the path. Well, there may be lions in the way which 'Faint-Heart' sees, but my contention is that if you advance you will find that these lions are stuffed with straw. There is no necessity of our being frightened. If other nations of the world are able to do all their legislation during the day time surely we ought to be able to do the same. Let me point out what the legislatures of other countries do, and if they do it why not we? Are we lacking in intelligence; are we more lacking in force than are our neighbours? Surely not. In Austria, with a population of 47,000,000, the Reichsrath—both Houses—sits from October to June; the lower chamber three and four days a week from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. or 5 p.m. There are no night sittings at all and yet they are able to legislate for 47,000,000 people. In the Belgian Chamber which legislates for a population of 7,000,000 they sit four days a week from 1.45 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. and occasionally from 10.30 a.m. to 12.45 p.m. to expedite business. In Denmark the Folkething sits from half an hour to four and a half hours, and the Landsthing for three hours. The French Chamber of Deputies, which legislates for 40,000,000, usually sits from 2.30 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. or 7 p.m., and the Senate much the same. In Germany, where they legislate for 60,000,000 people the session of the Reichstag usually lasts from November until May, and sits from 1 p.m. to 6 p.m., and the Landtag follows suit. The Hungarian House of Deputies sits from 10 a.m. until 2 p.m. and the House of Magnates commences at 11 a.m. In Italy they legislate for 32,000,000 people and the Senate sits from 3.30 p.m. until 6 p.m. or 6.30, and the Chamber of Deputies from 2 p.m. until 6 p.m., and sometimes 8 p.m. with occasional morning sittings. And what is the procedure in Japan, the country of the Mikado, which has sprung so suddenly into importance and which takes rank among the foremost nations of the earth. In Japan with 50,000,000 people, the Diet sits for three months each year, the House of Peers from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and the House of Representatives from 1 p.m. to 6 p.m. In the Netherlands the first Chamber of the States-General sits from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. and the second Chamber from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. or 4.30 p.m. If these nations are able to do their work during the day time why should not we? The Portuguese Cortes meet at 2 p.m. for a four hour sitting and the session generally last about three months. The ordinary sessions of the Spanish Senate and Congress last six hours and they legislate for 19,000,000 people. The Swedish Rikstag usually sits from January to June with morning and evening sittings. In Switzerland the sittings of the Conseils begin at 8 a.m. in summer and 9 a.m. in winter, and lasts until 1 p.m. or 1.30 p.m. And what about the United States which legislates for 90,000,000 people? There the House of Representatives meets generally at 11 a.m. and the Senate meets at noon and usually the sittings last until about 4 p.m., and only on extraordinary occasions do they have night sittings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if all these nations are able to carry on their legislative work effectually during the day time, surely this House of Commons ought to be able to accomplish its duty by closing at 10.30 at night. And who asks for these long hours from us? Are our constituents demanding this? Is the press demanding it? Is any one asking for this? On the contrary, we know full well that many of our constituents upbraid us and ask us why it is that we keep such abominable hours. They even accuse us of choosing the darkness rather than the light because our deeds are evil. That may be true and it may not, but it is certain that nobody is exacting these hours from us except ourselves. Under these circumstances I cannot see why we cannot shorten our hours of sitting and thus add very much to the health and comfort of every member here.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I would

wish that on a subject of this kind which concerns very directly all the members of this House, there would have been a general discussion of the views advanced by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright). The rule to which he has objected is certainly open to reasonable exception, but this rule has the prestige of observance for an almost unprecedented number of years; it has secular sanction. It has been the rule in England for many generations, and I think it is still the rule there, although there is a certain tacit understanding that the House is not to sit beyond a certain hour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They have the 12 o'clock rule, but it is frequently suspended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I believe it is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. At all events of late years we have practically adopted the rule suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. Wright). It is very seldom during late years, especially in the earlier part of the session, that we have sat later than 11 o'clock, or occasionally 12 o'clock. Towards the end of the session when we are all anxious to be relieved from our duties we all put on a little extra pressure and we sit sometimes pretty late; but for my part I have been brought up, if I may say so, under the rule of Sir John Macdonald, who was quite an authority not only on politics but on many other things; and he always adhered to the present rule. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I think will remember that although appeals of a similar nature were made in former times, Sir John never favoured them, but rather adhered to the present rule which has been maintained.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that on the whole it is as well to leave the rule as it is and to have a mutual understanding that we should conclude our sessions between 11 and 12 o'clock. When there is danger of a very late sitting, as happens sometimes, then the two sides of the House might agree to adjourn at a reasonable hour. It is very true that we lead a strenuous life; my hon. friend has spoken of this House as a great manufactory of words, and in this manufactory of words we do not know or observe the eight-hour law. We work very strenuously, for all we are worth, for seven months in the year, and it is unfortunately injuring the health of many of us. If my opinion is to count for anything, I would rather leave the rule as it is, and have the understanding I have just spoken of, that at this stage of the session and for several months, until we come to the closing days of the session, we should not sit later than 12 o'clock and should usually adjourn at 11 o'clock. The rules of the House were carefully revised only two years ago, and I believe that the work done then by members on both sides of the House was well done. The new rules seem to be satisfactory. In these we have an experiment, having the House meet at 2 o'clock on Wednesdays and rise at 6. So far as my observation goes the rule has worked satisfactorily, giving more leisure to members and a good deal of work has been despatched in the four hour sittings. If that innovation is confirmed and continued, perhaps we may find this an example to follow and extend it also to some other days. Undoubtedly it will be far preferable if we can work during the day time and have leisure in the evening, but if we are to despatch the business of the House, I am afraid we will have to do as we have done, work not only in the day time, but also to some extent at night. My hon. friend (Mr. A. A. Wright) has brought up a subject which is worthy of attention; he has handled it in a very felicitous manner, and I would request him now not to proceed further but to allow his motion to be withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Before the motion is withdrawn, I would like to say that I think the thanks of the House are due to the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. Wright) for bringing the subject before the House. It seems to me that in matters of procedure such as this custom counts for a great deal, and it does seem singular that in the American Congress they transact the business of the great republic to the south without sitting in the evening, while we in Canada are obliged to sit until 11, 12 or sometimes 2, 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, in order to accomplish ours. It is perhaps due very largely to habits of the past, to the customs of the House, to methods of procedure, but I should not dispair of seeing the reform which has been advanced today by our friend (Mr. A. A. Wright) accomplished. If it could be brought about without any serious interference with public business, it would be a great reform indeed. It has been adopted in Great Britain under what is called the 12 o'clock rule, but as the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has very well observed, in Great Britain it is found necessary, I think, to suspend the 12 o'clock rule frequently, especially as the session approaches its conclusion. If it were possible to have the government entirely reasonable with regard to its measures—and I rather despair of that good result so long as the government is constituted as it is at present—and if the opposition should continue to be as reasonable in the future as it has been in the past—and I am sure that it will—some reform like this might be brought about. Criticism could be put into a more concise form, the government could bring down its measures in good time and we perhaps could accomplish as much before 10.30 at night

as is now accomplished by sitting to 11, 12, or 1 o'clock in the morning. However, that seems to be a matter that cannot very well be entertained at present. I trust my hon. friend from Renfrew will not let it drop, but bring it up another session.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). What my right hon. friend has said is very true, that the late Sir John Macdonald was always opposed to any arbitrary limitation of our sittings. For my part I have a confession to make. I was opposed to the rule we adopted last year of the House rising at six o'clock on Wednesdays. I feared it would retard the work of the House and lengthen the session, but I have no hesitation in saying that I have been converted to the new rule. I think it operates excellently well. It is a great relief to get a breathing spell one night out of the week in the very midst of the work, which one may devote to recreation, or, as many of us do, use for the purpose of pulling up back work, which we would have to overtax our energies in doing if it were not for this intermission. Just as I was wrong then, I may be wrong to-day in thinking that if we came to the conclusion to arbitrarily end our sittings at half-past ten, we would not accommodate ourselves ultimately to that restriction and perhaps in the end get through more work and be in better shape physically than we otherwise would. But if our present rule is to be amended, as I think in course of time it will be, I think there is another respect in which a change might be made advantageously. I am perhaps as great a sinner as any man in this House in the matter of making speeches longer than they should be. In the United States, although they do not sit at night, they limit the time of a speaker; and although their 'Hansard' does not show any evidence of it, that is probably due to their elastic method of allowing speeches to be handed in and published as if really spoken. But possibly their system has the effect of making the debates more brisk and perhaps more to the point and certainly prevents long winded speakers like myself from taking up too much of the time of the House. On most of the questions which come before us, a half an hour or three-quarters of an hour should be quite long enough to enable a man to say all he has to say regarding them. Of course there are occasions when it would not be advisable to restrict certain speeches within that limit. For instance when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has to bring down his budget, it would be rather too much to ask that he should be limited to half an hour or three-quarters of an hour or perhaps within the hour, though if we take the example of the British House of Commons, we find that the budget speeches there, as a rule, are remarkably condensed. In the case, however, of minor debates, such as on the estimates, I think they might well be shortened, and that the result would be that a better debating power would be developed, we would get more quickly at the kernel or the heart of the subject, and we would not have so many historical disquisitions, especially if we had a government which behaved itself better and did not furnish us so much provocation to go into history with regard to its administration. But seriously speaking, if the rule were adopted of closing earlier in the evening, either by general consent or by rule of the House, and if there was a general disposition to curtail discussions on minor subjects and restrict these within a limited space of time, that I think would be found in the end beneficial. There is a point I wish to emphasize, and I think my right hon. friend will agree with me. Where the strain comes upon a hard working member of the House is in the last three or four weeks of the session. There is then more taken out of him than in all the preceding weeks. That arises from the fact that the great mass of the estimates, which are of great importance, are thrown into the last two or three weeks and sometimes into the last two weeks of the session. While it is the case that the main estimates of late years have been brought down at a fairly early period, other things have intervened, and all estimates, special and supplementary, are thrown on to the last days of the session. That is where the difficulty comes. If the government would be reasonable and bring down its estimates in good time, bring down its important legislation in good time, I am sure the opposition would be fairly reasonable and despatch them promptly and thus save ourselves a good deal. I agree with my hon. friend that the health of the members should be considered in conducting the business of the country, and that public business should be conducted in such a way as not to be too exacting upon our physical powers. Those members who have been in the House a number of years know, and sadly know, the strain and the results of that strain upon their health. It ought to be possible to get through with our daily business by half-past ten every night. At the same time, unless some other changes are made as well, I would rather leave this to the general good sense of the House. But I hope my hon. friend will not lose heart and courage and that, having gained a moral victory this time, he will trudge on until he gets a more substantial measure of success.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like to say a word, in accordance with the wish expressed by my right hon. friend the First Minister that we should give our views regarding these proposed changes in the customs of the House. I listened with a great deal of attention to the arguments given by my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. Wright). I think he

has taken a step in the right direction, and I think it would be a still better step if we were to confine ourselves to day sittings, such as he has indicated in the very exhaustive research my hon. friend has made into the practice of other countries. From the information given us by my hon. friend, it appears that in all civilized countries, except England, they have but one sitting a day, and except also probably in the dependencies of England which are governed by British customs. But in England the conditions are totally different. It would be very difficult there to have the meetings of the House, as in other countries, from two or half-past one until six. The members of the House of Commons in England are in general men of leisure, their habits are different from ours, and it is more convenient for them to meet at three o'clock and sit in the evening. But there they have endeavoured to limit the night sittings to the twelve o'clock rule except towards the end of the session. I have seen many members here whose health has been seriously affected by these late sittings, to which most of us are unaccustomed, because most of us are busy men as well outside of parliament—professional men or men who have other business that requires their attention—which renders it doubly difficult for us to withstand the fatigue of evening sessions. We made a very beneficial change last year. And my experience of our sittings on Wednesdays is that we get through a great deal of business and that the change from the evening sitting has been a very satisfactory one.

My hon. friend has stated that the House is a 'word factory,' and that idea has been expressed by other speakers. My own belief is that, if we had strictly business sittings from two to six or half past six, the discursive style, the style of long speeches which exists in this House, I think, more than in any other House I have any knowledge of, would be greatly curtailed. I am not in favour of that rule which prevails in the United States of limiting the time of the speaker, or allowing the handing in of a written speech for incorporation in the record of the debates. I do not think that is consonant with the spirit of our institutions. As my hon. friend is well aware, it would be impossible, in the House of Commons in England, to take up the time which some speeches take up in this House; because, by common consent in that chamber, the aggression would not be endured. I am sure that all who have any knowledge of the working of the House of Commons of England will agree with me in that. I believe that even Mr. Gladstone himself, when he proposed the second reading of the Home Rule Bill, occupied only a little more than an hour, and then he apologized for taking up so much time. I believe they got through more business in half an hour than we get through in a week here. I merely rose because we were invited by the Prime Minister to state our opinions. I regard this as a most important subject, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Wright) has brought it before us in a very forcible manner. And I would go further. I think we should try the day sittings. We should have plenty to do in the evening, and I believe the work of the session would be greatly facilitated.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). With the exception of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I am the senior member of this House now present. There are only three other members of the House who are my seniors—the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), the former Minister of Railways and member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Having put in twenty-five years in this House, I have come to the conclusion that we ought to make a change, and I would suggest that the change should be made in this way: let the House meet at ten o'clock in the morning and sit until one, then meet again at two and sit until six, and then adjourn. Our committees could meet at eight o'clock. This would relieve the cabinet ministers, as they could have from eight to ten to do their council work and prepare their business for next day, very few of them being members of committees. The majority of members would be relieved from attendance on committees for most of the evenings of the week, only one or two committees meet in one day. Our committees now usually have only two hours for their business, meeting at eleven and adjourning at one, and they would have as long time in the evening and be able to adjourn at ten. The ministers would benefit by not being compelled to sit in this House until twelve or one o'clock at night. And I believe the House would do more work and do it with less strain upon the health of members.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. If it is the wish of the Prime Minister that the resolution should be withdrawn, I shall certainly withdraw it. If I have failed I have certainly failed in a splendid cause.

Motion withdrawn.

ANGLO-JAPANESE CONVENTION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the government of Canada and the imperial authorities, and a copy of all correspondence between the government of Canada, and any person or persons, and of all reports communicated to the government in respect to the Anglo-Japanese convention regarding Canada.

He said: The object of this motion is to bring to the attention of the House and to

the knowledge of members the correspondence which preceded the adoption for Canada of the Anglo-Japanese convention of 1906. My principal desire in proposing this motion to the House is to find out what representations were made to this government, either by the Imperial government, by the government of Japan, or by other parties, as the motion indicates, concerning particularly Article 1 of the treaty of commerce between Great Britain and Japan which was signed on July 16, 1894, and to which Canada adhered under the agreement which was made at Tokio on January 31, 1906. I will read that article as it is important:

The subjects of each of the two high contracting parties should have full liberty to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the Dominions and possessions of the other contracting party, and should enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property.

They should have free and easy access to the courts of justice in pursuit and defence of their rights; they should be at liberty equally with native subjects to choose and employ lawyers, advocates and representatives to pursue and defend their rights before such courts, and in all other matters connected with the administration of justice they should enjoy all the rights and privileges enjoyed by native subjects.

In whatever relates to rights of residence and travel; to the possession of goods and effects of any kind; to the succession to personal estate, by will or otherwise, and the disposal of property of any sort in any manner whatsoever which they may lawfully acquire, the subjects of each contracting party should enjoy in the dominions and possessions of the other the same privileges, liberties and rights, and should be subject to no higher imposts or charges in these respects than native subjects, or subjects or citizens of the most favoured nation. The subjects of each of the contracting parties should enjoy in the dominions and possessions of the other entire liberty of conscience, and, subject to the laws, ordinances and regulations, should enjoy the right of private or public exercise of their worship, and also the right of burying their respective countrymen according to their religious customs, in such suitable and convenient places as may be established and maintained for that purpose.

They should not be compelled, under any pretext whatsoever, to pay any charges or taxes other or higher than those that are, or may be, paid by native subjects, or subjects or citizens of the most favoured nation.

This clause, I say, is important. It has given rise in this country to a great deal of comment on the part of many people who take a deep interest in immigration, and who severely condemn our adhering to such an agreement. But there are other clauses in the treaty that have a commercial aspect, and in regard to which we would like to have the correspondence, which, I believe, has never been laid upon the table of the House. There must have been quite an extensive correspondence between the home government and the government of the Dominion. I think I am not mistaken when I say that all the important dependencies of Great Britain were excluded from the operation of the treaty. I quote from article 19 of the treaty of commerce between Great Britian and Japan, in 1894:

The stipulations of the present treaty shall be applicable, so far as the laws permit, to all the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, excepting to those hereinafter named, that is to say, except to India, the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Cape, Natal, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia and New Zealand. Provided always that the stipulations of the present treaty shall be made applicable to any of the above-named colonies or foreign possessions on whose behalf notice to that effect shall have been given to the Japanese government by Her Britannic Majesty's representative at Tokio within two years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty.

I am not aware that any of those dependencies except Canada has agreed to the treaty, but I have no positive information on that subject. They were given two years in which to adhere to it, and it was only in 1906 that we, through the British ambassador in Japan, adhered to the treaty and to all the clauses contained in it. Now, Sir, that stipulation of a free entry into this country of Japanese subjects is a very grave matter indeed, and I think we should see all the correspondence on that subject as soon as possible. I said there had been correspondence between the home government and the government here. There may have been some correspondence also between this government and the Japanese consul here, possibly some correspondence also with Japan, although I presume that direct communication could only be made through the colonial office and the embassy in Japan. But the motion aims further to get all the correspondence between the government of Canada and any person or persons, and the reports communicated to the government in respect of that Anglo-Japanese convention regarding Canada. I think it was about the time this convention was entered into that our Mr. Preston, who had been a long time controller of European immigration, ceased to occupy that post in Europe, and he was sent elsewhere. I believe at that time he was sent to Japan, if I mistake not, at any rate I saw that he had visited that country, and I presume that in the exercise of the new functions which the government gave him he had occasion to send in reports and communications to this government which had come directly from that country. It would be interesting to see these reports, and to see the recommendations contained therein.

I do not wish at this moment to go into the

general question and to discuss here the pretensions which were lately put forward during the severe agitation that took place in British Columbia. But it must de obvious to every member of this House that an agreement such as the one which I have read to the House must necessarily infringe a principle for which I myself, and many other members of this House, have time and again contended; that is to say, that we should at all times, and in the interest of this country, and in favour, not only of the working classes largely interested, but of all classes, keep and maintain an absolute control over our immigration. This is an absolute abandonment of that principle. Now I venture to say, for my own part, that I would never give my adhesion to any such principle nor to its insertion in any treaty with any country. We have here an exceptional situation. We have an immense country, a sparse population, widely scattered, immense natural resources which are becoming daily better known. There are other countries, such as the empire of Japan, where the population is beyond the capacity of the country, and there are European countries where the population is extremely dense and where there is a continual tendency to overflow. What more natural than that the population of those countries should in large numbers, as no doubt they will in the ordinary course of things, tend towards this country where there are great facilities for settlement It is, therefore, our duty, as I have often said, and others have said it better than I, to maintain absolute control over our immigration, so that we can stop it, or modify it, and regulate as we like the people who are coming to make this country their home.

Very far from pretending that we have any dislike for the Japanese, for my own part I have the greatest possible admiration for that people. I consider that their civilization has advanced in a marvellous manner within the past half century. They are a wonderful people, and I admire them greatly, and in many respects I am prepared to admit that they are our superiors. But there is a fact that we cannot forget, that experience has proved beyond all doubt. The civilization, the modes of life, of his oriental people are entirely different from our own. I will not discuss at present whether our civilization is superior or whether their mode of life, their method of government are better or worse than our own. Suffice it to say that they are entirely different, and the best proof of the immense difficulty of assimilation between oriental people and people of Aryan extraction is the fact that although for centuries past we have had establishments in the far east we have not assimilated with those people in any way. The establishments we have had at Hong Kong, Shanghai and all other places in the east, where Europeans are stationed, have remained isolated from the surrounding population. All the writers I have read on the subject have declared that the assimilation of these two races was most improbable, and indeed was impossible. Therefore it seems to me there is nothing in any way offensive in the attitude which I take, and many others with me, that we are opposed, in the present state of the development of our country, and in our present circumstances, to any surrender of our absolute right, given us, probably, for that very purpose at the time of confederation, to control immigration. There is no European country, as I have said, with whom, if we made a treaty, I would consent to the insertion of such a general clause as that. I foresee that the government will say that at the time that treaty was approved in this parliament there was no question as to these difficulties that have since arisen. My answer to that is that at that time we had the absolute assurance of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that there would be no considerable immigration from Japan. He must have had some ground for that statement and the ground will probably be found when the correspondence and the reports which it is the object of this motion to have brought down are placed on the table of the House. But, under any circumstances, I am prepared to say to-day that the legislation went through too hastily. I do not know whether it was such legislation as the House had under its consideration yesterday which went through at the last moment of the session, but there is no doubt that, at any rate, from the question which was put at that time by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) or by some member in the House, objection was made and that it was overruled, or not considered because of the assurance we had from the Prime Minister. At that time and since we have been on very friendly terms with the empire of Japan, and I, for one would be very sorry to utter a single word which might be interpreted as not favouring those relations. Far from it. The empire of Japan is the ally of Great Britain and we are in very close union with the empire, forming part of it, and, for my part, I would be very pleased, to a very great degree, to see our commercial relations with the empire increased and developed and made most friendly. But, there is nothing unfriendly in the maintenance of the all-important principle that we should not be deprived of the right of exercising absolute control over our immigration. Oriental immigration, for the reasons to which I have very briefly adverted, is a particularly dangerous one. It is dangerous, not because—at least that is not the ground I take now—there is an objection to the oriental himself, but because you have there an element immensely numerous and desirous of expansion whether you consider the case of India, or Japan, or China. Japan particu-

larly, I believe, is seeking, outside of the present limits of the empire, new spheres of settlement and establishment because her inhabitants are so numerous. There is a fundamental objection to people whose customs, whose habits and whose civilization are entirely and absolutely different, and, under those circumstances, ought we, who are at the present moment nation building, in a country where there are already different races, though all European, endeavouring to assimilate, to allow to come in absolutely unrestricted a people so much at variance, so different from ourselves ? I maintain that we should not, and I therefore consider that the government acted very incautiously, very inconsiderately, very improvidently in adhering to that clause of the treaty concluded between Great Britain and Japan. It is a clause usually adopted in treaties between European nations and under the circumstances of this treaty there was no reason for not inserting that usual, formal clause, because nobody anticipated and nobody could anticipate while treating for Great Britain that there would be any considerable invasion or immigration into Great Britain of Japanese. The thing never had occurred and never could occur, and there was no reason why that clause which is found in numberless treaties should not be inserted in this particular one. But, when we came to adhere to the treaty we should have made at that time a restriction in regard to immigration—a restriction in favour of Japan and in favour of ourselves. There would have been nothing whatever offensive in the insertion of that restriction, it was a reserve of the most ordinary prudence and caution, and how the government came to omit it I cannot understand. At any rate we will have, if this motion is adopted by the House, all the papers and correspondence, perhaps the justification of the assurance which was at that time given by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and we will be in a better position to appreciate this very grave situation.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have no fault to find whatever with the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), with the spirit which characterized them or with the manner in which they were expressed. The House is entitled to the fullest information upon this subject. My hon. friend has very properly drawn attention to the fact that our civilization and the civilization of the oriental nations is so much at variance that it will be difficult for many years to come, if not for generations, perhaps for ever, to remove these objections which exist at the present day. I am quite sure they exist in a remarkable degree—in a degree that we cannot forget and certainly the considerations which my hon. friend presented to the House a few moments ago were in our minds when we determined to adhere to the treaty which had been negotiated between Japan and Great Britain some fourteen years ago. The House is entitled to have the fullest information upon the subject, it must have it and therefore the government have no objection to the motion and agree that it should be carried. I may say to my hon. friend, however, that for reasons which he will appreciate, it would not be advisable that these papers should be brought down and made public while Mr. Lemieux is still in Japan in connection with this very subject. We hope that Mr. Lemieux will be back in a very short time, but at all events if,—I will leave it to my hon. friend himself—in the opinion of the House the delay should be unduly great, the papers can be called for.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my right hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ? He has spoken of Mr. Lemieux. On what ground does Mr. Lemieux stand as our representative in Tokio ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is difficult to exactly define on what ground Mr. Lemieux stands. We have, as my hon. friend knows, no diplomatic status anywhere, but Mr. Lemieux has been introduced to the authorities at Tokio by His Majesty's ambassador, and it is under His Majesty's ambassador that negotiations—if negotiations they can be called—are being conducted, or that the representations are being made by Mr. Lemieux.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION—TENDERS.

Mr. JACOB T. SCHELL (Glengarry) moved for:

A return showing: 1. The estimated quantities used by the Transcontinental Railway Commission for arriving at the moneyed values of the tenders for the construction of the 50 miles, more or less, from Moncton westerly; for the construction of 62 miles, more or less, from Grand Falls westerly; from the south side of the St. Lawrence river, easterly 150 miles; for the 45 miles, more or less, westerly from near La Tuque; and for the 150 miles easterly from near Abitibi, known as the Abitibi section.

2. The various prices which each tenderer placed opposite the several items in the schedule or form of tender.

3. The total amount so ascertained of each tender.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a year ago a somewhat similar motion was placed before the House with reference to a contract which had been let upon the Transcontinental Railway previous to the contract referred to in this motion. I ask for the returns specified in this motion for two reasons. In the first place I wish the information asked for to be brought down; in the second place I wish to refer to the manner in

which the Transcontinental Railway Commission is not only asking for tenders but to the manner in which they act after the tenders are received. A special Act was passed with reference to the Transcontinental Railway and in that Act it is specially mentioned that the contracts shall be given to the lowest tender, and so it becomes a matter of very great public importance that the details of these contracts should be given to the public. We certainly have a right to get these details when they are moved for in the House, as I move for them now, but I think they should be given to the public without such formality. It is a well established custom among the railroad companies of Canada and other countries; it is the custom of the Ontario government, to give this information publicly. For the information of hon. members of the House who may not be conversant with the details of contracting and of railroad contracting in particular, I shall refer to the course generally pursued in such a matter. The first thing done towards building a railway is to survey a trial line; and if that trial line is thoroughly satisfactory a trial permanent line is the next step taken. If upon going over the gradients, elevations, and curvatures, it is found that upon that survey a good permanent line can be established then the permanent survey is finally made. After this permanent survey is completed, calculations are made as to the estimated cost based upon the estimated quantities. I presume that has been the practice followed by the Transcontinental Railway Commission. One reason why I do not refer to the contracts originally awarded is, that probably—and I speak advisedly—probably the estimated quantities were not actually ascertained over the entire extent of the contracts that were first let, or if they were so ascertained there were immediately variations, alterations and changes in the route, and I have it from one of the best authorities that actually the first contracts were not based upon properly ascertained estimated quantities. I direct my attention to the last contracts for the reason that I believe these contracts were entered into after the surveys were thoroughly completed and the quantities properly estimated, upon which to base the contemplated value of the contract. I repeat that this is a question of public importance and I propose to demonstrate that it is in the interest of the government, in the interest of intending contractors, and in the interest of the country that the utmost publicity be given whenever these contracts are let. I propose to show why, if this is done, not only the government, the parties interested, and the public will be safeguarded, but that there cannot be any ground whatever for any suspicion that everything is not done fairly, openly, above board and without any possible chance of the slightest hint of wrong-doing in connection with it. Whether that is the case at present or not, I will not discuss. My information is not absolute, but I will say this much with regard to the contracts that have been already let, that the variation in the price, in other words the total amounts of the tenders ascertained from estimated quantities have varied so largely that no question of interference with the matter so far could have taken place. But that may not always be the case. I wish to explain the procedure now so that every person who hears me may be thoroughly conversant with it. As I stated before, the estimated quantities must be ascertained before the contract can be let intelligently. Every railway company, before it lets a contract for the construction to go on (as is usually done in these days at so much per yard of excavation, so much per foot of timber, so much per ton of iron, and so on), every railway bases the cost or the value of the tender upon the estimated cost of quantities. Now, having your estimated quantities and your tender based upon the estimated quantities, the next thing is to figure out the money value of these tenders, and especially at that point I wish to place it beyond cavil as to what should be done. Let me give you an example to illustrate the customary procedure. A few days ago I received a letter from the Canadian Pacific Railway stating that they proposed to let a certain number of miles of railway to be constructed. They wrote to me: Inclosed you will find a list of estimated quantities, if you wish to tender for this work we will supply you with profiles and any other information needed at the head office in Montreal. I went to the head office of the Canadian Pacific in Montreal and obtained a profile without charge; the Transcontinental Railway Commission charges $1 a mile for profiles if you wish to go out over the work. The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Northern, and every other railway that I know of, provide enough profiles for the use of all who wish to tender, make no charge for them and do not ask you to return them. In tendering on Canadian Pacific Railway work you are given a profile mile by mile, and this profile gives the estimated quantities. I have here the profile of mile 12. It sets out solid rock excavation, 2,923 yards; loose rock, so many yards, and so on with embankment, grubbing, excavation, concrete in abutments, concrete in culverts, concrete pipe, rip-rap, excavations for pipe, timber—every item is given mile for mile, and at the end of each division the entire amount is tabulated. When they ask for tenders, they give a list of these quantities. I have here an estimate for 25 miles in which the number of acres of clearing, the number of squares of cross-logging, the yards of excavation of different materials and the quantities of

different materials required in construction, are set out fully. This is the way in which the Canadian Pacific Railway does its work. When the Ontario government let out the building of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, they did it upon precisely the same lines, excepting that they did not send out estimated quantities, but if you called at the office, as I did myself, you could see the estimated quantities. They gave a profile and all the information they possibly could that would be of assistance in tendering. A few days after the awarding of the contract the Ontario government issued, as coming from the commissioners of the railway, a pamphlet showing the particulars of all tenders. This will be found at page 16 of sessional paper No. 49 of the Ontario Legislature, 1902. There you have set forth in tabulated form the name of each tenderer, the estimated quantity of each class of work or material, the tenderer's price per unit of work or material, and his total price for each item in the tender. That was published broadcast; there could be no question of any tampering; there could be no question of any favouritism, that is giving publicity to public tenders and publicity of the right kind. When the first tenders on the National Transcontinental Railway were given I asked the right hon. the Prime Minister if he proposed to issue such a report as was issued by the Commissioners of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, and he said: No. I thought it was right to have issued such a list; that it was right in the interests of the government and for that reason I have brought this matter up in the House. At the time the first contract was awarded, a number of weeks elapsed before the contractors were decided upon, and I remember reading in the Ottawa papers, as well as in other papers, a long description of the wonderful system that had been devised in the Transcontinental office by which no engineer knew what part of any one individual's tender he was working on. It was a wonderful system; something so supremely able and so elaborate that no newspaper had been able to describe it. There was no more necessity for any of that childish nonsense than there is to try to climb to the moon. There is no necessity to take a week to publish the figures of two dozen contracts. There is no necessity to cast suspicion upon the integrity or honour of the engineering class of the Dominion of Canada, even by implication. There is no need of having an engineer handle the matter at all; a school child who could multiply 1,200 by 30 and 1,500,000 by 30 could tell the cost of 1,200 acres of clearing at $30 an acre, and of 1,500,000 yards of excavation at 30 cents, and by adding up the results could within a few hours tell the value of any tender sent into any railway office. When these figures are published openly so that any one can study them, then the government may stand before the world and know that no contractor can gainsay his own figures and no person could find any fault. Some time ago in talking with a gentleman having something to do with the Transcontinental Railway he said to me: Oh, estimated quantities may get you into trouble the word 'estimated quantities' is a sort of guarantee and so forth. They are simply estimated quantities. They are based upon the estimates tendered upon railway work. No man, however able, can look upon a rock cut or a cut, when the formation of the country about it would indicate that in all probability a part of that is earth and a part rock—there is no power under the sun that can tell us as to the actual quantity. That is estimated and must be estimated. But if you safeguard simply by putting in the words 'quantities not guaranteed,' there can be no objection and no one can make any claim. It is not like building a wall, where your walls are one foot and a half thick and they are built of brick and are absolutely defined. Railway work is something that is entirely a matter to be found out, so far as the cost goes. That can only be told after the construction is over, not before, and the estimated quantities are simply a matter of opinion or guess or judgment, just as you may wish to call it. An engineer, looking over the ground, would put down his soundings. He will say there is a good bottom, but he knows nothing about it until the actual construction goes on. Where he thought there was a good bottom, he may find there is no bottom at all. This summer, where we had a section passed over as good bottom, I was obliged to drive a pile one hundred and four feet before I found good bottom. You cannot tell what the rock, sand, or earth of a country may develop, until after that cut is out. Persons who have the experience and know anything about this matter, know that estimated quantities are simply estimates and nothing else in railway work. I have discussed this matter with the commission, and the commissioners are able men. I understand they are four of the ablest men that can be found in the Dominion for the purpose for which they were appointed. But if you handle a business of this kind, I do not care whether you employ shirt makers or green grocers, or what the commissioners may be, put out your tenders in that way upon the estimated quantities, and there can be no question of any claim upon the government or that commission. I am asking to have this return for the information it will give, and I am making these few remarks, backed up by the evidence of railway construction in this country, backed up by the experience of the Temiscaming and Northern roads; and I trust that the commissioners, in their own interests, will let their contracts, as other companies and governments have done. While it is of no bene-

fit to a contractor that these matters should come out, they are all curious and anxious to know. I say it is no benefit in the matter of estimated quantities, I will give over a piece of work and will not always agree with those estimated quantities; but if in going down past a bluff, I see that the geological formation assures me, in my judgment, that there will be a large amount of rock underneath apparently sand or clay cuts, I shall know there will be a great deal more work and put in my tender accordingly. But it is a matter of guess or judgment just as in the case of the engineer who puts down his estimated quantities. But the fact remains that the estimated quantities must be the only basis on which a tender is asked for and put in. I hope that this will have a dual effect—this order which I have put upon the paper.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all Orders in Council, correspondence, reports, memoranda, papers and documents, since the 1st day of January, 1900, relating to the Quebec bridge, including all reports and Orders in Council relating to the plans and specifications for the works of the undertaking, or to any approved thereof by the Governor in Council, or by the Department of Railways and Canals.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing: 1. The number of disputes dealt with under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, to December 1, 1907.

2. The dates at which the several applications for the operation of the Act have been received.

3. Names of the parties concerned in the several disputes.

4. Name of the party making application.

5. Locality of dispute.

6. Number of persons affected.

7. Nature of dispute.

8. Names of members of Board of Conciliation and Investigation where same has been established.

9. Date on which board was established.

10. Date of sittings of board.

11. Result of the reference of the dispute under Act.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 13, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. H. BELAND (Beauce). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether he intends distributing to the members of the House copies of the French tariff with respect to the items contained in schedule A of the treaty now submitted to the House ? The items contained in that schedule comprise Canadian products entitled to special favour, or to the minimum tariff in the French market ? That would indicate that there is a maximum and a minimum tariff in France and in order to judge of what special favour or what preference the Canadian products in the list are entitled to in the French market it is necessary that the maximum and minimum tariff of France should be distributed amongst the members of this House.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the information is being prepared and will be distributed.

Mr. FOSTER. In connection with the French treaty may I ask the minister if he would have a note made on the information as to the countries that at present enjoy France's minimum tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. The French minimum tariff ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the French minimum tariff. It is very important in connection with one part of the treaty as to shipments of goods.

Mr. FIELDING. The list of countries which enjoy the French minimum tariff ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. I will endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company. —Mr. Sam. Hughes.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Travellers' Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

SUPPLY—FRAUDULENT CIRCULAR TO IMMIGRANTS.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Supply I would like

to call the attention of the government to a rather remarkable circular which has been placed in my hands, issued in one of the large cities in Canada, in which the gentleman who signs it, after enumerating a number of kinds of business which he is willing to transact, goes on as follows :—

Issue marriage licenses, citizen papers, make all kinds of legal papers, passports, get permits for old or crippled people to be allowed to land in Canada, &c.

It is rather a remarkable statement to be floating around the country in the form of a circular. I thought it right to call the attention of the government to it. The letter which accompanies this circular and which is from a very reputable person, who is engaged in the charitable work of assisting men who are out of employment and who have recently come to this country, states that it is due to a regular business of this kind carried on in some parts of the country that we have many of the helpless people in Canada at the present time who are to be found in all of the larger cities. I shall be very happy to send the circular to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that they may consider whether some action ought not to be taken with respect to an advertisement of that kind scattered broadcast among the immigrants of the city to which I allude.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would be very glad if my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) would send me over the circular. I shall certainly see that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) takes cognizance of it.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR REMOVAL OF CROPS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I noticed that yesterday, in another place, a member of the government made rather an extended explanation in reference to the arrangement which had been made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) with certain of the banks looking towards the facilitation of the removal of grain from the Northwest. Several questions have been put to the Minister of Finance in this House but he has pleaded that it was not quite opportune or advisable that explanations should be given and this side of the House has given way as it felt it might for a time to the plea which was made. But I think that is all taken away when a gentleman, being a member of the government, lets it all out as far as he has it in his position in another place. I sympathize a little with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in being forestalled in a matter in his own department, but I think it is due to the House that he should be equally as alert as his much older colleague.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am unable to say anything in reply at present. I asked my hon. friend opposite to withhold his application for this information for a reasonable time, and he was good enough to consent. I think it is in the public interest that we should not make public the arrangement now, and probably there is still enough behind what has appeared in the press to make it interesting when the papers come down. I hope that shortly after Christmas we shall be able to discuss the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Will there be an injunction placed on the elderly member of the cabinet who seems rather anxious to satisfy public curiosity?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I shall have to take that into consideration.

DRUGS AND PATENT MEDICINES.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Might I ask if it is the intention of the government to bring down this session a Bill dealing with drugs and patent medicines? I put the question the other day when my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) informed me that the matter was under consideration. It might remain under consideration a very long time, and I think we ought to know whether it is his intention to bring down such a measure on not. If it is, I shall be very glad ; but otherwise I shall have to bring the matter up in a different way.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). I think I will be able to give a very definite answer in the course of a few days. The matter has not been overlooked. We have had several proposed Bills before us and are considering them now .

THE ALL RED LINE.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I notice in the despatches of the Canadian Associated Press that Mr. Sifton has with him in London the Dominion geographer, and the tenor of the despatch would seem to indicate that Mr. Sifton was using this official in the matter of his negotiations with reference to the proposed fast line in a way rather to give the impression that he is acting on behalf of this government. What is the particular purpose for which the Canadian geographer is away from his duties here and dancing attendance on Mr. Clifford Sifton in London?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. White, the Dominion geographer, is in Europe at my request in order to collect data concerning the lines of steamers now plying on the Atlantic from all ports, with the view of obtaining

information as to the possibility of reducing the time. We have been in communication with Mr. Sifton upon this point all along, and I see no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it supposed by the government that the Dominion geographer is the man best qualified to get data with reference to trade and traffic matters, such as are involved in this fast line steamship communication, and are his expenses being paid?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. His expenses are paid, and I am informed that he is very competent for that work.

POST OFFICE AT TRENT BRIDGE, EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (East Northumberland). I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister, who, I believe, is acting Postmaster General during the absence of Mr. Lemieux, when the post office at Trent Bridge in the county of East Northumberland will be reopened? Early in October the man who had been postmaster there a number of years left for the Northwest. Since then the post office has been closed. This is one of the oldest post offices in the county and its closing puts the farmers to great inconvenience. Some have to drive eight or nine miles to get their mail. Several petitions were sent to the government recommending certain men to be appointed as postmaster, but there were other petitions asking that these men be not appointed. It would be only just to the people in that part of East Northumberlaud to have this post office reopened as early as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the name?

Mr. OWEN. Trent Bridge.

THE GRAIN COMMISSION.

Mr. STAPLES. When will the report of the Royal Grain Commission be brought down? It was promised a few days ago. This is very important information to which our western farmers are looking forward.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have the word of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that this report will be brought down as soon as it is received.

POST OFFICE—PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if anything has been done regarding a matter about which I spoke to him a short time ago. Our parliamentary documents are not put in the post office as formerly, but are scattered all over the lobby, which causes great inconvenience to members and also causes loss, through these documents being appropriated by other people and not returned.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a matter which concerns the Committee of Internal Economy. That committee will meet shortly and deal with it in such a way as to meet the convenience of members.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Governor General's Secretary's Office—salaries, $11,937.50; contingencies, including salary of Miss Gilbertson at $650 per annum, and allowance of $300 to A. F. Sladen, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $40,600.

Mr. FIELDING. The only change there is an increase in the number of chief clerks from one to two. There are the statutory increases; the net result is an increase of $50 in the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to be made chief clerk?

Mr. FIELDING. When we ask for a vote like this it is sometimes not possible to tell who is to be appointed, but in this case I can tell that it is Mr. Walker.

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. Walker's present salary?

Mr. FIELDING. $1,900; the maximum of the first class; he is put in the way of promotion by being given a higher rank.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the other first class clerk?

Mr. FIELDING. The other chief clerk is Mr. C. J. Jones.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is Miss Gilbertson who is mentioned in the item?

Mr. FIELDING. Speaking from memory, Miss Gilbertson is a young lady who came out from England with His Excellency's staff and who consequently had not our civil service certificate.

Mr. FOSTER. It is an evasion of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FIELDING. Evasion is a hard word; it is a provision to make up for something the Civil Service Act lacks.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of the $300 for Mr. Sladen.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Sladen, in addition to his rank in the service acts as private secretary to His Excellency, and receives this extra amount in recognition of that face.

Office of the King's Privy Council of Canada—salaries, $32,175; contingencies, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not suppose it required an explanation as there is a decrease of $1,275.

Mr. FOSTER. That is so extraordinary that I should have thought the right hon. gentleman would be on his feet at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The explanation is that one of the officers has been dropped and there has been a promotion of one or two of the clerks. Last year there were two first-class clerks, this year one. There were six junior clerks, one has been promoted and the other has been dropped. I do not remember the names but the promotions have been made by way of seniority.

Mr. FOSTER. They have been all by seniority ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as I remember, yes.

Department of Militia and Defence—salaries, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $63,500; contingencies, $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We are at a disadvantage inasmuch as the parts of the Auditor General's Report already brought down do not cover these items of civil government.

Mr. FIELDING. There are several of the departments not included in the volume brought down, and if the hon. gentleman wishes them to stand over it is a reasonable request.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item is not in the report brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this should stand.

Mr. FIELDING. Very well.

Department of the Secretary of State—salaries, $46,387.50; contingencies, $7,500.

Mr. FIELDING. The Secretary of State informs me that there is no increase in the staff. One junior second-class clerk will be dropped and replaced by a third-class clerk. The statutory increases only are asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. And the statutory increases are all given ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you the names of the clerks whose salaries have been increased ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, but I think I can safely say that every clerk who is eligible has received the statutory increase. I know that is the general rule.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that apply to officers in all classes.

Mr. FIELDING. Wherever an officer has not reached the maximum of his class he gets the statutory increase.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BERGERON. And no new clerks have been appointed ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Secretary of State informs me there is no increase of staff whatever.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is meant by 'clerical assistance;' by whom is that work performed ; are the persons who render it members of the civil service ; have they passed the examination or are they persons taken in to do this temporary work.

Mr. FIELDING. In this case they would have to be persons qualified under the Civil Service law.

Mr. HENDERSON. And they are so qualified ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Unless the words 'Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act' are mentioned, the Act must apply.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery—salaries, $44,475; contingencies, $9,100.

Mr. FIELDING. The Secretary of State who has charge of this branch informs me that one junior second-class clerk is dropped, the statutory increases account for the difference between this vote and the net decrease of $135.

Mr. BENNETT. Is Mr. P. M. Draper in the employ of the Printing Bureau ?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot tell ; I shall have to get information for my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that this Mr. Draper is a candidate for what is known as the Board of Control in this city. What is the policy of the department in that respect ? In some parts of the province of Ontario intimation has been given that public officials must not be municipal candidates. How is it then that we have a municipal candidate in Ottawa in the person of a gentleman who has a leading position in the Printing Bureau. Has the minister ever heard of Mr. P. M. Draper ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have seen the gentleman's name occasionally in the press, but I was not aware until now that he was in the service. My official tells me, that he knows from his general knowledge of the public service that Mr. Draper is an officer of the Printing Bureau. I am informed that some gentlemen in the service are engaged in municipal affairs, so that it is quite evident that there can be no such rule as my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. BENNETT. However, the hearty concurrence of the department is with Mr. Draper in his present candidature.

Mr. FIELDING. I really do not know. If the gentleman happened to be a candidate in the ward in which I live I would not like to guarantee that I would vote for him. I would have to hear both sides.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to call attention to the fact that the item under discussion is not included in that part of the Auditor General's Report which has been brought down. It is in the volume that is missing.

Mr. FIELDING. The portion relating to the Department of the Secretary of State is down and I thought this item was included in that. Apparently it is not, and if it is desired that it should be held over, I have no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. We want to find the name of the gentleman who is running for municipal honours in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. FIELDING. My official tells me he is an officer in the Printing Bureau.

Mr. BENNETT. I think he is rather an important officer and he has had a pretty rapid promotion. He is very active in labour circles, too, and comes to the assistance of the government when necessary. What is his salary?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not state his salary off-hand, but I shall be happy to get the information later on.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister the number of hands in the Printing Bureau at present?

Mr. FIELDING. No. If hon. gentlemen want any information of that kind of which I have not a personal knowledge I would suggest that they mention it now and I shall be very happy to get it.

Mr. HENDERSON. With reference to an employee of the Printing Bureau becoming a candidate for municipal honours, I think it is important that we should understand that if he is elected a municipal officer and is called upon to give a certain amount of his time to the city of Ottawa, we should not pay him for that portion of his time which he gives to municipal affairs, but which belongs really to this country. I think a man who gets a good salary, as this gentleman does, should devote all his time to the service of the country and not divide it between the city and the country. It strikes me that there is a principle here which the government should take notice of. I would be entirely opposed to any man having anything to do with the municipal government of Ottawa so long as he remains in the civil service. If he wants to go into municipal politics he should throw up his position in the service.

Mr. FIELDING. While I am rather inclined myself to favour the view of my hon. friend, it may be difficult to lay down a general rule. Mr. Draper, I am informed, is not in the strict sense of the word a civil servant, though he is a salaried employee of the Printing Bureau. It is a debatable question whether an official of that kind might not become a member of the municipal council, which is a body without pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is a candidate for the Board of Control, the members of which are to receive pay.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that that is a salaried office, and I have no hesitation in saying that if Mr. Draper should be elected he would probably have to resign his position in the Bureau, but I do not know enough of the duties of the board of control to speak positively. On general principles an officer who receives pay as a public servant should devote his whole time to his office and should not receive pay as a municipal officer at the same time. Whether a public official should be an alderman or not is a larger question, and while I would prefer that he should not be, at the same time I would not like to lay down any general rule.

Mr. FOSTER. That brings up another question—how far are employees of the Dominion government to be allowed to engage in Dominion elections and provincial elections? I think they stand on a quite different plane, and, if I am not wrong, the Prime Minister himself has on more than one occasion in this House given decided expression to his opinion as to the participation actively in Dominion or provincial elections of persons who are in the employ of the government. There was, in fact, a resolution passed, and passed unanimously by the House on that subject, while, if my memory is not at fault—if it is, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works may be able to give me the information—an employee of the government on the Intercolonial Railway recently not only took a part in matters connected with Dominion politics, but was very actively engaged in trying to get for himself the nomination for the Dominion parliament at the recent party convention in the county of York. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was present at that convention. I have heard that there were very lively times there. It is stated that when the ballots were all counted the number that came out of the hat was about 400, but that when the delegates were counted the number was only about 150. That brings up also the question of methods in party elections, and I am quite sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, with the extreme sensitiveness that characterizes him with regard to contributions to election funds, must very decidedly have frowned down any attempt on the part of a Dominion employee to change the position of affairs, in a party sense, in the county of York. Probably he did not understand that that was a rule of this House or that his leader the Prime Minister not only gave his adhesion to that rule by voting for it, but also strongly expressed himself in favour of it. I think we ought to have an explanation as to whether this is all talk which hon. gentle-

men opposite may give to the electors in the way of resolutions and fine sentiments, to be entirely disregarded in practical work, or whether it is to be made an efficient rule.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I may say to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat that it is all talk as to the part which Mr. Allan, the gentleman to whom he no doubt refers, took at the convention in the county of York. Mr. Allan was not present at the convention. I was there but——

Mr. DANIEL. They had a lively time there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Allan had nothing to do with the matter. There was a very lively interest taken in the nomination of the candidates; I was glad to see that the names of three very prominent and popular gentlemen were submitted to the convention and there seemed to be a very strong feeling among the friends of all the candidates that whoever would be chosen would be sure to carry the constituency, and that is perhaps why more interest was taken in the convention than is ordinarily the case, especially where it is not thought that the candidate has much chance of success. So far as Mr. Allan is concerned I may say, having been in the county, that I do not think there was anything in his conduct which was at all inconsistent with the position which he occupies in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, as Mr. Allan had contested the county some years ago and is a very popular man there, hon. gentlemen will understand that he would quite naturally have friends who would be desirous of having him nominated as a candidate. Had he been nominated I am quite sure he would have felt it his duty to immediately resign his position on the Intercolonial, but I can assure my hon. friends that he took no part in the convention. With reference to New Brunswick matters, with which my hon. friend is less familiar than he used to be, I would suggest that he should not accept all that he sees in the newspapers, particularly the partisan papers representing his side of politics as the truth.

Mr. FOSTER. I have taken that lesson much to heart, and certain things that were stated in the papers as having been said by gentlemen high in administrative circles, I have learned to treat with little attention and to give but little adhesion to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I wish to say a word or two partly in support of what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said. He has expressed a desire that the government should give some expression of opinion as to whether or not there is a policy with regard to Dominion officials entering into the arena of Dominion or local politics. I take it that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) disapproves entirely of the idea that any one in the employ of the government should participate in party affairs or should seek office at the hands of electors as a party candidate. In this he is apparently enunciating the policy of his party and I wish to refer to a case in my own constituency, about which I did not intend to complain and do not now complain, but since my hon. friend is anxious about this matter I may say that in my own constituency an employee of this government has certainly taken a very active part in politics. He has been the candidate of his party in a political fight; he has been successful, but no complaint has been made by anybody on behalf of his party, and I hope that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will see that a complaint is made.

Mr. BERGERON. I cannot hear a word of what you say.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did not intend it for you.

Mr. BERGERON. Speak louder, we cannot appreciate it.

Department of the Interior—salaries, $190,012.50; contingencies, $36,900.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The sum of $182,050 was voted for civil government salaries for the fiscal year 1907-8, and it has been estimated that it will require $190,012.50 for this service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1909, an increase of $7,962.50. This increase includes statutory increases provided for clerks eligible for the same, $4,924; promotion of J. M. Roberts and T. Marchand to chief clerkships at $1,000, $3,800; of A. R. Morrissette to a second-class clerkship at $1,200, or $5,000 for these three promotions. There is also a difference in estimating for the salaries of three third-class clerks. This gives a total increase of something over $10,000, but there is $2,000 deduction to be made from this on account of the salaries of the gentlemen promoted in their former ranks, leaving the net increase at $7,962.50.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is Wagner still in the employ of your department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he getting any increase this year?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Wagner's salary does not come under the head of civil government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many officials are there altogether in the inside service of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. OLIVER. One hundred and forty-nine.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many were there this time last year?

Mr. OLIVER. One hundred and forty-six.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will look at page 13 of the estimates he will find that information.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the necessity urged by the department for two more chief clerks?

Mr. OLIVER. It was thought that in the interest of the administration of the department Mr. Roberts, the gentleman who has charge of the registration and who has conducted his branch with very great satisfaction, should have the rank of a chief clerk, as he had charge of a very important branch of the work and was doing it very well. The other gentlemen, Mr. Marchand, was assistant to the chief accountant and it was thought reasonable that, on account of length of service and ability, he should also receive that promotion.

Mr. HAGGART. Ability or qualifications on the part of the officials is not sufficient reason; what is the necessity for two more chief clerkships for the department?

Mr. OLIVER. It is our belief that it was in the interest of the service that these gentlemen should be given the chief clerkships for the reasons I have given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is asking about the observance of some provision of law in connection with these appointments?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it is not a question of the qualification of the individual; it is the reason assigned by the department for the necessity of two additional people of this rank.

Mr. OLIVER. I have tried to give reasons, and will try again. The reason for the promotion of Mr. Roberts to a chief clerkship was that he was in charge of an important branch of the department, a branch of such importance, and he being of such qualifications, it seemed to me, warranted his appointment to a chief clerkship in order that he might have that authority, standing and prestige necessary for the best working of the department. Mr. Marchand has been assistant accountant. It is, in the nature of things, necessary that our chief accountant should, from time to time, be absent from the office here to attend to the work of the department in other places, leaving some other person in charge of the accounts branch for considerable periods of time. It seemed to us that it was a right and proper thing that Mr. Marchand, being qualified and having the proper length of service, should have this rank of chief clerk.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) had to assign a reason for these changes in the order in council which gave the consent of the Governor General for this increase.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the terms of that order in mind, but the order was passed and there will be no objection, of course, to laying it on the table.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me these orders in council should always be brought down when a new position is created as in this case. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) seems to be under an entire misapprehension in this matter. As I understand the law and the practice, when a new position such as a chief clerkship is to be created, it must be because the public service demands it. When that office has been created, you select a suitable person to fill it. I can understand that; but I cannot understand the establishment of a new position merely for the purpose of appointing a certain person to it, which is the ground assigned by the Minister of the Interior. That is not a ground within the law, and if the order in council sets it forth as a ground, I do not think the order in council is within the law. Therefore, I would suggest to the minister that we should have the order in council before the item passes, so that we may understand the position exactly. I am not suggesting that this gentleman is not eminently qualified to fill the position. But that is not the point—the point for the committee to consider is whether the establishment of a new position of that kind is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. FIELDING. A case may arise where an officer who has been in the service a long time and has rendered particularly faithful service is at the maximum of his class. Would not the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) think that, in order to retain the services of such an officer, the minister would be justified—I am not speaking of the legal phase of the case—in promoting him to a higher rank by creating an additional chief clerkship? I think that would be a proper thing. Of course, the guiding principle in these matters is that the number of officials and their several grades shall be such as will best promote the interests of the public service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the maximum of the first-class?

Mr. FIELDING. It is $1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. This officer has not reached that.

Mr. FIELDING. I am speaking of the general principle to which the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) referred, and not as to this particular case. I do not know this man at all. But I know that if you adhere rigidly to the rule that before you appoint a man to a higher rank you must consider only the question whether the work would not go on as well if he were

kept in a lower rank, you would not be showing proper appreciation of a good and faithful officer; and I think that circumstances might arise which would justify the creation of an extra clerkship in order to keep a man in the service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree that if you have a work of a certain character, performed by a certain officer, and cannot have that performed except by a man at a salary and occupying a position of the character mentioned, that might be a proper consideration for such a change. But the ultimate consideration would be the interest of the public service, and not the promotion of the officer. The Minister of the Interior put it on the ground of the promotion of this officer. The consideration to be had in regard in such matters is whether or not the establishment of the office is in the public interest. Some of the considerations that have been mentioned by the minister might, undoubtedly, have weight in determining that question. But it was not in that way that the Minister of the Interior put it forward.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the minimum of a chief clerk?

Mr. FIELDING. It is $1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. The same as the maximum of a first-class clerk. Then, one of the reasons given by the Minister of Finance falls to the ground. Mr. Marchand is now receiving only $1,600 and Mr. Roberts, $1,500 a year. It will be seen that it is possible, if it be deemed proper, to give these men recognition in a monetary way, without moving them up a class, which opens the way not only for a present large rise in salary, but for their advancement to the maximum of the chief clerkship. Mr. Roberts has to earn $400 yet before he reaches the top of his class, and Mr. Marchand, $300. At the regular increase of $50 a year, they could go on advancing in the position of chief clerk for years yet. There are other clerks there who are receiving more than these gentlemen, but you are promoting these two, who could do their work just as well if called first-class clerks. It does not add anything to the real ability or efficiency of a man to call him chief clerk instead of first-class clerk. And it does seem to me unfair that the minister should take these two gentlemen who have not arrived anywhere near the maximum of their class and re-arrange the order and system of the department by the creation of two new chief clerkships, the only reason given being that these two gentlemen are good officers. I think this system is being worked to a very large extent and it certainly seems to me to be outside the genius and spirit of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I seem to have succeeded in making myself very thoroughly misunderstood. I tried to say that these men were placed in these clerkships because it appeared to me that their work was such as required that they should have this rank in order that their work might be better done.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

Mr. OLIVER. Because Mr. Roberts is in charge of an important branch of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. And does it well?

Mr. OLIVER. He is the head of the branch——

Mr. FOSTER. He does it well?

Mr. OLIVER. He does it well. He has a large number of employees under him, and we believe that he would be in a better position towards his employees if we gave him this superior rank and increased salary with the result of securing better work in his branch.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

Mr. OLIVER. I am only giving my hon. friend the reasons which I wish placed on 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOSTER. No, you are giving an impression. What is the ground upon which you give that impression?

Mr. OLIVER. The ground is that if there is a large room full of men working together, all on approximately the same salary and all in approximately the same rank, one of these men will not have the same authority over the others as he would have if he had a higher rank and a higher salary. I think that is an elementary principle that even my hon. friend will understand and appreciate. That was the reason why Mr. Roberts was given this increased salary and promotion. If I failed to make myself clear before, I hope I have succeeded now. I just wish, in this connection, to touch on the position taken by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He said that if the necessity of the service requires the creation of a certain office then the office should be created, and we should find the man to fill it. That sounds very well and it reads very well.

Mr. HAGGART. It is the law.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly it is the law, and I think my hon. friend will find that we have not contravened the law but we have taken our reasoning in another way. In practice it is a very undesirable thing to create an office unless and until you have a suitable man to fill that office. In this case we created the office because we thought it was necessary, and at the time we created it we had what we believed was a suitable man to fill it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be that the order in council will show whether the rea-

sons are satisfactory or not. I would suggest that the item stand until the order in council is produced.

Mr. CROCKET. I noticed in the public press that Mr. Scott, Superintendent of Immigration, had recently been in St. John conferring with the provincial government authorities in reference to a proposal that this government co-operate with the New Brunswick government for the promotion of immigration into that province. Is the hon. minister able to state if any arrangement has been made between the two governments for that purpose?

Mr. OLIVER. There have no definite arrangements been made, but there have been preliminary negotiations entered into. Mr. Scott did go down to Halifax and St. John in connection with his ordinary duties at these two receiving ports, and while there did discuss with the government of the two provinces the desirability of some sort of a mutual arrangement in regard to the inducement of immigration into these provinces and the distribution of such immigration as would come to them. There have been no arrangements entered into in so far as I am aware up to the present time, but there is a discussion going on in regard to the matter.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the hon. minister state if the provincial government submitted any proposal in the matter?

Mr. OLIVER. Not, that has come to my knowledge. I think there has been a preliminary discussion between Mr. Scott and the Immigration Department and the representatives of the provincial government, but in so far as I am aware, no definite proposal has yet been submitted on either side.

Mr. HAGGART. There has been an arrangement made with the Ontario government, has there not?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there is no arrangement with the Ontario government. Some time ago, if it is of interest to the committee, the Ontario Minister of Agriculture and myself had an interview, and at that interview the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario gave me to understand that he would consult his colleagues of the provincial government and possibly as a result of that consultation they would decide to withdraw their present efforts with regard to the distribution of immigrants at Toronto. That is a matter entirely of their own concern and, of course, if a conclusion is reached, it will be of their own motion and not by any agreement with us.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the hon. Minister of the Interior, in reply to a question by my hon. friend the member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as to the number of clerks in the Interior Department to say that there were 149. I find in looking up the pages of the Auditor General's Report here that this vote is asked to pay 616 people, as I find by counting over the names. There are about 120 draughtsmen in the Department of the Interior. I wonder how the hon. gentleman reconciles the fact that when he answers my hon. friend from Lanark that there are only 149 clerks he is asking a vote to pay the salaries of some 616 clerks. Surely he refers to the permanent staff only?

Mr. OLIVER. I am only sorry we are not able to pay 616 clerks out of this vote. The vote asked for here only applies to what we call the inside service. The vote under the head of civil government covers the salaries of employees who are in what we call permanent employment and they constitute only a comparatively small part of the total of the employees of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the number today, compared with 1896, of permanent and extra employees in the Department of the Interior, and why should 120 draughtsmen be required?

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable at the moment to give the number of employees in the department in 1896, and I could not at the moment either give the number now, but I think my hon. friend will admit that with a settlement of something like 120,000 people in the Northwest inside of three or four years as against half that number in all the years preceding 1896, there is room for a very considerable increase of the staff necessary to deal with that part of the public business.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. Has the work in the Department of the Interior increased this year as compared with last year? Have more homesteads been taken up, or is the work so much greater as to require more clerks?

Mr. OLIVER. In some branches the work has increased considerably, not however in the number of homesteads taken up. The number of homesteads taken up during the past year is larger than in any previous year excepting the one immediately preceding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the figures for the two years?

Mr. OLIVER. Approximately 41,000 for the year before last and 32,000, I think, for this year. I want to point out that the taking of the homestead entry is only a very small part of the work of the department dealing with the lands. After the homestead entry is taken up the greater part of the work comes to be done. It is after the entries are made that applications for cancellation or extension of the time come in and ultimately inspection of the lands by the inspector. All these require a great deal more

time and office help than the mere taking of the homestead entries. The inspection of the homesteads and the issuing of patents begin three years after the entry is made, so that with regard to the large rush of entries which took place three years ago, two years ago and last year, the work is only beginning. Up to last year, this work was not nearly so great because the entries three years previously were much less numerous. But this year and next we shall have to deal with a tremendously large number of applications for patent. Therefore, although the number of homestead entries is not as large as last year, our work has increased because of the large number of entries of the previous years.

Department of Indian Affairs—salaries, $67,100; contingencies, $15,375.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the hon. minister give us the number of inside officials and the number in the outside service and some idea of the general expense ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are about fifty in what is called the inside service and some three hundred in the outside service, that is who are paid salaries. But there are besides a very large number who are paid fees. That number I am unable at present to give.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the hon. minister tell us whether that three hundred is in excess of the same class of officials in 1906 ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable to give the actual figures, but my information is that the number is practically the same. If there is an increase, it is very trifling.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that under these, we have the name of Mr. Bryce, medical inspector. The minister has no doubt seen his report on the Indian schools. That report shows a lamentable condition of affairs especially with regard to sanitary conditions. How does the hon. gentleman explain that ? Have those in charge of the schools been altogether careless or inefficient, or is this due to lack of inspection and supervision ? Was this the first time medical or some inspector made the first round of these institutions and reported on them ?

Mr. OLIVER. As the Indian schools are not directly under the management of the government, it would be well perhaps that I should not venture at the moment to account for the facts stated by Dr. Bryce. We have inspectors whose business it is to inspect all matters connected with the Indians. These men have from time to time inspected the schools, but I think that this recent visit of Dr. Bryce was the first occasion on which a general and comprehensive inspection was made regarding the conditions of health. No doubt my hon. friend was startled at the conclusions of Dr. Bryce. They certainly require very careful consideration, and I assure my hon. friend they are receiving that consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose at another time the minister will be prepared to tell us what measures have been taken. We give a large amount of money, and the results seem quite inadequate. What struck me most was the almost appalling carelessness regarding the health of the students, causing such mortality.

Mr. OLIVER. As regards the mortality, I might say that while the mortality shown in Dr. Bryce's report is certainly appalling, on the other hand it has been represented to us that the conditions in that respect within the schools are no worse than those outside.

Mr. FOSTER. But they ought to be better.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in my own defence in this case. I am simply giving the argument as it was given us. The matter is of course one of very grave importance. It has been taken up with the authorities who are in direct charge. I think that I shall be in a better position a little later on to go into the matter more fully and deal with the suggestions I shall submit to the House in due time.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very reasonable position to take, and when the time for that discussion comes the minister ought to be able to make some suggestions. It strikes me we had better get out of the business altogether, if, with the large expenditure of money and the end aimed at of really doing some good to the Indian children, we cannot do better than has been done in the past. The subject of education is a very difficult one as has been found both in the United States and in Canada. It may ultimately be shown to be folly to attempt, to adopt what you might call higher methods of education for these children, and that the best thing to do is to teach them farming or some trade. I would not say that all the money heretofore has been wasted, but when you come to pick up the beneficial results I am afraid it would take a fine-tooth comb to get hold of it.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the result of the legal contest that has been going on for some time between the province of Ontario and the Dominion government in respect to Indian lands ?

Mr. OLIVER. The case recently dealt with by the courts begins with the North-west Angle treaty made in the seventies when the western boundaries of Ontario were not defined. A treaty was made by the Dominion government for the purpose of buying from the Indians the land over which they had rights. The land was purchased and the cost and expenses in connection therewith paid out of the Dominion treasury. Afterwards a part of the land

east of the Northwest Angle, became a part of the province of Ontario; the land became the property of the province and as is the case in other parts of Ontario, as the province owns the land which was bought from the Indians, it is held that the province should pay the cost of it. That principle has been conceded in, I think, all the other treaties made with Indians in regard to land now owned by the province of Ontario, except this particular part which at the date of the treaty was in dispute. I assume that under the circumstances the province did not feel warranted in accepting the responsibility without a decision of the courts. By consent between the Dominion and the province a case was submitted to the Supreme Court; a portion of the contention of the Dominion was upheld and that portion so upheld involved the payment of a certain sum by Ontario.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Did the minister say that the Indian schools are not directly under the control or management of the Dominion government?

Mr. OLIVER. There are two industrial schools managed directly by the government. All the others are managed by one or other of the religious denominations, and the government allows the denomination in control of the school a contribution towards its support. The church and not the government is directly responsible for the control of the schools.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Did the report of Doctor Bryce deal with the government schools as well as with the denominational schools?

Mr. OLIVER. It dealt with all schools that his instructions covered.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Was the same criticism directed against the government schools?

Mr. OLIVER. Doctor Bryce deals with each individual school and his criticism is a criticism in particular and not in general.

Mr. FOSTER. Some are better and some worse.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does not the government exercise some supervision over these schools to the support of which they contribute?

Mr. OLIVER. They have the responsibility of inspection, and if the schools do not conform to certain arrangements, the government would not be warranted in paying the assistance agreed upon.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have seen in the newspapers that one of the Northwest schools had been raided; that a serious state of things was shown to exist, and I would like to know whether that school is under the management of the government, and whether they have control, or whether the children are helpless under such circumstances. If the newspaper reports are correct it is one of the worst outrages ever committed in Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the name of the school?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think it was the Kamsack school. It was a most terrible affair if the newspaper reports are correct.

Mr. OLIVER. I imagine the newspaper report referred to is the same as I read. It related to a school not at but near Kamsack, and which I think is on the Crowstand reserve. It is in charge of the Presbyterian church. Some of the occurrences alluded to in the newspaper took place some time last May. They came to the attention of the officials of the Indian Department who brought them to the notice of the authorities of the church, and the authorities of the church decided that the conditions were not such as would warrant drastic action on the part of the church authorities towards the officials of the schools.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I think I saw a statement in the newspaper that there were prosecutions and some parties found guilty.

Mr. OLIVER. The press report dealt with a series of cases extending over several months. Convictions for the sale of liquor took place by reason of the action of the officials of the Indian Department.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The article I saw stated, I think, that there were forty prosecutions already started, and I think there have been some convictions. Has the government no responsibility in regard to that particular school?

Mr. OLIVER. Those convictions were not in connection with the school at all. They had reference to the sale of liquor to Indians in and about Kamsack and on the reserve, and had no connection with the incident in the school which my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That was not at all the statement that I read. Some of the pupils of the school were taken out and kept two days and made drunk. The article at great length related all the circumstances connected with the matter, which certainly had to do with the school. It was a very serious offence the like of which I have never seen mentioned in Canada before, and certainly it should be investigated. It was on the 27th of November that the incident was published in one or other of the Toronto papers.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that the statements in the papers were not absolutely correct, as I have seen since a statement from the Board of Trade of Kamsack contradict-

ing in many important particulars the statements which appeared in the papers, and generally indicating that they were unreliable. However, a number of convictions were secured against people for selling liquor to Indians on the Kamsack reserve. The arrests were brought about by the action of the Indian Department and the cases were tried and the fines inflicted by the Indian agent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Am I correct in understanding the minister to say that there are only two Indian schools under the control and supervision of the government, and what is the standard by which he pays out moneys from the Indian fund towards the maintainence of the schools that are under church control ?

Mr. OLIVER. There were at one time three schools under the direct responsibility of the government—one at St. Paul's, Manitoba, another at Elkhorn, Manitoba, and the other at Calgary. The St. Paul's school was burnt some years ago and has not been rebuilt, the school at Calgary is about to be closed, and the school at Elkhorn is carried on. The schools under the direct control of the churches are aided by the government by a grant per head of the pupils in attendance, varying from $72 to $130 according to the circumstances of the school.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would like to ask the minister if any attempt is being made by this government and the government of British Columbia to settle the vexed question as to whether or not the province has a right to Indian lands. If nothing has been done to settle that question, I am of the opinion that it would be a very wise thing on the part of both governments to make a test case and carry it to the Privy Council if necessary, so as to decide once for all who has control of the Indian lands after the Indians have ceased to use them as reserves. A great many reserves in British Columbia are contiguous to large centres, and it would be much better for the Indians themselves and all concerned if they were removed from the centres of civilization. There are also some very fertile valleys in British Columbia which are nominally Indian reserves, but which as a matter of fact are not occupied by Indians and never will be ; but they are kept unused, by the Indian Department, I presume through no fault of theirs, and settlement in the surrounding country is retarded in consequence. As an instance, I may mention Squawmish valley, one of the most fertile valleys of the province. Very few Indians are there, and if they were removed and that valley opened for settlement, a considerable quantity of land would be brought under cultivation by white people, who would do something for the country. I make the suggestion to the government, not with the view of provoking an acrimonious dispute with the provincial government, but with the view of the two governments getting together and settling the question of the ownership of these lands, so that some arrangement could be made for buying out the claims of the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. The question which my hon. friend has brought up is one of very great importance. It is of much greater importance in the province of British Columbia than in any of the other provinces, because though the area of that province is very great, the amount of agricultural land is comparatively small, and of that land, scattered all through the province, the Indians have taken their pick, with the result that the development of the province is undoubtedly very seriously retarded. When the reserves were set apart, and subsequently, in the negotiations between the province and the Dominion for the entrance of the province into the Dominion and for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, the question of the Indian reserves was dealt with, and the conditions respecting the reserves in British Columbia were made different from those respecting reserves in other parts of the Dominion. In other parts of the Dominion the Indians have an absolute right to the land, and when the land is disposed of the proceeds accrue to the Indians. But in the province of British Columbia, under the arrangement made between the province and the Dominion, the ultimate right in the land, the reversionary interest, is in the province. This is the agreement between the province and the Dominion. While, when this arrangement was made it looked like a preservation of the interests of the province, and as being in the best interests of the people of that province, as it came to be worked out it was found that instead of being for the benefit of the province in securing its development it has so far prevented the alienation of Indian lands, which are now unused, because it is perfectly clear that if the Indians are not going to get the benefit of the lands which they are not using, but which they might alienate, they are not going to alienate them or permit them to be alienated, and as a consequence the Indians all over British Columbia have been sitting tight and holding their thousand reserves in a thousand places in that province. The British Columbia government was not in a position to displace the Indians and neither was this government because, as the guardian of the Indians, being charged with the responsibility of their protection, it was not for this government to say to the Indians : you have too much land in this place, you must get off. On the other hand, the British Columbia government was not in a position to assert any right or authority to compel the Indians to get off and the result has been the holding up of the province. It was not the fault of either the Dominion

or the province but the position was such that the Dominion could not approach the Indians satisfactorily to secure the surrender of any of their reserves. The time came, however, when an opportunity seemed to occur in the case of the Metlakatla reserve at the port of Prince Rupert. When the Grand Trunk Pacific desired to acquire a large area of land upon that reserve for townsite purposes, it seemed as if something might be done ; the Indians were approached and asked if they would alienate a portion of that reserve at a figure, subject of course to the reversionary interest of the province of British Columbia. The agreement was entered into, the alienation was made so far as the Indians were concerned but then the province stepped in and said : Our rights are such that any relaxation of the hold of the Indians on any of these lands, transfers that land absolutely to us. That is the position in which that land stands to-day and of course as long as that situation continues, this government is absolutely debarred, as a business proposition, from undertaking to deal with any other reserve in the province of British Columbia. However, there have been negotiations between the two governments looking to a decision by the highest authority as to the respective rights of the Indians and the province in these lands. This government has agreed or suggested that the British Columbia government should join issue with us and have this question tried and finally settled. The Dominion government recognizes that it is not to the advantage of the Dominion that these fertile valleys in British Columbia should be held in the hands of people who do not use them. At the same time, as guardian of the Indians, it is not for us to undertake to displace them nor is it for us to trespass in any way on the rights of British Columbia. So we hope that with the concurrence of the province we will have it tried before the courts ; the Dominion will have to act for the Indians, not in any spirit of hostility to British Columbia, but merely is discharging the responsibility placed on us to guard the interests of the Indians. The matter will be tried in due time, and when a decision has been rendered it will be possible to deal with the reserves in a more businesslike way than in the past.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a matter of importance as any one who has visited British Columbia and is at all familiar with the situation will realize. I have had occasion to bring this matter up several times when this vote was under review in past years. It seems to me that it ought to be a very easy matter for the two governments, presided over presumably by business men, to get together, even without the intervention of the courts and arrange this matter in such a way that the Indians will be much better provided for by the proceeds of the sale of these lands than by their possession. Any one familiar with the reserves knows that, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Vancouver, they are in many instance close to towns, and valuable lands are thus prevented from being used for settlement, which is not in the interest of the country ; and this also brings the Indians into too close communication with modern civilization, which is not always an advantage to the Indians. The two governments should get together in a friendly spirit, and in a business way settle the question ; let the lands be put up to public tender and sale and the proceeds divided, a portion going to buy out the reversionary interest of the province and the balance going to the Indians.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. This is such an important question from a British Columbia standpoint, that it is scarcely proper to discuss it in connection with the salaries of the officials of the Indian Department. I might say, however, that even if a judicial decision is secured in reference to this matter, I do not think it would settle it so far as the Indians or the people of British Columbia are concerned. If the courts hold that the province of British Columbia has a reversionary interest, we are just in the position we are in now, that is that there shall be no encouragement to the Indians to abandon the right to their reserves and nothing would be done.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only question that would come before the court ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I suppose so. I suggest that as this government has secured 3,500,000 acres in the Peace River Valley, and 6,500,000 acres in the railway belt in British Columbia, the minister ought to bargain with the provincial government and offer to exchange a portion of this land taken from the province of British Columbia for the reversionary interest in the Indian reserves. If the province should abandon its reversionary interest in the Indian reserves these reserves should be dealt with by the department just as in other parts of the Dominion. To-day, of the whole Similkameen valley, one of the richest in the Dominion, only half is open to cultivation. There is room there for from 100 to 200 families growing fruit. It is absolutely impossible, under present conditions, to have anything done with it. The Indians quite properly say : We do not want to do anything ; if we abandon our right to the reserve, any money to which we are entitled for abandoning that right goes into the provincial exchequer, not into our pockets at all, so why should we abandon our right ? Thus it is practically impossible to do anything while you have what is to all intents and purposes dual authority over the lands of the Indians. I would throw out the sug-

gestion to the minister that if we can get prompt action by giving the province of British Columbia a quid pro quo for its reversionary interests in the shape of lands, and you have plenty of land in the province of British Columbia, owned by this government, it would be an easy and satisfactory method of settling the difficulty.

Mr. OLIVER. I only want to say a word as to the suggestion that we ought to be able to arrive at a satisfactory and amicable solution of this difficulty by agreement with the province of British Columbia. There was a time when we hoped to be able to do that. But, in view of, what seems to me, the very extraordinary attitude taken by the province in this matter—that is, its view that whatever the Indians do to release any portions of the lands that act thereby transfers that land to the ownership of the province—as long as the province maintains that attitude we have nothing to negotiate ; we are not in a position to make any bargain in regard to any thing. We believe that that is not warranted under the law, and, believing that, and being guardians of the Indians, we are not able to accept it. But, should it be decided by the privy council that the contention of the province is right, of course we should accept it, and we would then be in a position to negotiate with the province, acknowledging that the land was theirs.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any question as to the reversionary right of the province, say in case of abandonment of the land by the Indians ? Is not that settled ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are many questions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not admitted that if the Indians sell out the land it goes to the province.

Mr. FOWLER. It is only in case of the dying out of the tribe ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is very different from the selling out of their rights by the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. Speaking generally, and without prejudice—I want that to be understood, because I am not familiar with all the details—it is admitted that on the dying out of a band of Indians, in the case of certain of the reserves of the province, their land would thereby become the sole property of the province. But that is not the point at issue. The point is in regard to portions of the reserve not in use by the Indians. We believed, at the time we entered into this transaction with regard to the Metlakatla reserve, that it was perfectly within the right of the Indians to alienate that part of the reserve which they thought it was more in their interest to alienate than to hold. But the province of British Columbia holds that, it matters not under what condition, as soon as the Indian lets go, their right steps in. That, of course, puts negotiation out of possibility. The only course is to submit the matter to the courts. Once it is decided, we shall know our position. I can assure the House and the country that this government has no intention or desire to contest any right of the province of British Columbia. But it must discharge the duty placed upon it of maintaining the rights of the Indians. To go into the matter a little deeper, there are several classes of cases in these reserves in British Columbia. There are reserves which were set apart when British Columbia was a crown colony—set apart by imperial authority and direction. There are reserves which were set apart by the province before it entered the Dominion. There are reserves which were set apart after the province entered the Dominion. And the question of the reserves within the railway belt is in a somewhat different position from the others. Having these four or five different classes of reserves, everybody will agree, I think, that it is very desirable, in the interests of the province on the one hand and of the Indians on the other, that there should be a judicial decision in regard to it.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose the province had the reversionary right after the Indians where it was a case of the extinction of the tribe or abandonment. But, if, as has been pointed out, this is not a case of the extinction of the tribe, the matter ought to be finally settled by the courts.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to call the attention of the minister to a matter of great importance to the settlers in the country in which I live. This may not be exactly the best time to discuss it, but the importance of the case is my justification for speaking of it now. I speak of the shipping of cattle from the Piegan reserve and an incident which occurred there during the month of November. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is aware of the situation of this reserve, and knows that it is surrounded on all sides by an agricultural and stock country, and that the railway—the only railway in that southern country—passes through this reserve. The stock men this year, for the first time, sold their cattle by weight. The only scale on the railway for a distance of a hundred miles is situated on the reserve. The settlers who had cattle to ship drove their cattle as usual to the corral on that reserve where the scale is. They have been shipping there for a number of years and never had any trouble until this particular case arose in November. They were marking and shipping their cattle for about three days when the police came along and arrested the man in charge of the shipment of cattle. This man was taken as a prisoner to the agency and fined $10 a day for the time they were on the reserve, besides costs of $5.75. The accused wanted the

case remanded in order that he might have opportunity to consult a lawyer and make his defence. But this remand was refused by the agent who, as magistrate, tried the case. Taking it all round, it seems to me this was a very arbitrary piece of work. The stockmen of that locality may wish to ship cattle this year. They might be shipping even now, or any time during the fore part of the winter. I would like to know if this matter has been brought to the attention of the department, and, if so, what steps have been taken to protect the cattlemen and give them an opportunity to ship their cattle at that point.

Mr. OLIVER. The matter was brought to the attention of the department when it occurred, and we have had the inspector of agencies visit the locality to make a report. I would not like to express myself further in regard to the matter until I receive the inspector's report. But I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) that the interests of the cattlemen who ship at that point will receive every consideration, subject, of course, to the rights of the Indians.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to impress upon the minister very strongly the importance of a settlement of that question to the people in that locality. As I have stated this reserve is surrounded by stockmen, and this is the only point between Lethbridge and the Crow's Nest Pass where they can ship, selling by weight. In shipping at that point, they are doing no injury to the reserve or to anybody, and I am sure that it is in accordance with the public interest as well as to their own advantage that they should have an opportunity to ship on this Piegan reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no doubt I shall be able to give the result of the report received when we get into other estimates of the department.

Mr. STAPLES. In previous sessions, I have called the attention of the minister to the case of the town of Swan Lake in the province of Manitoba, and have urged that he should acquire the Indian reservation at that point. I would like to know what progress is being made in this matter. This is a matter that I have brought to the attention of the minister every session of this parliament. He has given me his promise that he will do his utmost to try and acquire this particular reservation in order that it may be settled up by a class of agriculturists who will advance the interests of this particular town and locality. I would like to know what success the minister has had in arriving at a settlement with the Indians of that reservation.

Mr. OLIVER. I had a special agent visit the reserve comparatively recently and within a few days we received his report. He was not able to get a surrender of the whole reserve, but he was able to get a surrender of about one-half of it, and I think it would be well for us to accept the terms in regard to the part that he was able to secure a surrender of.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. minister tell me what portion of the reserve he has been able to get a surrender of?

Mr. OLIVER. The sections on the north and west sides of the reserve.

Mr. STAPLES. I presume the minister will be able to give me full information about it in a few days?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I can by to-morrow or the day after, if the hon. gentleman will allow the matter to stand until then. I will bring down a sketch and memo. as to the proposed surrender and lay it on the table.

Mr. STAPLES. That will be very satisfactory.

Mr. LAKE. Has the minister made up his mind that he will sell the surrendered portion of the Crooked Lakes reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. The reserve is now surveyed and we can sell it at any time. Our intention was to sell it in the spring. We thought that, perhaps, under all the circumstances, during the present fall the best price might not be realized, and that we might be able to do better in the spring.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the minister if the department has on file any report in regard to the proposal for the removal of the St. Mary's reserve opposite the city of Fredericton to a location more distant from the city?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, our information is that the Indians will not consent to the proposed removal.

Mr. CROCKET. The Indian Commissioner, I believe, has very strongly advised it, has he not? Of course it cannot be accomplished without the consent of the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is an Indian reserve the Indians have absolute rights so long as they choose to assert them, and we are not in a position to remove them except with their consent.

Mr. BLAIN. Does Mr. MacRae, the Inspector of Agencies, make a written report to the department?

Mr. OLIVER. He reports in writing each inspection that he makes.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to lay on the table the most recent report.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend wish to mention any particular report?

Mr. BLAIN. The last report Mr. MacRae has made.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that he does not make a general report but only a particular report on each inspection. If the hon. gentleman wishes to have these reports covering a certain period——

Mr. BLAIN. Say for the last six months.

Mr. OLIVER. All right.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. minister whether he has had brought to his attention the report of Mr. Bryce on the condition of health of the Industrial schools in Manitoba and the Northwest?

Mr. OLIVER. The investigation was made on my order.

Office of the Auditor General—salaries, $70,425; contingencies, $18,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The increases there are statutory and to provide for certain promotions which the Auditor General desires to make. He proposes to appoint one additional chief clerk, to promote three second-class clerks to first class, to promote three junior seconds to second class, to promote four third-class to junior seconds, and to appoint five extra clerks to third-class clerkships at their present salaries. That is extra clerks who are now in the temporary class and are paid out of contingencies will be made permanent. In the contingencies there is an increase of $1,000 which includes fifteen statutory increases. The Auditor General proposes to ask that of his temporary clerks five be placed on the permanent list, and that will leave some vacancies on the temporary list for emergencies as they arise from time to time.

Mr. U. WILSON. Why should the item for contingencies be so large?

Mr. FIELDING. The item of contingencies includes temporary clerks who are not on the permanent list. If they are on the permanent list they appear under the head of civil government, but if they are not permanent they are paid out of contingencies.

Mr. U. WILSON. How many are there of them?

Mr. FIELDING. Twenty.

Mr. U. WILSON. Are they constantly employed? If so, why are they not on the permanent list?

Mr. FIELDING. The practice is to have a number of temporary people who are sometimes employed longer than one expects, but the theory of their appointment is that when the work is not pressing they may be dropped.

Mr. U. WILSON. Do you not think that is a pretty large number?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. FIELDING. You must have some elasticity. There are seasons when the work of the Auditor General is very pressing, and you must have these extra clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. How many chief clerks are there in all?

Mr. FIELDING. Last season's appropriation for chief clerks made provision for seven and we propose to give eight.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the positions all filled last year?

Mr. FIELDING. There are seven actually in the service now.

Mr. FOSTER. Were there seven all through the year?

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General informs me that I am mistaken. There were six actually in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there was provision made last year for seven?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. But there was not an additional one appointed?

Mr. FIELDING. No, that is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason for making provision and then finding it is unnecessary?

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General informs me that provision was made by his predecessor, but that he did not carry out what was his apparent intention. He did not create the office.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the same remark apply to the first-class clerks?

Mr. FIELDING. The number of first-class clerks proposed now is six as against five.

Mr. FOSTER. There seems to have been only four last year.

Mr. FIELDING. You have to add Mr. Bissonnette, who was a second-class clerk, and has been promoted since the 31st March, after the Auditor General's Report was issued.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the promotions you propose to make?

Mr. FIELDING. The names are not yet determined. They will be largely, if not wholly, in the way of seniority. The first step is to get the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same time it is usual to find out the intention of the department, as otherwise we can have no effective criticism.

Mr. FIELDING. It would be very inconvenient if every time we asked a vote for a public servant we had to determine who is to fill the vacancy. Some times it is easy to indicate, but in others it is not.

There is no list of names submitted. We are asking a vote to make these promotions and will after decide who are entitled to them.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you propose to make them in order of seniority?

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General says he cannot answer for every individual. As a rule they are made by seniority, but not necessarily so.

Mr. BERGERON. Our former Auditor General frequently complained of not having sufficient clerks to do the work properly. He wanted to change the whole office. Is our present Auditor General satisfied that he has sufficient men to do the work as it should be done?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken as regards our former Auditor General. He never asked for the appointment of additional clerks to his office without his request being granted. My rule has been to allow the Auditor General, who is not exactly an official of my department, but an official of parliament, a very free hand as to the number of his clerks and the promotions he should make. In every instance the clerks asked by the Auditor General are granted and their promotions made as he desires.

Mr. BERGERON. I remember well our former Auditor General complaining. However, it makes no difference if the present Auditor General is satisfied with his staff.

Mr. FIELDING. He has got all he has asked for.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board —salaries, $66,352.50; contingencies, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $14,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The contingencies are the same as last year. The increases are entirely to provide for the statutory increases which we propose to give to all who are eligible.

Mr. FOSTER. What was expended on the contingencies last year?

Mr. FIELDING. The expenditure for the last fiscal period of nine months was $10,195.91.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no change there?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Department of Customs—salaries, $81,862.50; contingencies, $7,000.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). There is no change in the commissioner and assistant commissioner. In the chief clerks there is a decrease of $462.50 owing to the promotion of Mr. Frost from first-class to the position of chief clerk. Mr. Farrow was made assistant commissioner. His salary was $2,500. Mr. Frost was promoted to his place at $1,937.50, being $562 decrease. The $50 statutory increase went to the remaining two chief clerks, which makes the net decrease $462.50.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Farrow gets the full $3,000?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. There is no change in the first-class clerks except the statutory increase of $50.

Mr. FOSTER. They all get the statutory increase?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, all who are not at the maximum. In the second-class provision is made for a statutory increase to all, twelve at $50 each.

Mr. FOSTER. In the juniors you have four additional. What is the reason for that?

Mr. PATERSON. There is a provision made for statutory increases to all of this class who are not at the maximum. There are twenty-four at $50 each, and two at $12.50 each, making a total increase of $1,225. The two who get the $12.50 each increase get it to the 1st of July, which makes the difference. The two who only get the $12.50, the portion to which they are entitled of the statutory increase, Mr. Ross and Mr. Rochester, will not reach the maximum until the 1st of July, 1908, and their promotion will have to be considered later. Owing to the transfer of four from the outside to the inside in the current fiscal year at less salary than estimated for in 1907-8, there was an over-estimate of $400. There was an over-estimate in the current fiscal year of $400 on the item of junior second-class clerks; deducting this from $1,225 for statutory increases there is a net increase of $825. We brought some officers from the outside. We could not bring them in at a higher rate and we have estimated higher. We also provide for four additional junior second-class clerks; one at $1,000 and three at $900 each, total, $3,700. This provision for new clerks and the $825 for statutory increases makes a total of $4,525 under this item. I may say that these four clerks are really in the service now and are engaged in this work, but hitherto they have been paid out of the vote for the Board of Customs and we desire to bring them into the regular civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. The other vote will be decreased ?

Mr. PATERSON. It should be decreased; it is not our intention to fill their places. There may however be an increase in that vote on account of other expenses..

Public Works Department, $77,187.50.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). There is a very slight change from last year, the increase being only $575,

and that is made up entirely of statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Practically all have had statutory increases ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All that are eligible.

Mr. BENNETT. If the deputy minister is here I would like to get information with reference to the valuation fees paid for the new departmental buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would not that discussion more properly come up on the estimates for the new buildings ?

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps so, but if the deputy were here we might have the information now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The deputy is not here, but I will have the information for these particular items when they come before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that Mr. M. N. Mathé, a second-class clerk, has been paid $427 for travelling expenses ; how was that expended ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the short time I have been in the department it has come under my notice that quite a number of clerks are necessarily sent to look after public works in various parts of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. Mathé seems to be a second-class clerk.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He might have some special information which would enable him to attend to particular work. I will obtain the information.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that, and the travelling expenses of Gelinas, $369.

Mr. DANIEL. There seems to have been only $44,000 expended last year out of the $62,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be accounted for by the fact that the Auditor General's Report only covers a period of nine months.

Mr. BENNETT. At page V—23, Auditor General's Report there is an item of $704 for Mr. W. O'Mara in connection with that land purchase ; is he on the permanent staff.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is not. The purchase of the land for the new Dominion buildings was quite a large purchase and there were a good many properties to acquire. A gentleman was appointed to examine the properties, make a valuation, and endeavour to acquire the properties by purchase. He was of course also instructed to arrange for the expropriation of those properties which could not be acquired otherwise. In the discharge of his duties he felt it necessary to employ the gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers. His employment was temporary.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BENNETT. Who was that—Mr. Riopelle ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Riopelle was the gentleman who was appointed to acquire the properties.

Mr. BENNETT. I find on page V—329 and 330 of the Auditor General's Report some correspondence about a payment to a clerk named Emile Lacas of $129.16. It would seem to have been a question between the Auditor General and the Deputy Minister as to whether or not this man earned the money. The Auditor General calls attention to the fact that the records of the department prove that the man had worked during the month in question, and he makes this note :

Mr. Lacas' time-book has not yet been received, and the payment is still withheld.

I was in error in saying he had been paid. Is the minister aware whether the matter has been cleared up ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware. Mr. Lacas has applied for leave of absence. He is at the head of one of the photographic branches of the department. I have been aware in a general way of the discussion that has taken place between the Deputy Minister and the Auditor General, but I am not aware whether the matter has been settled.

Mr. BENNETT. Is he still in the employ of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is still in the employ of the department, but I have recommended that he be granted a short leave of absence.

Mr. BENNETT. And he is now on leave of absence ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know whether he has actually taken the leave or not.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister inform the committee what his policy is in respect to his employees taking part in elections ? We have the advantage of a new minister, and I think the present is an opportune time for him to lay down a policy in this respect. We have had some trouble in regard to that in the past, and we do not wish to allow our new minister to get into the same trouble.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure I appreciate and desire to express my appreciation of my hon. friend's anxiety not to get me into any trouble, and it will be a great pleasure to me to have his assistance at all times. I am not aware that any of the officials of the department over which I preside have taken part in elections ; I do not think it would be desirable, and I would discourage such a practice. I received a request that a gentleman employed in my department might do certain clerical work in connection with elections by reason of

his having certain knowledge which would fit him for the work, but I refused to give the permission. I think it is better that the clerks should confine themselves strictly to the work of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. I would think that such an application would indicate to the minister that something of that kind had gone on in the past.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I am not at all prepared to say that. The application came from one who I would suppose had not any particular bias; but I thought it well to adopt the policy, which I have no reason to suppose was not the policy in the past that the officials should adhere as strictly as possible to the work of the department and not take part in election matters.

Mr. BENNETT. I find at page V—327 that a gentleman named Mr. Vautelet has made a very large claim on the department. It would seem that this gentleman had been engaged to prepare certain plans for what is known as the St. Andrew's dam. Is that the dam below Winnipeg?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems extraordinary that a department manned as this department is, with skilful and experienced engineers and draftsmen, should have to go outside and employ a gentleman for $15,000 to prepare these plans. I think it will rather astonish the people of the country to learn that when a work of this nature, not of any extraordinary technical difficulty, is to be undertaken, the Department of Public Works has to confess its inability to supply a competent man for that work—either that or the work of the department is so pressing that no person can be spared to take it up. The hon. gentleman has assumed the control of a department that has not given much satisfaction to the people of this country during the last ten years, for almost every session the answer to every query is: 'I knew nothing about it, I had nothing to do with it, I was not the minister, some one else had it in charge.' This is a claim of such striking size that I would ask the minister if he could give the House an explanation—first, under what minister this engagement was made, why the sum of $15,000 has not been paid over, and why it is that of this large amount $5,000 has been paid, and Mr. Lafleur, the engineer of the department, recommends the payment of $5,000 further, and does not recommend the payment of the bill in its entirety. The last letter of the Auditor General's Department says this, over the signature of Frederick Hayter, for the Auditor General:

There should, I think, be an order in council for an arrangement of this magnitude. If one has already been obtained, please have a copy furnished to this office.

In making a large payment outside of the department for services similar to those generally performed by the departmental officials, it would be well to give an explicit statement of the reason for so doing—whether lack of time in the department or extra technicality in the work under discussion.

The rate of 3½ per cent should be certified by the chief engineer as 'fair and just.'

I ask the minister what explanation can possibly be given for going outside the department technical staff and asking a man to prepare plans with such a large consideration as this, no less than $15,000. If any head of a department may do this without, as the Auditor General properly says, going before Council, where is the limit? The Minister of Public Works would have just as much right to engage an engineer at $100,000 as at $15,000. I would ask the minister, who has not been long in his department, are any obligations of this nature now being incurred in connection with any public enterprise? Has the minister himself personally contracted with any engineers or contractors for work outside and if so to what extent? I am not aware that the minister has done anything of this kind, and I wish to ask him what his policy in respect to such undertakings will be in the future.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend's question is a very proper one, and one to which answer as full and satisfactory as possible should be given. The facts of the case are that Mr. Vautelet, of Montreal, is an architect enjoying a very high reputation for the erection of large works, more particularly where the construction is of steel. He has done a good deal of work for the Canadian Pacific Railroad in connection with very expensive buildings. As hon. gentlemen are aware, there has been until recent years considerable delay and dissatisfaction in connection with the construction of the important works known as the locks at the St. Andrews' rapids, below Winnipeg. My information is that the then minister, Hon. Mr. Hyman, felt that in undertaking these works, with a view of having them constructed with as little delay as possible, and of the most perfect character, he was justified in calling in the best engineering skill it would be possible to obtain, and it was he who employed Mr. Vautelet, for the superstructure of this dam at the Red River rapids. Hon. gentlemen may ask themselves as to whether or not this was a prudent act on the part of the minister. I am not at all prepared to say that when the department is engaging in a work of great magnitude and unusual character, it is at all imprudent or improper to engage the services of outside engineers or architects. Mr. Hyman took the view that this work required such skill on the part of the designer that his course was in the public interest and I am not prepared to question his judgment. We know that railway companies

when engaging in the erection of large buildings or other important works of unusual cost go beyond their own staffs and employ specialists who have been successful in the particular class of work called for, as the Grand Trunk Railway have done in calling in one of the leading architects of New York to design their new hotel in Ottawa, which it is desired to make one of the finest on the continent. It must be remembered in justification of such a course that an error of judgment on the part of the designer of such a structure might cost hundreds or thousands of times the amount of money expended for the services of such an engineer or architect.

Mr. BERGERON. Was this gentleman not engaged before Mr. Hyman became minister ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not for the St. Andrews locks.

Mr. BERGERON. He was for the Quebec harbour ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is another matter ; that was for the plans of some works at Montreal in connection with the harbour improvements but the department did not pay his claim in regard to that and a suit is now pending in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the same man ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the same gentleman who was employed by Mr. Tarte in connection with some very large works at Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that case is now before the courts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but that has nothing to do with the matter. I find here a memorandum from Mr. Hyman accepting Mr. Vautelet's offer that he should be paid 5 per cent on the cost of the work. This matter has engaged my attention since I have been minister, I have been applied to for the payment of the balance of this claim ; I have the matter under consideration and no payment will be made without an order in council. The matter will be fully considered. I have not employed any outside architects or engineers, and I am not aware of any outside engineer being now in the employ of the department for special work; of course in saying this I do not include what we call the non-permanent staff.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not aware of the nature of the work at the St. Andrew's dam as I have not seen the plans, and I quite agree that on a work of that kind, where there are special difficulties, it would not be out of the way to call in an outside engineer. But let me review this gentleman's whole connection with the department. In the first place the department employs him

for some sheds at Montreal. I do not know the ground of the action now pending, whether he was not properly hired by the department or whether the services rendered were insufficient. While I am willing to admit that there might be cases where the department should call in a gentleman from outside to give the benefit of his experience, it seems to me that the people of Canada will wonder why, we have to go outside the department and obtain the services of a gentleman at an expense of $12,250 for the preparation of plans for ordinary freight sheds at Quebec.

Now, I do not know what was the character of these sheds, but I suppose they were plain and of structural iron, like other freight sheds in different parts of the country. It must be a matter of wonderment to the public that the Department of Public Works declares, in effect, that its chief engineer is not capable of putting up an ordinary iron shed. You can hardly go into any little town in the province of Ontario where you will not see a skating rink or a large hall which has been erected by a local architect. And here we have an ordinary iron framework shed, and the department admits that it has not an engineer capable of preparing the plans for such a structure, but must go to an outsider and pay him $12,250 to prepare plans. I have heard something of the connection of this engineer with the Public Works Department. That he was a friend of the former minister (Mr. Tarte) goes without saying. And his claim is of such a nature that the department for reasons of its own —but reasons well known to the public— have refused to pay it, and here we find him a creditor of this Dominion to the amount of $12,250 in respect of these sheds erected in Quebec. It is now about six o'clock, and perhaps the minister may be able to give us this evening a description of the sheds re-erected in Quebec.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not give a description of the sheds erected in Quebec. I think they were very elaborate in design, but they were not erected.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) might give us the proportions of these buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will try to do that.

Mr. BENNETT. Even though we may have no great technical knowledge of this subject, we may be able to reach some conclusion as to whether the department should have gone outside to employ an architect or engineer to design this building. Perhaps the minister will give us the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Ministers' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company. Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada. —Mr. Cash.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Department of Public Works—salaries, $62,-187.50; contingencies, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) that I asked the deputy minister to obtain the information in regard to the extent of the works in connection with the superstructure of the lock at St. Andrew's rapids for which Mr. Vautelet was employed, and also in regard to the sheds at Quebec. He has not apparently been able to get the information yet. I would suggest that my hon. friend give me a memorandum of any other matters which occur to him now and I will get the information. The public works items will be up for discussion again when we come to page 63 of the printed estimates. Then I will be able to give very much fuller and more satisfactory information than I can hope to do now.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that will be quite satisfactory.

Department of Agriculture—salaries, $83,-500; contingencies, $22,750.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). In regard to civil government, the committee will see that there is a decrease. That is due to the dropping of two third-class clerks. It has been our practice to raise patent examiners who have served a certain length of time to the grade of first-class clerks. We have raised two examiners to first-class clerkships, but we have not filled up the vacancies thus created. The amount asked for printing and stationery is the same as last year.

Department of Inland Revenue—salaries, $51,012.50; contingencies, $7,000.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The total increase is $85. Two officials were superannuated, and statutory increases were given the others, and the difference between the two is the $85. The aggregate number of employees is the same as last year.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the superannuation allowance to the two men ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Burns, aged 75, gets $1,018.10 retiring allowance. Mr. Dunne, aged 46, gets $766.66. The latter, though a comparatively young man, was absolutely incapacitated by rheumatism. He was from twenty to twenty-five years in the service. The former was about thirty-four years in the service and was retired at his own request.

Department of Mines—salaries, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $87,742.50.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The increase is more apparent than real. The Department of Mines was organized last year, and officials who were then serving the government in the outside service were brought into this department. For instance, Dr. Eugene Haanel, now director, receiving $3,000 per year. Mr. Nystrom, a mining engineer, $1,837.50. These were paid from a vote of $5,500 for the Mines Branch of the Interior Department voted last year. Their salaries are now voted as officials of the Mines Branch. In addition, B. F. Haanel, E. Lindeman, H. Leverin, all mining engineers, were on the temporary staff, also paid from the same vote, so that the increase is more apparent than real. There is no increase except the statutory $50 in the case of Mr. Nystrom. The other increases are all statutory. There are twenty-eight technical officers. Dr. Bell's salary remains at $3,000. All the others received $50 increase except in the case of Mr. Denis, who gets an increase of $300. Mr. Denis is a technical officer of high standing, who has been attached permanently to the Mines Branch and his salary made similar to those paid other technical officers. This will account for all the increases. There are no new appointments but simply a transfer from the temporary to the permanent staff.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does this include the Geological Survey officials ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This $12,000 is added in salaries taken from the Interior Department ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Formerly these officials I have named and who have been put on the permanent staff, were paid from the vote of $55,000 for the Mines Branch of the Interior Department last session.

Mr. BERGERON. So that will not appear in the other item.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The vote for the Mines Branch of the Interior Department will be reduced by a relative amount, although I think in the other estimates we are asking quite as large a sum as before for the purpose of carrying on the Mines Branch.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a transfer of salary from one branch to the other ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention to do away with the Geological Survey Department as a separate department ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No. There are very few votes in these estimates asked for the Mines Branch, in all seven officials, while in the Geological Survey Branch there are about forty.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the number of officials in that department ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. About forty-six in the entire department.

Mr. CROCKET. How many in the Geological Survey ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Twenty-eight technical officers ; two first-class, three second-class and five junior second-class, who receive salaries ranging from $3,000 down to $800.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much devoted to the Mines Branch ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. One officer, $3,000 ; one at $1,837 ; two at $1,850 ; one at $1,750 ; one at $850 and one at $800.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What duties have been discharged by the head of the Mines Branch, and the other prominent officers?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Cirkel, M.E., is investigating the chrome iron ore deposits of the Eastern townships, after which he will collect material in the province of Ontario for the report on the mining metalurgical industries of Canada. Mr. J. W. Bell, M.E., is collecting material in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, for the report on the mining and metallurgical industries of Canada; Mr. Robert Hedley, M.E., is obtaining material in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, for the same report; Mr. Lindeman, M.E., is to investigate the iron ore deposits of Vancouver Island and conditions necessary for the inauguration of an iron industry in British Columbia. Mr. Nystrom, M.E., is to investigate the peat industry in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Germany, Holland and Ireland, and we expect to have his report at an early date. Mr. B. F. Haanel, B. Sc., is investigating the iron ore property in the township of Leeds, and Mr. J. J. Bell is collecting statistics in Ontario and Quebec for the report on the mining and metallurgical industry of Canada. It is intended to issue a very comprehensive report and we hope a very creditable report on the mining and metalurgical industries in Canada.

Trade and Commerce—salaries, $24,025; contingencies, $11,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is Mr. W. T. R. Preston, please?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Preston is in Yokohama.

Mr. BERGERON. What is he doing there?

Mr. FIELDING. He is supposed to be a commercial agent looking after the extension of Canadian trade.

Mr. BERGERON. I see there was a Mr. Preston present at a dinner given by the Tokio Board of Trade to the Hon. Mr. Lemieux, is that the same gentleman?

Mr. FIELDING. Very likely, he is in Japan.

Mr. BERGERON. If he is in Yokohama he cannot be in Tokio.

Mr. FISHER. They are only eighteen miles apart.

Mr. BERGERON. I don't know as much about Japan as does the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. If you did you would not put that question.

Mr. FIELDING. A slow train could take him there in a couple of hours, and it is worth going eighteen miles to a good dinner. Provision is made for the annual statutory increases and the increase in the department is only $212.50. The chief item in contingencies is an increase of $1,000 on account of the department having to pay postage on packages which formerly went free.

Mr. U. WILSON. I think this is the department that employs Mr. J. L. Haycock, the inspector of binder twine.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. U. WILSON. Well, three or four days before voting day last general election Mr. Haycock appeared on the public platform in my town in company with a cabinet minister and made a strong speech against me.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what he is paid for.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I want to know if officers paid out of the public treasury are to be allowed to go round stumping against members who are opposed to the government. If the Minister of Finance wants to read an account of Mr. Haycock's doings on that occasion he will find it in the Toronto 'Globe' of the 29th of October,

1904. I object to that sort of thing, and I do not think that kind of an official should be retained in the public service.

Mr. BENNETT. Send him up our way.

Mr. FOWLER. You will take care of him.

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) brought the matter up last year and perhaps the year before, and there must be some statutory limitation in these things. If my hon. friend desires my opinion I have no hesitation in saying that I think that where a man does not receive a living salary; where he receives some small salary which is not a living wage, there may be some difficulty in defining his proper status; but where a man receives a living salary he has no business to take any part whatever in politics other than to exercise his franchise as a citizen. That is the view I have always held, and I would strongly enforce it wherever it came within my authority so to do. But sometimes, I do not say it is so in the present case, many of our officers receive but a very small allowance and it is pretty hard to draw the line in such cases. I would say unhesitatingly that every officer of the government who receives a living wage ought to abstain from any political action except the right to exercise his franchise.

Mr. BENNETT. Does any minister enforce that principle?

Mr. FIELDING. Every minister should do it as far as possible, and if it has not been done thoroughly in the past, I would not hesitate to say that it ought to be done.

Mr. U. WILSON. Mr. Haycock gets $1,600 a year salary, and $1,300 a year for expenses, which is more money than he ever earned before in any one year in his lifetime. I think his present office is simply a reward because when he was leader of the Patrons he gave a guarantee that he would not see Sir Oliver Mowat defeated in the local House. I know Mr. Haycock very well, and I know he has been accused on several occasions in my riding of distributing money and trying to bribe voters in the rear of my county. Perhaps that is not since he has been an officer of this government, but it is nevertheless true. I want the Minister of Finance to know Mr. Haycock's general character. I need not tell him how low he was before he got this office and how near he was to a bar-room loafer, and his own brother-in-law told me on the streets of Napanee that he was the biggest liar between Napanee and Gaspé.

Mr. FIELDING. Does Ottawa lie between these points?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is the character his brother-in-law gives to Mr. Haycock, to whom this government is paying $1,600 of salary and $1,300 or $1,400 of expenses, and allowing him or permitting him to go on the stump against an opponent.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to ask if it is true that Mr. E. H. S. Flood has been appointed a trade commissioner?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What is his salary and his sphere of duty?

Mr. FIELDING. His salary is $3,000 a year, in addition to which he is entitled to travelling expenses. His work is to travel through the British West Indies, from island to island, with the view of interesting parties in the development of Canadian trade.

Mr. FOWLER. Haven't you men down there now supposed to be doing that work?

Mr. FIELDING. There are four local agents stationed at different points and receiving from $250 to $400 a year, very small sums, for which they cannot be expected to do very much service, and the idea is to have a commissioner who will be constantly on the move interesting people in Canadian trade. It is a most desirable move to encourage West Indian trade, and the prospects at present are more promising than usual.

Mr. FOWLER. What qualifications has Mr. Flood?

Mr. FIELDING. He is, I am informed, a university graduate. At all events, he is a well-educated man and has been engaged in business in the city of St. John, where he and his family are well known.

Mr. BENNETT. Have you still Mr. J. B. Jackson in England? If so, where is he and what is his salary?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Jackson is still the agent at Leeds, with a salary of $3,000 a year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. And how much expenses?

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever they are, I am not able to give the amount, because they are not covered by this vote.

Mr. BERGERON. I find by the Auditor General's Report that he was paid last year $4,197.07. Is that correct?

Mr. FIELDING. I believe so.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. As a matter of fact, his salary and expenses amount to from $5,000 to $6,000 a year. I have had returns on two or three occasions in regard to Mr. Jackson.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed that Mr. Jackson has offices in both Leeds and Hull, and, therefore, he would naturally incur greater expenses than some other agents. However, there is a special vote covering expenses, and when we reach that I shall

be glad to give any aditional information that may be sought.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many months in the year is Mr. Haycock in the employ of the government?

Mr. FIELDING. He is employed all the year around, his duties being inspector in the binder twine business, and he also checks the accounts rendered for bounty by the manufacturers of binder twine. He visits all the factories for that purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no danger of a conflict between the employees of the Department of Trade and Commerce and those of the Department of the Interior all over Europe?

Mr. FIELDING. No, their lines are different.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that Mr. Preston has nothing at all to do with immigration now?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BERGERON. How many of these agents of the government are in Europe today?

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be very happy to give the hon. gentleman the information later, as it does not come under this vote. The immigration agents come under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to know how many agents of the Department of Trade and Commerce are in Europe.

Mr. FIELDING. Six.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are they?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Ball at Birmingham, Mr. Jackson at Leeds and Hull, Mr. McKinnon at Bristol, Mr. MacNamara at Manchester, Mr. Poindron at Paris and Mr. Sontum at Christiania, making four in England and two on the continent.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is Mr. Preston?

Mr. FIELDING. He is in Yokohama or Tokio.

Mr. BERGERON. That would be seven.

Mr. FIELDING. But Tokio is not in Europe.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to know how many agents the Department of Trade and Commerce has in Europe, or China, or Russia, or anywhere else.

Mr. FIELDING. That was not my hon. friend's question. He asked for the number in Europe. In addition, Mr. Larke is in Sydney, Australia, Mr. D. H. Ross in Melbourne, Mr. Chesley in Cape Town, Mr. Donly in Mexico, Mr. McLean in Japan, five in the West Indies, of whom four are local men with small salaries and not in the same rank with the others, and Mr. Arnaud in St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. BERGERON. That is eighteen altogether. What are the duties of these gentlemen; does the department get any report from them and how does the department know whether or not they are doing any work for the money they receive?

Mr. FIELDING. These gentlemen make reports very frequently, which reports are mailed to every member of this parliament. I am afraid my hon. friend's mail has miscarried.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. I read these reports. It is very good reading, but does their work amount to a great deal for the country? It looks to me as if these appointments were made more to provide positions for some people than anything else.

Mr. FIELDING. The department is well satisfied with the results for the money we expend. If we had not these agents, I am sure my hon. friend would be the first to complain that we were not looking after our foreign trade. A trade agent is like an advertisement—you cannot just tell when the business will come, but in time the business increases and we hope that will be the case with these agents. At all events, every member of this House will feel that we should make an effort to get some share of the trade of the world, and if we do not send out these commissioners and make the effort we certainly will fail.

Mr. CROCKET. Which of these seventeen or eighteen agents enjoys the highest salary?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Preston gets $3,600, the others $3,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Preston, for the nine months ending March 1, received in addition $1,254.55 travelling expenses and $833.30 living allowance. Are the other agents entitled to living allowances?

Mr. FIELDING. No; Mr. Preston received living expenses because on his way to the east he went to South Africa, and did some temporary service there. But when he reaches Japan he becomes a salaried officer at $3,600 and is not entitled to living allowance. The others are not entitled to living allowance but are entitled to travelling expenses when travelling.

Mr. LALOR. Why was Mr. Preston removed from England?

Mr. FIELDING. He was regarded as a most excellent man for the work in the east and we like to send the best man where the work is most difficult.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Does the minister of his own knowledge, know if Alexander Smith, late Liberal organizer for Ontario,

was ever associated with Mr. Haycock in any seizures and paid for that service ?

Mr. FIELDING. The officer of the department assures me that he has no information of that kind and I can certainly say from my knowledge that I have no information. It might not have come under my notice but the officer of the department, who should know, assures me it is not so.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I refer to a seizure in the city of Chatham, against the M. J. Wilson cordage company in which Smith accompanied Haycock on the settlement of the seizure. The fine was collected by the Magistrate, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Haycock together in a private office. I asked the amount of the seizure last year and it was stated to be $300.02. Of this $67 was given by a cheque to Mr. Haycock and Mr. Smith's bill was $245. Mr. Smith refused to accept a cheque payable in Chatham for his share of the spoils, if they were spoils, he wanted the cash and when he could not get that he wanted a cheque payable at Toronto. The cheque was paid.

Mr. FIELDING. Whose cheque ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was drawn by the M. J. Wilson Cordage Company. I have the cheque and can produce it if the minister cares to see it.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend says he has the cheque I take it for granted that he has. If Mr. Smith were employed in a legal capacity it would be by the Department of Justice and any payment to him would come through that department. If my hon. friend will intimate what information he desires I will feel it my duty to inquire and at a later stage to answer any question he chooses to put.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to have the whole transaction gone into

Mr. FIELDING. At what date did this occur ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. In 1904-5. It is supposed that Mr. Smith came to Chatham in his official capacity as a government agent. The cheque was made out separately to Mr. Smith and he wanted to get his share. It does not appear in the Auditor General's Report except the fine, $300 and the $67 to Mr. Haycock.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand it, this comes out of the Department of Trade and Commerce and such a case should surely come within the knowledge of the deputy. It seems extraordinary that Mr. Smith, ex-Liberal organizer, should go up there with Mr. Haycock, also an ex-political organizer and take these people by the throat and that Mr. Smith should take $245 out of them. Such a case must surely be in the knowledge of the department. These men are well known, their characters and reputations are known all through the country. My hon. friend just described this man Haycock in accordance with his known reputation. Last night the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) described certain men as thieves and embezzlers in the public service. It is no use mincing matters, let us call a spade a spade. We have the case of Wagner, a convicted thief who is in the Department of the Interior. This man Jackson at Hull was stigmatized by Judge Street as a perjurer. It is about time that the public should know the true character of these men. It is a disgrace to Canada to have a man of the character and reputation of this fellow Jackson in England to-day. If the minister met a British cabinet minister in England to-day and was asked who Jackson was, I venture to say he would sacrifice the truth rather than tell his reputation, he would be ashamed to say that Canada had to-day as their agent in England, a man of the reputation of this man Jackson. Look at the department of Public Works. The second most important official in that department stands before the whole country, a convicted thief, as can be seen in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At what page does the hon. gentleman find that ?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall give it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman should give it now.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman wants to drag out the name of one of his officials I will give it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do, and if my hon. friend will pardon me, I think I have a right, when a statement of that kind is made in the Commons, as head of the department and in justice to the officials of the department to insist that the reference to the Auditor General's Report should be given so that it may be known to what official the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. BENNETT. I will give it when I sit down, but in the meantime I will make this statement of facts that last year after the Auditor General had challenged a large expenditure by an important clerk in his department—I will give his name privately unless the minister wants it publicly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do.

Mr. BENNETT. It is Mr. Gelinas, secretary of the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is not second in the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Secretary and the second official in his department, next to the deputy minister. When the Auditor General pointed out a large amount charged for hack hire what was the result ? He refunded the money, practically admitted that he had been embezzling. Where is he now ? Is he

not secretary of the department? I saw something in 'The Globe' the other day, saying that Mr. Foster should not use such words as 'thieves and embezzlers in the public service to-day.' Not one of the four ministers beside my hon. friend will deny this case, it has all been threshed out. He is the second most important to the deputy minister, in the department and there he sits to-day. There is a power behind these men which prevents their being put out of office. I am not blaming the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) for it, for he has only recently come into the department. It is the fault of the system that has gone on. Let me tell the Minister of Public Works that one thing he will find in the department is the sworn testimony of a man who was paid $3.50 a day to inspect dredge scows to see that they were filled with mud. This man cheerfully swore that he had not been near these scows and knew nothing about them, and also that an official on an adjoining scow had taken from him $1 a day for keeping it quiet. I can tell the minister that he will find an awful crowd when he goes among his people in the province of Ontario. If he will look up the tenders for the work at Port Arthur and Fort William, he will find that one firm put in two tenders under different names with the idea that, if there were no intervening tenders, the minister would be able to draw out the lower tender and let the work at the higher price. The Minister of Public Works is new to this arena.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to learn all I can.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, he will learn many things that will surprise him very much if he has been where matters were run fairly and above board. He should look up the evidence in respect to the Gelinas correspondence. Claims were made for pay for officers in the department. The pay-list was demanded by the Auditor General before he would pass the account. But the pay-list was not produced—I assume because it would prove that the claim was not an honest and straightforward one. All I can say, so far as this man Jackson and this man Preston are concerned is that, it would be more creditable for the country if both were out of the public service and decent men put in their places.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I may say for the information of the department that in the settlement of the seizure of the Chatham Cordage Company, settled on the 24th of February, I have the check to Mr. Haycock, giving him $67.50; the check to M. Houston, who was the magistrate in the case, $300.02; and check to Alex. Smith for $245.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he?

Mr. CLEMENTS. He is the Liberal organizer for the province of Ontario. I asked last year what the total expenses were, and the amount was given to me as being $349.02. I immediately wrote to the manager of the Cordage Company, Mr. Wilson, and he wrote me back saying that the settlement cost him $612.52. Now, I would like to know—and I hope the minister will go into the matter—why Mr. Alex. Smith could go up there in this capacity and extract $245 from Mr. Wilson.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a proper matter for inquiry. But what struck me as remarkable is that this is a matter which is at least three years old. If Mr. Wilson felt that he had a grievance, I should think he would have made a complaint to the minister. Is my hon. friend Mr. Clements aware whether he did so or not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I may give the facts which will explain to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) why this matter was not gone into before. This seizure took place at a time when the elections were spoken of. There was a short session, and the elections followed, and this seizure took place just prior to the time when the elections were to come off. Mr. Wilson and the whole management of the concern, some of them relatives of my own, were strong Conservatives. This seemed to be the only concern seized at that time. They realized the position that the seizure placed them in, and thought that if they wanted to do business they had better 'let sleeping dogs lie.' But the factory is now out of business and the machinery sold. The men concerned are anxious that the matter should be gone into. It was put into my hands last year, and I was going to bring it up in the Public Accounts Committee. But the session closed earlier than was expected and I left it over until this session.

Mr. FIELDING. But has the management ever made any representation to any minister of the Crown explaining this transaction. There are thousands of officials acting for the government. While it is quite possible something may occur which would give just cause of complaint, I would expect the party aggrieved to take the earliest possible opportunity of making his grievance known to the minister. If he made that complaint, and that complaint were not fairly dealt with, he would then be quite justified in bringing the matter up in this House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The manager of the concern gave this matter into my hands. Mr. Wilson is prepared to come here and give evidence of the whole case if that privilege is accorded him.

Mr. FIELDING. But that does not meet the point. Did Mr. Wilson make representations to the Minister of Trade and Commerce or any other minister complaining of having been wrongly treated? How could the government be blamed for not

affording him relief if they were not told that a wrong had been done ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I believe Mr. Wilson has made no complaint to any minister of the Crown. He complained to me and asked me to bring the matter up.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree that it is open to any citizen to have a grievance brought up in this House. But I think that if a citizen has a grievance against the government he should first make it known to the minister and give him an opportunity to make the matter right. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) will agree with me that it was Mr. Wilson's duty, the moment the error occurred, if it was an error, or the wrong was done, if it was a wrong, to make representation to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and demand an inquiry. If he could not do it at once for such reason as the hon. member has stated, he should have done it later. However, the matter is brought forward now, and I will see to it that the information is obtained.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The point is whether Mr. Alex. Smith was entitled to this $245—

Mr. FIELDING. I think that most of us, if we had been, as we believed, wrongly deprived of $200 or $300 four years ago, would have found a way to bring the subject to the attention of the proper minister instead of waiting so long and then bringing it up in parliament. That would have been the businesslike way of doing it. Mr. Wilson may have a grievance but the marvel is that he has nursed it and kept it to himself instead of bringing it to the attention of the proper minister.

Mr. LALOR. But it has been explained to the minister that this firm is now out of business, and its members are no longer afraid of Mr. Smith. While they were in business they were afraid to make complaints. Now, they bring it to the representative of their riding in this House to have it investigated.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that I cannot admit that that is a sufficient reason for this delay. The hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements) admits that he has had the case in his hands for over a year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I may tell the hon. minister that this matter was to have been brought up in the Public Accounts Committee prior to the closing of last session. I had no thought of the session closing when it did, but as soon as the matter was brought to my attention I gave notice of it, and I have taken the first opportunity of bringing it up.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the first name of this Mr. Wilson?

Mr. CLEMENTS. M. J. Wilson.

Mr. BOYCE. It was somewhat interesting to hear the words that dropped from the lips of the hon. Minister of Finance in regard to the non-complaint to any department or any responsible minister of the Crown in reference to the misdoings of an official of this government. I presume the hon. gentleman must be joking, I presume he must have forgotten the history of the past year, that he must be making a play upon the history of the past, upon the history that has been set forth in this House —and this is a matter of record—because we know and we know from bitter experience how futile it is, how puerile it is, how silly it is for any hon. gentleman in this House to have the audacity to complain to any responsible minister of the Crown, aye, to complain in parliament itself, of the misdoings of any official of this government. Complaints were made in regard to the conduct of a responsible officer of the government in the district of East Algoma. I am speaking of a certain postmaster. So grievous were those complaints that the inspector of this government was sent up there, that inspector went into that office, investigated the state of things and recommended that man's instant dismissal.

Mr. BENNETT. What for?

Mr. BOYCE. For theft; for larceny. He did his duty. What became of the charge? The man was allowed to resign. He was begged and entreated to resign, and four months having elapsed between the issue of the fiat for his dismissal and the time of his resignation he was paid during all that time, petted, pampered and kept in office by this government. Being a thief, being a man who had been reported to be a thief by their own official, the inspector of the Post Office Department, what became of him? He began to be very useful to this government in elections. He was used by the candidate of this government in the election and in the provincial election in January, 1905, and on the following 25th January, 1905, and in February, 1905, the same gentleman applied to the Postmaster General for his reinstatement and he was reinstated. There is one instance of the futility of complaining to a responsible minister of the Crown in this government of the misconduct of an official. Does the hon. gentleman want another instance? He is more familiar with the records of parliament than I am. Another occurs to me and it is right up in the same district. It is the case of the postmaster at Copper Cliff. Complaints were made, and a petition signed by over 500 residents of the town of Copper Cliff was sent to this government asking for the removal of the postmaster. It was alleged on the floor of this House, on the 12th July, 1906, as an absolute fact and proved by

the records of the court, that this man had been found guilty of corrupt practices in elections, and that he was still holding office. What became of him? Records of this parliament show that the Postmaster General stood up in his place and said that he saw no reason for interfering with the postmaster at Copper Cliff—Mr. W. C. Kilpatrick. That is another instance, and I could go on ad infinitum. There is the case of Philip Wagner in the Northwest. There a man was found guilty by the court of preying upon and stealing from the immigrants. While it was his duty to safeguard them he stole from them. He was indicted for it and he went to jail. During the time that he was in jail his salary was paid by this government, and when he was released this jail-bird was taken back into the arms of this paternal government and given a more important office with an increased salary. Surely the hon. Finance Minister must be perpetrating a little joke on this House when he taunts my hon. friend from Went Kent (Mr. Clements) with not having brought this matter at an earlier date to the attention of the government. These matters are brought to the attention of the government in this House and very little attention is paid to them, but later on they will be brought to the attention of the government through the medium of the popular vote.

Mr. FIELDING. We are quite accustomed to hearing hon. gentlemen say what they are going to do with the popular vote. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) will have to give us something newer and fresher if he wants to make any impression on the House. He began by saying that it was the silliest thing in the world to make any representations to this government or even to parliament and that, of course, is the explanation of the speech which he has just delivered. I have not sufficient familiarity with the various departments to give him a reply in regard to the various matters to which he has referred. Some of his questions have been discussed from time to time by the responsible ministers, and I remember that the explanations which they gave seemed to be fair and satisfactory.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman think the explanation was sufficient in regard to the Thessalon postmaster?

Mr. FIELDING. I remember that the impression I received was that it was sufficient.

Mr. BENNETT. The postmaster blamed the theft on his little girl.

Mr. FIELDING. May be so.

Mr. BENNETT. That satisfied the minister?

Mr. FIELDING. If I had to undertake the defence of the details of all the departments of the government on a vote respecting binder twine I am afraid that I would be undertaking a good deal. But I am ready to go back to the original complaint which is that a certain person was obliged to pay $200 or $300 improperly. If that gentleman had a grievance it was his duty to place it before the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and if he has failed to do so then he has no ground of complaint. Now that the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter I will feel it my duty to ask the department officials to look into it, but I think this man has no ground of complaint, because he failed to make representations to the proper officer.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the Finance Minister does not do himself justice. Talking of the Thessalon post office, he said that, having a recollection of all that happened in that case, the Postmaster General satisfied him that his course was right. What was the course of the Postmaster General? A friendly post office inspector was sent there to examine the books.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the hon. gentleman referring to? Where does this evidence appear?

Mr. BENNETT. In the report of the post office inspector at the time and in 'Hansard.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what year?

Mr. BENNETT. Several years.

Mr. FIELDING. It is annual.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, that is so, but the hon. gentleman is getting so calloused to these things that he lets them all pass by. There was a time when the hon. gentleman would wince in this House. I remember the temperance plebiscite vote in the province of Quebec when it was proved in this House and when the evidence was read to show that ballot boxes were systematically opened, that men who were members of this House, that men who are to-day judges, were implicated in it. When these ballot boxes were opened in the province of Quebec it was found that there were more votes recorded than there were votes on the list. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), the temperance apostle, pricking up his ears. When the returns were brought in there were only 30,000 votes polled against prohibition in the province of Quebec, while after there were 90,000 against. How were these returns made up?—by men opening the ballot boxes days after they were closed, filling them with ballots, and although the names of these offenders were sent wide and broad over the country, this government did not dare to make an inquiry. The record shows that there were more votes polled in these divisions against prohibition than there were names on the voters' list. The Min-

ister of Agriculture, who had been doing business on the temperance platform for years, had not the courage to say that there must be an investigation, there was no investigation and, to-day, in the 'Hansard' of parliament and the 'Hansard' of the Senate, there are to be found the names of men—members of this House—who were charged with complicity in these frauds. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had better abandon the position he has taken to-night, that this government is going to do what is right. Let him take the brave stand which was taken by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), when he answered my hon friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) regarding one of these embezzlers. When he was asked what the government did when these cases are disclosed and the theft laid bare, his reply was: 'The government comes in as administering public affairs and not as administering justice. That is the ground which this government takes. No matter what wrong is committed, no matter what crime is perpetrated, this government, if the accused is a friend of theirs, are going to stand by him. If the people want a government of that kind, let them have it. Every country deserves what it gets. Should a Sodom and Gomorrah overtake this country some day, the people will richly deserve it. We have a government which says, no matter what thieves we may have in our service, we will keep them there because they are party friends. That was the case in the matter of the Thessalon post office. It is childish to say that the explanation which the postmaster gave, that his little girl had stolen $1,300 out of the till and was never noticed, is even plausible. This government dare not prosecute most of these criminals.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has just been repeating the old accusations concerning the plebiscite vote in the province of Quebec. As regards the hon. gentleman himself, I would not take the trouble to reply, but as there may be others, who do not know him and who may attach some credence to what he says, I wish to say that his statements are absolutely without foundation. The accusations against the province of Quebec were absolutely unfounded and were shown to have been so.

Mr. BENNETT. Why did not the hon. gentleman, in defence of his colleagues, who were branded all over the country—two or three of whom are judges in the province of Quebec—have an inquiry into these accusations ?

Mr. FISHER. We had sufficient inquiry to show they were false.

Mr. BENNETT. Was it a public inquiry ?

Mr. FISHER. No, there was no necessity for a public inquiry

Mr. BENNETT. Take the record as it stands, and that will prove these charges.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I have here a few of the polling returns on that occasion. Here is the return for poll No. 3 Quebec Centre. 105 votes were polled and yet there were on the list only 101 names. Would the minister say that was a straight poll ? Will this temperance apostle say that in a polling division, where you get only 101 names on the list, 105 votes could be honestly polled. Take poll No. 20 Quebec Centre. There were 121 votes polled and 133 on the list. Take No. 1 Quebec West—114 polled and 115 on the list. No. 2 Quebec West—111 polled, 114 on the list. No. 13 Lachine —108 polled, 111 on the list. St. James No. 20—137 polled, 146 on the list. Richelieu—151 polled, 160 on the list. There was nearly 100 per cent polled of the number on the lists. These were in the French speaking counties where the people were taking very little interest in the vote at all, and mark you in these there was not a single vote for prohibition. Why were 125 votes polled against prohibition when there were only 101 on the list ? Go to the counties where there was active interest on both sides. Take Brome represented by the Minister of Agriculture. 1,216 were polled in favour of prohibition and 691 against. In this division both sides were bringing out the vote, yet only 1,917 were polled out of 3,684 on the list. Not much more than 50 per cent voted, and yet in these other divisions, more than 100 per cent of the vote was polled in some of them. Take Huntingdon, there 1,266 voted for prohibition and 221 against. There were 1,487 votes out of 3,363 on the list.

Mr. DEVLIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the province of Quebec took absolutely no interest in the matter of prohibition ?

Mr. BENNETT. I say there was practically no interest taken in it.

Mr. DEVLIN. As I remember, there was a very active interest taken on the question.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the Senate Hansard of 1905. There he will find the keen interest taken, when certain colleagues were stated to have gone to the polls, after the polls had been closed, and urged on the deputy officers that, under instructions from one Pacaud, of Quebec, something desperate had to be done. There is evidence in the Senate debate, page after page of these frauds. What could be more fraudulent than having 105 votes polled in a division where there were only 101 on the list ? Will the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) meet a Presbyterian clergyman in my rid-

ing, who then lived in the Eastern townships and who is a strong Liberal, and say to him that the vote was honestly taken ? I have heard him discuss the frauds perpetrated.

Mr. BERGERON. Is here any increase in the number of officers ?

Mr. FIELDING. Only the statutory increases. There is one promotion of a second-class clerk to a first-class clerkship and there are the statutory increases.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I quite agree that it is very necessary to have men in these foreign countries looking after our trade. How does the information, outside of these weekly reports, get into the hands of the public so that the manufacturing interests may take advantage of them ? What quantity of these reports is printed ?

Mr. FIELDING. About 2,500 are sent out every week. They are sent to every member of parliament and every newspaper on the register for receiving our publications, and every individual who asks for them is given them free of charge. If any person in Canada wants these weekly bulletins, they will be mailed to him without any charge by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do the newspapers make use of them ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am told that it is the habit of the newspaper representatives to call at the department constantly and there they are shown these reports. A brief is made of them in the form of bulletins which are distributed. They are official reports placed at the disposal of the press irrespective of party. I am constantly reading in the public papers references to these bulletins, stating that the Trade and Commerce Department has inquiries about this, that and the other matter. The thing is very widely advertised indeed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are these letters given openly to the press or are they not culled over and only those the government select sent out ?

Mr. FIELDING. If I had any document come to my department I should certainly exercise the right to judge whether I should give it to the press or not. If a minister receives anything which he regards as of a confidential nature it would be highly improper that he should give it to the press.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not mean anything of a confidential nature.

Mr. LALOR. I do not wish to depreciate these foreign agents, but as one who is interested in many lines of export trade, I wish to say that I have corresponded at different times with the people who are mentioned in these weekly reports as wanting to buy certain goods I had to sell and I have never found these reports of any use. I never found any practical benefit or business arising from them and I doubt very much if there is a business man in this House who is interested in the export trade who can bear testimony as to any value arising from these weekly reports.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I can state that not later than last week a large manufacturer in Hamilton told me that through these trade reports they had made inquiries in New Zealand and as a result they are preparing a very large set of samples for that trade and they anticipate getting a very large order. This gentleman spoke most highly of the Trade and Commerce Department for the efforts it is making to extend our trade in foreign countries and I think the case I mentioned in Hamilton is an ordinary result of the efforts the department is making in that direction.

Mr. LALOR. I hope good results may come to the city of Hamilton from the correspondence my hon. friend mentions, but I venture to say that in a few months from now he will find disappointment. In the greatest number of these instances where foreign firms inquire for Canadian products and correspondence has been entered into, if you look up their record you will find they are not safe people to do business with. My experience is that it has been an utter failure and that is the general feeling in the country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have given an instance of what has actually taken place and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) has no right to say that no good will come of it, because he knows nothing about it. Let me ask the hon. gentleman this: As a business man would he advise the withdrawal of all these commercial agents? I would ask any business man in this House if he would advise such a thing. I do not believe there is a man in this country who does not approve of the system.

Mr. LALOR. My hon. friend misunderstood me. I did not say the experience to which he referred would be a failure, but I said I doubted that it would be a success. I do not wish to depreciate the foreign agents, but I would advocate putting much better men in these positions. I would advise the government not to appoint rascals, I may say, men who have been condemned by the courts of the country, and some who should be in jail for political offences, and because the government is afraid of the revelations these men may make they send them to represent Canada in foreign countries.

Mr. FIELDING. As the most effective answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) I am informed that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association made use of these reports and have in various

ways indicated to the officials of the department that they regard them as very satisfactory and very useful.

Mr. PUGSLEY. While the matter is fresh in my mind, I desire to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) who sits opposite me, stated that in the Auditor General's Report for 1906 I would find correspondence in reference to the secretary of my department which would indicate, if I remember the hon. gentleman's words correctly, that he was shown to be a thief.

Mr. BENNETT. I used the word embezzler.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have read the correspondence and I say to my hon. friend that there is not one word there to sustain his statement. No matter what mistakes, no matter what errors Mr. Gelinas may have been guilty of, there is not one word in that correspondence which would justify the hon. gentleman making such a charge as that. I say it is unworthy of any member of this House to make a statement of that kind against a young man who is not here to defend himself.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) is getting very brave; he was not so very brave the other day; his bravery has cropped up suddenly. In the first place I did not wish to mention the name of his clerk and I told him so at the outset, but he has precipitated the name of his clerk into the discussion and I can tell the hon. minister that it is not the fault of the clerk, but the fault of the system of this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the fault of the system which has permitted this thing to go on and condoned it. The hon. gentleman will find that the Auditor General draws attention to the fact that this gentleman has charged several hundred dollars for cab hire, and when he is called upon to give an explanation he said that he had a book that contained day by day the items of his expenditure. But when this clerk is taken in hand by his minister and when the whole matter is laid bare he refunded two or three hundred dollars. Does the minister challenge that statement? Now, this brave minister, he sits there like what? I will let the public judge what it thinks of him. The minister has right under his hand a statement which shows that $300 were returned by the secretary. Why did he return the money? If he had expended it honestly in the public service why did he give it back? And when he is questioned he gave the childish answer that he did not keep an account of this $600 or $700 expenditure, but that from time to time he put it down on a lot of small pieces of paper and that not thinking he would ever be called upon to produce these pieces of papers he destroyed them. I ask the minister to tell me why the secretary returned that money. If he honestly spent it, why did he go down in his pockets to give it back? I am surprised that this minister who was so judicious the other day, who was so careful the other day, who was so thoughtful to keep out of the storm, should have rushed in to-night. It is true there is a reward offered for the discovery of the hon. gentleman; the hon. gentleman has gone from one end of the country to the other challenging any man in this House to make a statement about a certain expenditure in a New Brunswick election, and when the hon. gentleman is challenged to make the statement he sits there as dumb as the oldest Egyptian mummy that was ever embalmed. You cannot drag a word out of him. Yesterday he was slapped in the face in his own caucus for making charges outside and not being able to substantiate them, and one of the greatest newspapers in the country has a cartoon showing a barn and there is a man making a great noise inside that frightens the animals, and protruding from beneath the barn there is a pair of massive feet and there is a prize of $5,000—

An hon. MEMBER. $500,000.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister deals in large sums and the newspaper offers $500,000 for any person who can find the man to whom the feet belong. Well, it is the hon. gentleman who is under the barn and he will stay under the barn. Now, the hon. gentleman came up here with a reputation for a certain amount of brag, bluff and bluster. He has sustained it outside, but he has not kept it up in this House. I would recommend the hon. gentleman, when I again make a statement in this House, not wishing to drag in the name of one of his clerks, to have a little respect for the clerk's feelings and not make it public himself. I tell the minister again that it is plain from that report that the secretary of his department returned to the funds of Canada $200 or $300, and I ask him, if that money was honestly disbursed, why did he return it? Canada is not so poor that it is going to take from a poor clerk $200 or $300 of his own money. The minister had better be careful in future when he makes statements in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I feel that I ought to be very grateful to the hon. gentleman for the gratuitous advice he gives me. I am new to this House, I am a stranger to a large number of the members, but I trust that I shall be able so to conduct myself as to gain the respect of this parliament. Since I came here I have heard statements made by some hon. gentlemen which I would not have expected to hear in a parliament of gentlemen, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to cultivate the habit of discussing public questions in a manner that will not reflect discredit on the parliament of which

he is a member. With regard to myself, let me say that when it becomes necessary for me to defend myself I am prepared to do it either here or before any other tribunal or in any other place ; but I will not permit any member of this House to tell me when I shall speak or what course I shall take in this parliament or anywhere else. As to that, I shall exercise my own judgment. But, Sir, to-night the hon. gentleman made what I thought was a most unworthy, most unjust and most unwarranted attack on a young man who is employed in my department. That young man is not here to defend himself. He charged him with being an embezzler. He mentioned the secretary of my department, and then he hides himself behind the excuse that I asked him to give the name.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me. I told him across the floor of the House, and 'Hansard' will prove it, that I would give him the name privately, and he refused that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is worse still for the hon. gentleman to make a statement that will go broadcast throughout this country that there are men in my department who are guilty of embezzlement and who are being kept there. This parliament has a right, and the public have a right, to know who is the man to whom the hon. gentleman refers. If it can be shown to me that there is any man in my department who is guilty of theft or embezzlement, he will not remain there one hour after the proof comes to me ; but I shall not take the word of the hon. gentleman as proof, because the hon. gentleman's reputation has gone beyond the bounds of this parliament as one who is not always sure of his evidence when he makes statements with regard to the character of others. I repeat that a perusal of the Auditor General's Report, while it shows that this young man has made a mistake in not keeping an accurate account of travelling expenses, cab hire and other bills, does not show that the amounts charged were not expended by him. It does not show that he is guilty of the very serious crime which the hon. gentleman has charged against him.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman does not yet read the correspondence, which shows that the clerk does not give an explanation why the $200 or $300 was refunded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have read the correspondence.

Mr. BENNETT. The name of the clerk would not have been heard in this discussion if the hon. gentleman had not precipitated its mention himself. The hon. gentleman has paid his respects to myself, saying that he has heard my name outside. I can only say that I cannot reciprocate and say that his name has been heard particularly in Ontario. I think the hon. gentleman's name would have been very little known in Canada, at least in Ontario, had it not been for that braggart defiance which he threw out a few weeks ago. That was the hon. gentleman's entry into Ontario politics, when he made certain charges against the honoured leader of the opposition. That is what advertised him. Perhaps that is what he was seeking for—cheap notoriety. He has got cheap notoriety by that, but he has got cheaper notoriety by his silence in this chamber.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the nature of the mistake ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find in the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Gelinas declares that every dollar of his bill had been expended in travelling expenses, not only for himself, but for certain other persons, including some messengers connected with one of the departments ; but as he had not the vouchers, he apparently consented to make a return at the request of the minister. He still, however, makes the positive statement that these moneys were disbursed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the practice to require vouchers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I may say that the rule of the department now, which I have given instructions strictly to be adhered to, is that the accounts for all these travelling expenses shall be given item by item, and shall be certified to by the Deputy Minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN Was that the old practice ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Apparently not ; there was some looseness. The secretary, being I admit somewhat careless, had not kept an accurate account in writing of the various items of expenses.

Mr. BERGERON. There was a rule some twelve years ago that money would not be paid unless vouchers were given.

Mr. FOWLER. Might it not be possible that this young man had mixed his own private cab hire with the public ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He says not, positively.

Mr. FOWLER. It is possible for that kind of thing to occur. I do not know that I have in mind any instance under this government ; but I know that in our local government there was some private business mixed up with public. These things might occur.

Mr. BENNETT. Was it a minister ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might perhaps be no more than right to remark that it is unfortunate that the mistake was in favour of the young man himself. It is a charitable view, perhaps, to say that it was en-

tirely a mistake. If vouchers are required for these disbursements and no vouchers were forthcoming, the items should not have been included in the expense account; I think the minister will agree with that. It seems that he has laid down what I regard as a very salutary rule, that not only must the vouchers be produced, but the Deputy Minister must add his signature, so that there may be no mistakes of this kind. That is very good for the future. So far as the past is concerned, the minister is inclined to take a gentle view of the question, but I think the gentleman in question should not have included these items unless he were prepared to furnish the vouchers, and it is unfortunate, to say the least, that the mistake made in his expense account was entirely in his own favour and against the interests of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree that it was unfortunate for the young man that the mistake occurred, but in the face of his positive assurance that the money was actually paid out I would be very sorry indeed to make the statement which the hon. member made in regard to him. As I said before, I think it is wholly unwarranted in the correspondence in the Auditor General's Report. The rule which has been established will prevent such a thing occurring again.

Mr. BOYCE. I presume the minister has no reason to doubt his statement that the money was paid out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no reason.

Mr. BOYCE. Then can he give any reasonable explanation of why the money was refunded by the young man after he had paid it out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely the hon. gentleman can very well see that if the minister was not satisfied with the statement, as he had not the vouchers, the minister might say: I cannot allow that, you have not the vouchers although you say you spent the money.

Mr. BERGERON. It was paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he paid it back. The minister may have insisted that it should be paid back. I do not know what took place but I can understand that the minister might have said: You have not the vouchers for this, you say you paid it, you are positive you paid it but as you have not the vouchers the amount cannot be allowed and you should refund it. That is the charitable view of it and I am disposed to take that view rather than suppose that the young man committed the crime charged against him.

Mr. LALOR. The discovery that these vouchers were not with the accounts was made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and there is no credit for it due to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. FOWLER. Was all the money for which there were no vouchers refunded?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware as to that.

Mr. BENNETT. I shall refresh the memory of the House; the correspondence is in a preceding report of the Auditor General. The attention of the Public Works Department was called by the Auditor General to the fact that Mr. Gelinas had a bill of about $700 of which a large part was for hack hire. Furthermore, in that letter the Auditor General calls attention to this fact that as this clerk lived almost on the line of the street railway in the city it was absurd to believe that he should have disbursed this large amount for cab hire. Mr. Foster brought this up in the House and read this letter and what was the result? Mr. Hyman then acting Minister of Public Works, must have brought Mr. Gelinas on the carpet, because it was announced afterwards that reparation had been made by Mr. Gelinas. The minister says the correspondence shows that it was a straight above board transaction. It was a mistake. Let me read this letter. It is dated from the Auditor General's office, April 3rd, 1906:

Sir,—A deposit receipt has come to hand for $281.60, credited to 'casual revenue, 1905-6,' and endorsed with the following explanation: 'Repayment by F. Gélinas of portion of expenditure of 1904-5 (departmental contingencies), telephones, telegrams and letters under travelling expenses, $128.85; cab-hire at Ottawa, $152.75, total $281.60. Please send a detailed account, showing the manner in which these sums were calculated.

The letter from this office dated April 22, 1905——

That is the year before.

—discussed the charges of 1903-4, as well as those of 1904-5. What progress has been made towards adjusting any over charges of 1903-4, and previous years?

Your attention is called to the second-last paragraph of Mr. Gélinas' letter of April 27, 1905 (transmitted to this office February 16, 1906), which reads as follows: 'I do now make the most categorical declaration that all the sums charged in my accounts were duly spent.'

At what date did the necessity for a refund become obvious to you? Was it after February 16, 1906, the date of your letter or transmission?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. FRASER,
Auditor General.

Where is the answer to that letter? There is no answer forthcoming. Here is Mr. Gelinas in 1905 making a categorical denial that there was one cent improperly charged by him, and here is Mr. Gelinas in the year following giving back to the de-

partment $281.60. The minister says he made a mistake and cannot give the details of where he made the mistake, he cannot give any details. In one year he makes a categorical denial that he owed a cent to the department, he says that it is a true and honest account and afterwards he gives this money back to the department. What does the minister call that? Is that embezzlement, to take your employer's money and in a brazen-faced way say that you have not his money and next year bring it back? What is that if it is not embezzlement, or theft, or obtaining money under false pretenses, or whatever you choose to call it? The minister has brought in the clerk's name; it would not have been brought in except by him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then why do you make the charge?

Mr. BENNETT. Because the clerk himself admitted the charge. I wanted to spare the clerk's name and did not mention it and told the minister I would give it to him privately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You think it is better to make the general charge?

Mr. BENNETT. However, after the minister has been here a while and has gone through the crowd he will have to meet with——

Mr. PUGSLEY. You think I will get accustomed to you, do you?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, that may be.

Arts, agriculture and statistics—Archives, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $50,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the Archives in the new building?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I am very glad to say that the archives are in the new building near Sussex street, a building of which I am very proud, and which I would ask every member of the House to visit. I will not detain the committee by going into details of this work, but only ask every member to visit the archives, inspect the building and its contents, and become familiar with the work carried on there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the total cost of the building and grounds?

Mr. FISHER. That is rather a matter for the Public Works Department. The ground belonged to the government, and my recollection is that the building cost about $75,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad of this opportunity to express my opinion that the man in charge of this branch of the public service, Dr. Doughty, is probably the best man for the position that could be found in Canada. He is a man well fitted for his duties and entirely devoted to them.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) speak as he does. I believe that Dr. Doughty is the right man in the right place. He is especially qualified for his work, and enthusiastic in the performance of it. I am glad I was able to secure his services, as I believe they are of exceptional value to the country.

Mr. BERGERON. What is his salary?

Mr. FISHER. It is $3,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the maximum?

Mr. FISHER. It is a special sum settled by agreement between Dr. Doughty and myself, when he was engaged about a year and a half ago. The salary is paid out of this lump vote.

Mr. BERGERON. I would not like my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) to think that I want the salaries increased, but I am sure there is no case in which an increase might more properly be made than in the case of Dr. Doughty.

Mr. FISHER. What Dr. Doughty wants more than an increase in salary is money to carry on his work. And, if more money is wanted for this purpose, I will ask the House to grant it, as I am sure it will be well spent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Dr. Doughty is a great acquisition to the service of which he is the head. He is an enthusiast in his work, and I believe, as the minister has said, that he thinks more of the progress of that work than about any personal ambition in the way of an increase of salary or otherwise.

'Patent Record,' $17,000.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. How many copies of the' Patent Record' are printed?

Mr. FISHER. Twelve hundred.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does this cover only the printing and paper?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems a good deal for twelve hundred copies.

Mr. FISHER. It is published monthly, and it includes cuts of all the articles patented. That is what costs the money.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the same amount as last year?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. U. WILSON. Why should not the person applying for the patent furnish cuts?

Mr. FISHER. He furnishes a drawing, but we have to get the cut made.

Mr. U. WILSON. Why should not the patentee pay that?

Mr. FISHER. This is no part of his application. This record is published for the information of the public.

Mr. U. WILSON. The patentee has not to get a regular machine made, as was formerly required.

Mr. FISHER. The application for a patent must be accompanied by what is called a working drawing—a drawing by following which a mechanic could make the article. This is submitted to the examiner. If the patent is issued, that is all the applicant has to do with it. We have to print a picture of that patent for the information of the public, and the making of all these cuts is expensive. If the 'Patent Record' were all letterpress, it could be printed for half the money.

Mr. U. WILSON. Under the old system, the patentee had to furnish a model.

Mr. FISHER. That was done away with years ago.

Mr. U. WILSON. But it was not provided that they should furnish a cut as well as a drawing?

Mr. FISHER. No. The change with regard to models was made fifteen years ago.

Mr. U. WILSON. It is not that long since you sold the old models.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Have all those models been disposed of?

Mr. FISHER. Long ago.

Census and statistics, $30,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the work of the census still going on?

Mr. FISHER. Not of the decennial census. But we have a Census Bureau which takes the place of the old statistical office, and every year we are taking a census of some special kind and issuing the figures in bulletin form.

Mr. BERGERON. Are all the volumes of the last census issued in French and English?

Mr. FISHER. Yes; long ago. The volumes were printed with alternate pages in French and English.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not remember having received these volumes. How many were there?

Mr. FISHER. Speaking from memory, four volumes. The whole work was finished two or three years ago, and I have not the information under my hand at the moment.

Mr. BERGERON. I have often received pamphlets and bluebooks of census statistics, but I do not remember receiving any bound volumes.

Mr. FISHER. They were sent out with the sessional papers, in the usual way, to all members of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I remember that the volumes of the census of 1880 were bound in a green cloth, making fine volumes for a library. I do not remember receiving the volumes of the last census in that form.

Mr. FISHER. Those of last census were bound in yellow cloth. They were of the same size as the others, so that they could be placed with them on a library shelf. They were issued three years ago.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider the advisability of gathering statistics from foreign countries and giving the people of Canada some idea what the nations of the world are doing in their trade with other countries. It is practically impossible to obtain any information in regard to foreign trade between different nations by looking through our statistics. If the hon. gentleman will investigate some of the United States reports he will find how important and necessary it is and I sincerely hope that some effort will be made in that direction.

Mr. FISHER. I confess that I have taken a different view. I thought it was better for us to confine our attention largely to the statistics of our own country and to give that information to the world at large as completely and as frequently as possible. Of course, I can understand that some people, like my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong), perhaps, who is studying trade questions, will find it very convenient to have abstracts made of the foreign blue-books, but it would be a very laborious process if we had an office for that purpose. The number of people in the country who would be interested in it would be comparatively small and they can get that information out of blue-books or official statements of foreign countries. Nearly all the governments now issue information about their own countries and these publications are available all over Canada and in the library of parliament here for reference and study. If the House wishes to have an office of the statistical bureau devoted to that kind of work, of course I can organize it. But I really think that it would be more important for us in Canada to tabulate the statistics of our own country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would occur to me that it would be well for the minister to remember that he has the census staff between the decennial and quinquennial census. I do not know whether more are required or not. It may be possible that they are not very busy

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they are very busy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are really overworked ?

Mr. FISHER. I hope they are not overworked, but they are busy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope not; I hope their health is not suffering. The Department of Trade and Commerce does acquire statistics in regard to foreign countries. I do not know whether they are properly tabulated or not. I am not aware that they are. It would occur to me that some men might be employed in tabulating the information which is obtained by the Department of Trade and Commerce. I do not know whether that information is as useful as it could be made. If the Department of Trade and Commerce is not doing that the census department might be doing it. This is entirely without prejudice to what is proposed further by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), who suggests that something more extensive than that is desirable and I am inclined to agree with him.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know exactly to what extent the Department of Trade and Commerce is tabulating the information with regard to foreign commerce. I have no doubt there is some information of that kind. We have in the Statistical Department all the statistics of foreign countries and occasionally when definite questions are asked us I have asked the officers of the Statistical Department to look up and get answers to those questions for the individuals applying. But I have never thought it was wise or necessary to prepare a volume of statistics on foreign countries. That is a question well worthy of consideration and I am not disposed to be dogmatic about it at all and to say that we should not do it, but I can assure my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that this staff is busy. Perhaps he does not remember the explanation I gave on a former occasion that between the decennial censuses we are taking other censuses. For instance, in the five year period we took the census of the Northwest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I referred to the quinquennial census.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and at the same time we took other quinquennial censuses. We took a census of the manufacturing industries in Canada coming in between two decennial censuses so as to be able to make comparisons and give the people of the country newer information than was available in the census of five years ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How often is that taken ?

Mr. FISHER. We have done it once since the decennial census, and very likely will do it again before the next decennial census.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there anything done with respect to the population of Canada when any of these censuses are taken, because I see statements sometimes in the papers about the increase of population. Is that based upon any information from the department?

Mr FISHER. The statistical office has for many years made up yearly an estimate of the increased population.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That has been omitted during the past two years ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, because, as a matter of fact, it is found to be somewhat misleading. It was based upon what was called the natural increase and it did not take account of either immigration or emigration.

Mr. BERGERON. It would be a very conservative estimate?

Mr. FISHER. It would be a rather conservative estimate, I think. But, I explained some two or three years ago, when I asked the House to authorize the establishment of a permanent census and statistical office, why I thought it was well to take statistical information between the decennial censuses and not to wait for ten years for information. We have been carrying that out. At the same time as we took the quinquennial census of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan we took the agricultural census of that part of the country and we have taken an agricultural census of the rest of the Dominion which is nearly ready for publication.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you any employees other than the permanent ones?

Mr. FISHER. No, we do that by correspondence. We send out forms all over the country to persons whose names are on the lists we have. We base the applications for information upon the names we have in the decennial census. We took a manufacturing census. I will give an instance of the way in which the work is done ; we took all the manufacturers who had made returns in the decennial census of 1901; we got information from the Manufacturers' Association and from all other sources we possibly could of new establishments and we sent a schedule to be filled out by all these establishments.

Mr. BERGERON. By themselves?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, we sent them through the post.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the other forms sent to generally?

Mr. FISHER. The agricultural forms are sent to people with whom we are in correspondence and who seem to have the information in regard to the agricultural production of the different provinces. This is largely done through the provincial governments. We get lists of farmers from the secretary-treasurers of the muicipalities. This is a pretty complete method of reaching the facts. At the same time I want to

confess frankly that it is not absolutely accurate. It is as complete as possible, but not absolutely so.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it costly?

Mr. FISHER. No, it costs simply the salaries of the people here and the printing of the forms.

Mr. LALOR. Do the people who give the information receive anything?

Mr. FISHER. A few dollars are paid to the local secretary-treasurers who give us the lists of persons to whom to apply, but the people who fill in the forms get nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. That would not be much.

Mr. FISHER. It is $2 or $3 in each case. The whole thing practically costs very little more than the salaries of the officers here to whom my hon. friend the leader of the opposition referred, and some printing. We have the use of the mails for nothing and the returns are brought in free, and the result is we shall be able in a few weeks to place before the country a fairly accurate census of the agriculture of Canada for this last year. The whole of this cost amounts to $30,000 this year, but that includes all the statistical work of the department which, before this kind of work was begun, cost from $15,000 to $18,000. We imagine that at a cost of $15,000 for the statistical branch every year, apart from census year, we shall be able to issue these interim statistical statements of the production and trade of Canada. The work is being done in such a way that it will not cost nearly as much as it is worth.

Mr. BERGERON. That will no doubt be of advantage in taking the next census.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, we are able to take the censuses in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta much more cheaply in consequence of having a permanent staff. We did all the preparatory work in the office without employing extra men. We only employed extra men during the compilation. We used our permanent officials as commissioners. The chief officers were all taken from our permanent staff.

Statistical Year-book, $6,000.

Mr. BARR. Is the present Year-book any improvement on last year's? Last year's book was very defective. Three years ago the Year-book had a lot of valuable information, but last year a great deal of information given in former years was left out. I hope the hon. gentleman will return to the former custom and give us a Year-book which will contain valuable information.

Mr. FISHER. I hoped to lay the book on the table before Christmas, but I am sorry that I cannot bring it down before early in January. The only difference is that I have omitted information about foreign countries. The information about Canada is as complete and very much the same as it has been for years.

Mr. BARR. That will depreciate its usefulness very much.

Mr. BERGERON. Who prepares the Year-book?

Mr. FISHER. The staff of the census.

Mr. DANIEL. Last year the minister promised he would alter the Year-book in certain respects so as to remove the objections which some of us made. But from what he has just said, I presume he is not going to make any change.

Mr. FISHER. What were the points of objection?

Mr. DANIEL. When Mr. Johnston had the making of the Year-book there was a great deal more information in it especially with regard to foreign countries and other matters which I cannot recall just now. The hon. gentleman promised he would have the book improved so as to make it as useful as the former one. In last year's, a great many of the tables were simply extracts from the census, and it did not contain the variety of useful information which we found in the former publication. From what I heard, that seemed to be the general opinion.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that last year's book had a good deal of census in it, but that was because it was the first Year-book published after the census was taken. What was taken from the census however consisted of compilations, in which the striking and main facts were put together in such a way as to make them comprehensive in their relation to one another. That having been done last year, it will not be repeated this year, and the tables will be on different subjects, except that certain things are put in every year and brought up to date so as to give the information which it has been customary to give for many years.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the information for the year be to the end of the present fiscal year, the 31st March, or as before to December 31st?

Mr. FISHER. I must confess that I do not know. I should think however it would be to the end of our fiscal year, because the information in the Year-book is taken from the departmental returns largely, which are made up to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not agree with the minister that we should cut down the statistical Year-book and not give the information given in former years, particularly

with regard to foreign countries. Instead of our getting more information yearly in that book we are getting less. It is important that we should have the statistics of other countries, not only for the convenience of members of this House but for the convenience of all those who wish to compare the progress of our own country with that of foreign countries, otherwise they will have to go to our parliamentary library or send for that information to foreign countries. Possibly twenty pages added to the present report, giving these statistics such as you will find in many of the foreign reports, will be all that is necessary.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate that there is a point there. I would get all the information of course about the foreign countries, and you might put a certain amount in and then hon. gentleman would say there was something else they wanted and the particular thing a student wanted was not there, but it is worth considering and I shall be very glad to consider it.

Mr. DUBEAU. (Translation.) I wish to ask the hon. the Minister of Agriculture whether he would be kind enough to take the necessary steps, in order to have the French edition of the Statistical Year-Book issued, if possible, at the same time as the English edition, so that those who, like myself, refer to the French edition for information, may have it before them, as soon as possible.

Of all the official reports issued by the department, I consider the Year-Book as the most important one. I may further say that I have carefully studied the edition of 1905, and that I did find in that report some most useful information, not only to members of this House in general, but to all business men who are concerned in matters relating to the progress of the country.

Therefore, I hope, the hon. Minister of Agriculture will spare no effort to have the French edition of the Year-Book issued this year, at or about the same time as the English edition.

Mr. FISHER. (Translation). I heartily congratulate my hon. friend for having called my attention to the grievance he has just referred to, and I may tell him that I have also entered a grievance on the same matter. It seems that it is by no means an easy task for the government printing bureau to issue the French edition of the Statistical Year-Book at the same time as the English edition. Nevertheless, I have deemed it my duty to inquire into the cause of the delay in the publication of the French edition, and here is what I was told: They pretend that it is necessary to have the English edition first, before beginning to make the translation for the French edition. I must confess that I hardly realize why that should be necessary. Therefore, I have taken the determination to have the French translation of the Year-Book in my department, so as to be able to send the copy of both editions simultaneously to the printing bureau. Through this arrangement I hope I may succeed in issuing both editions at the same time.

Let me further state that, in my opinion, the various departments should make it a duty to issue their reports simultaneously in both languages. In Canada, we have two official languages, French and English, which are on a footing of perfect equality. Therefore, the reports of all departments should be issued at the same time, in both languages.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear! hear!

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see the member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) in his place but it has reached the mystic hour of half past ten and in honour of his presentation of the case yesterday I think we may adjourn now.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 16, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery his certificate of the return of John Stanfield, Esquire, for the electoral district of Colchester.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

John Stanfield, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Colchester, Nova Scotia; introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. G. W. Fowler.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

Bill (No. 16) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Herron.

BELLEVILLE, PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville, Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member (Mr. Porter) is not in his seat and the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) wishes the Bill to stand until he is here.

Order allowed to stand.

QUESTIONS.

THE BOYLE CONCESSION.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked:

Has the Dawson legislature memorialized the government of Canada regarding what is known as the Boyle concession? If so, what action has been taken in regard to the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No memorial has been received from the Yukon council regarding the Boyle concession.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION—CHANGES IN ENGINEERING STAFF.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

What changes, if any, have been made in the National Transcontinental Railway Commission's engineering staff during the current calendar year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). If the hon. gentleman will consent to put that in the form of a motion for a return I will likely be able to put it on the table as soon as the motion is passed.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND LIFE-SAVING STATIONS.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. A. McLean—asked :

1. Has the government taken any steps within the past year towards the establishment of life-saving stations and equipment in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? If so, at what points and with what equipment?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Lifeboats with the usual equipments have been established at the following points : Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island; Souris, P.E.I., Brier island, N.S., Richibucto, N.B. Provision is now being made for the establishment of a life-saving station at Alberton, P.E.I.

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR BUOYS.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. A. McLean—asked :

1. Were tenders called for the placing of the buoys in Cascumpec harbour, Prince Edward Island, last season? If so, who were the tenderers and amount of each tender?

2. If no tenders were called, why not, and what amount was paid for the service?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No tenders were invited in 1906-7. The contract was renewed with Mr. Samuel Fraser, for a period of three years from the 15th June, 1906.

2. Tenders for the Cascumpec buoy service were called for in 1903, and the tender of Mr. Samuel Fraser at ninety-five dollars per annum was accepted. His contract was renewed in 1906, at the same price and will not terminate until the 15th June, 1909. No complaints were made against the contractor.

TIGNISH HARBOUR.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. A. McLean—asked:

1. Has the government received information that the harbour or run at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, is too small to accommodate the large number of sailing craft and the fishing fleets from New Brunswick which seek shelter there?

2. Has the government received a petition from the fishermen of Caraquet, New Brunswick, to extend the run at Tignish, and also a resolution from the West Prince Board of Trade, and is it the intention to extend the run inward so as to give the additional mooring required?

3. Has the government been asked to put a spur track from Tignish station to the breakwater, so as to give facilities to the shipping interests, and what is the intention of the government in this regard?

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

1 and 2. The government has received a petition from the people of Gloucester county and a resolution from the Alberton and West Prince Board of Trade, both asking for the enlargement of the harbour at Tignish. The petitions are now in the hands of the resident engineer for report, for which we have to wait before any opinion can be expressed on the matter.

3. The Department of Railways informs me that it has not been asked to put a spur track from Tignish station to the breakwater.

CRUISER 'VIGILANT' COLLISION.

Mr. WM. JACKSON asked :

1. Was the government cruiser 'Vigilant' in collision with any kind of craft in Port Stanley this season?

2. If so, what is the name of the vessel in collision?

3. Has the department made any inquiry into the cause of accident?

4. If any inquiry has been made, what was the cause of the accident?

5. Who was in charge of the 'Vigilant' at the time of the accident?

6. Who was in charge of the engine at the time of the accident?

7. On what recommendation were these officers appointed?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes. In November last.
2. 'Nettie B.'
3. Yes, but in view of the conflicting statements made, the department is having an inquiry under oath.
4. Impossible, in view of those conflicting statements made as to the direct cause of the accident.
5. The chief officer.
6. Chief and 3rd engineers.
7. The chief officer holds an extra master's board of trade certificate, the best certificate that can possibly be obtained. The chief engineer holds a chief's certificate.

PACIFIC COAST WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS.

Mr. M. S. McCarthy asked :

1. Has the government, since last session, entered into any arrangement for the erection and equipment of wireless telegraph stations on the Pacific coast ?
2. If so, what system is to be or has been installed, how many stations are to be established, and what is the price to be paid ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.
2. Five stations. Cost cannot yet be ascertained as stations not completed.

COMPENSATION PAID BY RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked :

1. Has the Russian government paid to the owners of the British Columbia schooners 'Carmolite' and 'Vancouver Belle' the sum of $44,701, the amount agreed upon for damages for wrongful seizure ?
2. Have the claims of the owners of the schooners 'Maria' and 'Rosie Olsen,' which were seized at the same time as the 'Carmolite' and 'Vancouver Belle' been recognized by the Russian government ? If so, what is the amount to be paid to the owners of these vessels ? If not, on what grounds does the Russian government refuse to pay these claims ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The government has just been informed that the award, with interest, totalling £16,962.58 or $82,549.77, has been paid to the High Commissioner for Canada through the Colonial Office, as the amount awarded by Russia in respect of outstanding claims.
2. No. On the ground that the evidence was sufficient to warrant the seizure of these vessels.

BRITISH COLUMBIA LIFE-BOATS.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked :

1. Has the government recently purchased a motor boat in the United States for life saving purposes in British Columbia waters?
2. Is the government aware that there are several establishments in Canada which manufacture motor boats?
3. What was the price paid for the vessel to be used in British Columbia ?
4. Were Canadian motor boat builders given an opportunity for tendering for the construction of this vessel? If not, why not?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes, and many Canadian establishments have turned out excellent work, but it was impracticable to employ them in this instance because it was necessary to have the boat built by a firm having experience with this special type of construction. The department consulted the United States life saving service and entrusted the work to the firm that has been almost exclusively employed by that service and at the price paid by that service.
3. $10,900.
4. No. Because the boat was built from designs furnished by the United States life saving service, embodying all improvements in the type of self righting and self bailing life-boat suggested by the long experience and under the supervision of the constructive officer of that service, and only by giving the order to the Electric Launch Company of Bayonne, N.J., could the boat have been secured for use this winter. The boat is built of solid mahogany by men specially brought from England trained in that special lifeboat work. It would have been impossible to have secured either men or materials in time in Canada. The government, however, favours the policy of doing such work as far as possible in Canada, and if any further motor lifeboats are required, will, if practicable, have them built in Canada.

QUEBEC COLONIZATION SOCIETIES.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid by the Federal government, since January 1, 1900, to the Colonization and Repatriation Society of Montreal ?
2. What amount of money has been paid by the Federal government, since January 1, 1900, to the Colonization and Repatriation Societies of Lake St. John and of Quebec ?
3. What amount of money has been paid by the Federal government, since January 1, 1900, to the Lake St. John Railway Company for the encouragement of repatriation.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. $25,300.
2. $22,000.
3. $54,000.

CANADIANS RETURNED FROM UNITED STATES.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

What is the number of the Canadians that have returned from the United States since October 30, 1906 ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). 5,097.

PETAWAWA DOCK.

Mr. WHITE asked :

1. Have tenders been advertised for in connection with the improvements to the Petawawa dock ?
2. When will the work be commenced ?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.
2. I am not yet satisfied that this work is required in the public interest, but the matter is under consideration.

PINETTE HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. How many petitions have been received from certain sections of Prince Edward Island asking for the dredging of Pinette harbour in that province ?
2. When was the last petition received ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to grant the prayer of the petitioners ? If so, when, and if in the next ensuing summer ?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Two.
2. January 24, 1906.
3. The matter is under consideration.

BELLE RIVER HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government expended money voted last session of parliament for improving Belle river harbour in Prince Edward Island ?
2. Has the work performed been sufficient to make the harbour available for the shipping requirements of the surrounding country ?
3. Has the government engineer's report been received ? If so, what is the nature of it, and the amount required to make the harbour suitable for shipping ?
4. Is it the intention of the government to complete the work next summer, and what expenditure is proposed to be made on it ?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. The work performed is considered sufficient.

3 and 4. No report has been received as to further work required since that made two years ago and following which last year's vote was obtained.

DREDGING IN QUEBEC.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What sums have been voted or expended for the dredging of the river bottom between Charlemagne and Terrebonne?
2. Since when has dredging been going on there?
3. What sums have been voted or expended for wharfs at Terrebonne and at St. François de Sales?
4. Who obtained the contracts?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The hon. gentleman will see that the question is very broad ; it covers all expenditures or votes since confederation. I do not know whether my hon. friend intended that, but I would ask that he let the question stand as a notice for a return.

Question allowed to stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What sums have been expended or voted for the dredging of the Rivière à la Graisse at Rigaud?
2. To whom were the contracts given?
3. What sums have been voted or paid out for dredging Dorion Bay, Vaudreuil Station?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This question, like the other, is very general, covering all votes since confederation. Therefore, I would ask that the hon. gentleman let it stand as a notice for a return.

Question allowed to stand as a notice of motion.

THE BUBONIC PLAGUE.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked :

1. Is the government aware that up to December 1, of the present year, 114 cases of bubonic plague have been found in the state of California and that seventy deaths have been the result, and further that two deaths have recently taken place from the same disease in the city of Seattle?
2. What steps have the government taken to prevent the spread of bubonic plague into British Columbia and other parts of Canada?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The government is aware of the presence of the bubonic plague in the State of California since August last, and is also aware of the outbreak of that disease in the city of Seattle in October last.

2. At the seaports in British Columbia, all vessels arriving from California and Puget Sound ports are breasted out at a distance of six feet from the pier ; their mooring ropes are guarded with funnels or discs ; and the gangways, reduced to a minimum, are guarded and the vessels fumigated with sulphur once a week. Such precautions are taken to prevent the landing of rats from the vessels, these animals being the usual medium of infection. By arrangement with the United States Public Health authorities, similar precautions are taken at the ports of departure to prevent rats embarking on the vessels. Special instructions to inspect for the bubonic plague have been given to the regular quarantine officers in British Columbia, and the customs officer at the unorganized maritime quarantine stations have been instructed to have a medical examination of every vessel arriving direct

from California or Puget Sound ports. Special medical officers have been stationed at the various points where railways enter British Columbia from the United States, with instructions to specially examine for the bubonic plague. On the report of the news of the outbreak at Seattle, the Director-General of Public Health was at once sent there and to British Columbia to supervise the precautionary measures being taken. While at Seattle, that officer was able to secure, by the courtesy of the United States Public Health authorities, that an arrangement should be made by them with the various railway companies running out of Seattle, that empty freight cars should be sprinkled with chloride of lime or carbolic acid, and that their doors should be kept closed, especially when at a station platform and always at night, to prevent so far as possible the entry of rats into the cars. A supply of Yersin's anti-plague serum was sent to the different quarantine officers, maritime and inland, in British Columbia, and will be renewed from time to time. Haffkine's plague prophylactic fluid is prepared in our quarantine laboratory, and has been placed in the hands of our medical officers in British Columbia.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN MUNICIPAL POLITICS.

Mr. A. A. McLean (Queens) asked :

1. Is the government aware that two employees of the Printing Bureau have announced themselves as candidates for the Board of Control in the city of Ottawa?

2. In the event of either or both employees being elected, will the government relax the rule regarding the hours of labour in the Printing Bureau in the case of such controllers to enable them to properly discharge their duties to the citizens of Ottawa?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. The attention of the government has been called to this matter.

2. The subject is under consideration. It is difficult to lay down any general rigid rule in matters of this kind.

THE STEAMER 'STANLEY.'

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. How many staterooms are there on the steamer 'Stanley' and are they all available for the passengers?

2. If not all available for passengers, how are they utilized?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Eight double-berthed staterooms and one four-berthed stateroom are available for passengers.

2. No officers or crews quarters within confines of saloon.

THE REV. JOHN McDOUGALL.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked:

1. Was the Rev. John McDougall ever employed by the present government before the 21st day of February, 1905, or the date of the introduction in this House of the Act to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta known as the Autonomy Bill? If so, in what capacity?

2. Has he been in the employment of the government at any time since said date? If so, in what capacity?

3. What was the specific nature of the duties attached to each of his engagements, respectively?

4. What date did he enter on this engagement or engagements respectively?

5. How much has he been paid for his services to date, and how much in expenses?

6. Is he at the present time in the employment of the government?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). As far as the Interior Department is concerned:

1. Yes; as special delegate to Great Britain for a period of three months in connection with immigration.

2. Yes; as commissioner for investigation of Doukhobor land claims.

3. (a) To lecture on immigration; (b) In the capacity of commissioner for the investigation of Doukhobor land claims, to make visits to the Doukhobor colonies in the Yorkton, Prince Albert and Regina land districts for investigation and adjustment in regard to all matters relating to the holding of homestead entries by Doukhobors.

4. (a) 1st January, 1901; (b) 20th July, 1906.

5. (a) Allowance for three months $450; expenses, $211.97 ; (b) Services, $3,910 ; advances for expenses of self and party, $4,600.

6. No.

As far as the Department of Indian Affairs is concerned:

1. No.

2. Yes, as an agent.

3. Negotiations with certain Indian bands for the surrender of the following reserves, or portions thereof—Blood, Alta; Stony, Alta.; Sarcee, Alta.; Stony Plain, Sask.; Cote, Sask.; Fishing Lakes, Sask.; Hobbema, Alta.; Montreal Lake, Sask.; Swan Lake, Man.

4. May 28, 1906 ; June 2, 1906 ; July 24, 1906 ; August 7, 1906 ; September 4, 1906 ; October 10, 1906 ; November 30, 1906 ; September 30, 1907 ; September 10, 1907.

5. For services, $1,690; for expenses, $1,204.40.

6. Has recently been negotiating for surrender of reserve at Swan Lake, Man., and is paid for time actually spent upon this work.

MAIL SUBSIDIES TO STEAMSHIPS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What is the total amount paid by this government each year, in the past five years, towards mail subsidies to steamships?
2. What are the names of the countries served, the names of steamers and owners and the steamship subventions?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The information could most conveniently be brought down in the form of a return, and I would suggest that the hon. gentleman make a motion.

Question allowed to stand as a notice of motion.

IMPORTATIONS OF GERMAN GOODS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What action has this government taken in regard to German goods coming into Canada through England and being sold here under the British preference?
2. Has the government any agents now in England making an investigation of this question? If not, what is the reason an investigation has not been held in regard to this matter?
3. What action, if any, has the government taken towards improving the trade relations between Canada and Germany?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs).

1. The government has taken action by the establishment of regulations, to prevent German goods coming into Canada through England and being sold here under the British preference, and by seizure proceedings under the customs laws when goods improperly entered for duty in Canada under the general tariff or under the British preferential tariff are found to be of German origin.

2. Investigations have been and are being made in England by Canadian trade commissioners and by the secretary of the High Commissioner.

3. The trade relations between Canada and Germany are as yet under consideration.

ABSINTHE AND BRANDY IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What was the total amount of absinthe imported into Canada in the year 1906, and the value of the same, with the amount of duty collected?
2. What was the total amount of eau-de-vie imported into Canada in the year 1906, and the value of same, with the amount of duty collected?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs).

1. For the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1906, 3,082 gallons imported absinthe were entered for duty; value, $4,470; duty collected thereon $7,396.80.

2. During the same period 341,754 gallons imported brandy (and imitations thereof) were entered for duty; value, $553,102; duty collected thereon $820,209.60.

WIRES ACROSS RAILWAY TRACKS.

Mr. BARR asked:

1. What is the number of applications made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the privilege to cross railway tracks with telephone wires?
2. What was the number of applications granted?
3. What was the number of applications refused?
4. What was the cause of said refusal?
5. What was the date of each application?
6. What date were the said applications granted?
7. What was the length of time from date of said application to the granting of same?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The total number of applications made to the board for leave to cross railway tracks with telephone wires covering the period from the 1st Febuary, 1904, to 1st December, 1907, is 1,384.

2. The total number of applications granted over said period from the 1st February, 1904, to the 1st December, 1907, is 1,365.

3. No applications have been refused.

4. This question is answered by number three.

5. To give the date of each separate application will, owing to the large number of applications, require additional time to furnish a complete reply to this question.

6. The answer to number five covers this question also.

7. Provided the applicant complies with the requirements of section 246 of the Railway Act and the rules and regulations of the board, and provided a public hearing is not asked for and the applicant be ready to accept an order in accordance with the 'standard conditions and specifications for telephone crossings' approved by the board, and provided the board's engineer approves of the plan and profile filed, the application should be granted within three weeks from the date of its being received by the secretary of the board. Should, however, a written consent to the crossing be filed on behalf of the railway company whose lines are to be crossed, then an order might issue within a shorter period and in cases of urgency forthwith.

PORT MAITLAND PIERS.

Mr. LALOR asked:

1. What was the amount of Battle's tender for building piers at Port Maitland?
2. Have there been any extras? If so, what amount?
3. What is the total amount paid for work on piers at Port Maitland?

4. Is it the intention of the government to build both piers at Port Maitland?
5. Have any tenders been asked for building the west pier?
6. Who is the government inspector of the work?
7. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Mr. Battle's tender was not accepted by the department for building piers at Port Maitland. The contract was awarded to Edward Conroy at his tender price, on schedule, his being the lowest.
2. No extras. On May, 1907, the superintending engineer reported that on examination, the east pier showed that about 290 feet towards the shore end was in a badly damaged condition—requiring dredging out and replacing, and made suggestion for remedying the trouble. Authority was given for completing the necessary work on schedule prices as in tender.
3. $52,780.
4. No decision has been reached by the department.
5. No.
6. Samuel Braund.
7. There does not appear to be any evidence in the department as to who recommended him.

TIMBER LICENSES RENEWED IN MANITOBA AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Of the 316 renewed timber licenses in force for the current year for berths in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Keewatin, how many affect limits on which no timber upon which royalty has been paid has been cut since the license was originally issued ?
2. What total area in square miles do such limits represent ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. One hundred and seventy-eight.
2. 4,450·29 square miles.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS INTEREST.

Mr. FORGET—by Mr. Ames—asked :

1. Has the government, through the Honourable Minister of Finance, given an intimation to the Dominion Bankers Association that it will raise the rate of interest on government and post office savings banks deposits from 3 per cent to 3½ per cent ?
2. Is it the intention of the Minister of Finance to so raise the rate ? If so, when ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. No.
2. No such conclusion has been reached.

DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

1. What was the total amount of Dominion notes outstanding on October 31, 1907 ?
2. What was the total amount of deposits in government and post office savings departments on October 31, 1907 ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. $61,241,544.56.
2.

Dominion government savings banks	$14,712,257 70
Post office savings banks	46,519,453 64
Total	$61,231,721 34

ORIENTAL IMMIGRANTS TO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked :

1. How many Japanese, Hindoos, or other Asiatics, respectively, have arrived in British Columbia since January 15, 1907 ?
2. How many arrived there in each of the three years preceding said date ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Chinese, 1,325, of whom 1,152 remained in British Columbia ; Japanese, 7,358, of whom 7,357 remained in British Columbia ; Hindoos, 2,046, of whom 2,045 remained in British Columbia.
2. For the twelve months ending January 15, 1907 :—Chinese, 59, of whom 55 remained in British Columbia ; Japanese, 3,004, of whom 2,999 remained in British Columbia ; Hindoos, 2,296, of whom 2,296 remained in British Columbia.

For the twelve months ending January 15, 1906 :—Chinese, 10, of whom 10 remained in British Columbia ; Japanese, 786, of whom 779 remained in British Columbia ; Hindoos, 148, of whom 139 remaned in British Columbia.

There are no records of Asiatic immigration prior to January 15, 1905.

SEED GRAIN DISTRIBUTION TO NORTHWEST.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to make any distribution of seed grain to the settlers in the Northwest during the present winter or before next spring ?
2. Has any request for the supply of grain for seed purposes been received by the government since September 1 last, from any persons in the province of Saskatchewan or on behalf of any such person ?
3. If so, from whom have such applications been received ?
4. How has the government replied to any such applications, whether favourably or not?
5. Has the government authorized any one to promise that any seed grain would be given or distributed? If so who was authorized?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The matter is under consideration with the government of Saskatchewan.
2. Yes.

3. From the following persons :—Arthur Allen Cook, A. D. McPherson, F. M. Jarrett, John C. English, Guss. McDougall, Jas. Schippers, Gustave Granatier, Alfred Utendall, J. K. Rittenhouse, H. J. Stapleton, J. F. McLaren, Michal Furman, Michal Remenda, Tomasz Ksiandzna, Jan Derkacz, Michal Hladybrods, Franko Wilgosz, Jan Marcinkin, Jan Ksiandzna, Jan Kyryluk.

4. They have been simply acknowledged and referred to the Commissioner of Immigration to be investigated.

5. No.

EAST ELGIN IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

1. How many immigration agents are employed in East Elgin, and what are their names ?

2. How many immigrants have they located ?

3. What amount was paid to each agent ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Three : C. Showers, J. Hilman, William Aitkin.

2. None.

3. Nothing.

INDIAN RESERVE, SWAN LAKE.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. Has the government taken any action towards acquiring the Indian reserve near Swan lake, Manitoba?

2. If so, of what nature has the action been, and what has been accomplished?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. The Rev. Mr. McDougall, under instructions, has taken up the question of surrender of a portion of this reserve with the Indians, and a report has just been received from him to the effect that the Indians are willing to surrender a portion of their reserve at Swan Lake, comprising sections 7, 18, 19 ; south ½ of section 30 ; south ½ of 28 ; and south ½ of 27, all in township 5, range 11, west of 1st meridian, and the 2,400 acres held by them near Battleford, on the following conditions:—

(1) That the minimum price of the Swan Lake land be $10 per acre.

(2) That the minimum price of the Battleford lands be $6 per acre.

(3) That the Indians' equity be one-third the price of the land.

(4) That the first payment made to the Indians at the time of their formal surrender be equal to $100 to each soul of their population.

(5) That the second payment of the balance of the one-third being the Indians equity be paid to them as soon as a sufficiency of funds arising from the sale of these lands is realized by the department.

(6) That the interest on the funded moneys coming to the Indians' credit for these lands be paid to them on the per capita basis at the time of the annual treaty payments.

This proposition is now under consideration by the department.

COAL LANDS, EAGLE LAKE.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Has the government surrendered to the province of Saskatchewan any coal lands in the neighbourhood of Eagle lake?

2. If so, where are these lands located, and what is their extent?

3. When were they transferred to the provincial government, and what were the conditions of the surrender?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior):

1. The government has not surrendered to the province of Saskatchewan any coal lands in the neighbourhood of Eagle lake.

In July last the agent of Dominion lands at Battleford was instructed to reserve from all applications until further instructed certain lands in township 32, ranges 20 and 21 west of the 3rd meridian, at the request of the premier of the province of Saskatchewan. This reservation included the coal mining and surface rights of these lands which were available for disposal by the Crown. A discovery of a small seam of coal had been reported, and as the existence of any large coal measures in that part of the province was at that time very doubtful, the reservation was made to enable the provincial authorities to make a thorough test with the view of establishing beyond doubt whether or not coal of economic value existed there.

2. The lands included in this reservation were : Sections 11, 12, 13, 14 and 23, in township 32, range 21, and section 18, in township 32, range 20 west of the 3rd meridian.

3. The lands have not been transferred to the provincial government.

MR. JAMES WHITE.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Is Mr. James White, the Canadian geographer, in England at the present time in connection with the All-Red line project ?

2. If so, of what nature are the instructions under which he is acting?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. White is in England for the purpose of collecting information and data on all lines now plying between Europe and America, on the Atlantic, and cognate subjects.

WHARF AT HIGGIN'S SHORE, P.E.I.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Alex. Martin—asked:

Has the government received a request for the extension of the wharf at Higgin's shore,

so as to make it available for small trading vessels, and is it the intention of the government to grant such request?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Yes, a request has been made and the matter is under consideration.

CLIFTON BREAKWATER, GLOUCESTER, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER asked:

What amounts of public money have been expended on the Stonehaven of Clifton breakwater in the county of Gloucester, N.B., during the years from 1896 to 1907, respectively?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works).

Year.	Amount.
To June 30, 1896	$ .....
" 1897	.....
" 1898	1,036 56
" 1899	500 00
" 1900	6,086 92
" 1901	4,326 51
" 1902	2,991 28
" 1903	2,500 00
" 1904	2,289 50
" 1905	2,499 23
" 1906	9,000 46
To March 31, 1907	1,999 99
From April 1 to November 30	1,801 49
Total	$35,031 94

MR. R. T. MACILREITH.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. When was R. T. MacIlreith first authorized to act as agent for the Minister of Justice in Nova Scotia?
2. Is he still acting in that capacity?
3. Over what territory do his services extend?
4. In what cases has he acted for the government, what was the amount of this bill as rendered in each case, and at what was it taxed by the Justice Department?
5. What is the total amount received by him to date for such services?
6. What action has been taken by Mr. MacIlreith as a result of the following letter :—

Ottawa, July 12, 1904.

Sir,—I have the honour to state that a complaint has been made to this department on behalf of Mr. A. J. MacDonald, barrister, of Baddeck, Nova Scotia, your agent there, that you have retained one-third of the amounts allowed him on taxation in the following matters: Port Bevis wharf site, Breton Cove wharf site and MacQuay's wharf site. I am directed by the Minister of Justice to state that he deems such action on your part highly improper, and I am to request you to pay over the amount retained to Mr. Macdonald with as little delay as possible. These instructions apply also to your other agents in case you retain any portion of the amounts allowed them.

I am, your obedient servant,
(Signed) A. POWER,
Acting D.M.J.

R. T. MacIlreith,
Barrister, Halifax.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

7. Has any inquiry been made as to his alleged tolling of sub-agents' fees in Nova Scotia? If so, with what result?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. On the 8th April, 1903.
2. Yes.
3. The province of Nova Scotia.
4. An answer to this question would involve the examination of accounts of five years, distributed among various departments of the government.

The House, on the 6th February last, ordered a return showing copies of all accounts, vouchers, cheques and documents relating to payments made to Mr. MacIlreith and such return is being prepared.

5. The total payments, to 31st March, 1907, as appears from the annual Reports of the Auditor General, since Mr. MacIlreith's first employment amount to $20,-362.24.

To ascertain the amount of subsequent payments would involve a reference to each department of the government (including the management of the Intercolonial Railway) and, if required, could more conveniently be given in the form of a return.

6 and 7. Mr. MacIlreith took strong exception to this letter on the ground that he had engaged Mr. Macdonald in the matter under an agreement that if, instead of Mr. MacIlreith attending personally to the whole of the work in question, he employed Mr. Macdonald, as his agent, to do part of it, the fees chargeable for such work as should be done by Mr. Macdonald should be shared, (as is the well understood custom, obtaining, in such circumstances, among solicitors in England and in Ontario), and in the proportion said to be 'the usual and regular agency basis in Nova Scotia, viz. : two-thirds to the agent and one-third to the principal.'

Mr. Macdonald denied the existence of any such agreement, and the department being unable to decide the difference left the parties to adjust it between themselves.

No inquiry has been made by the department on the subject, except the correspondence arising out of the difficulty above referred to.

THE 'SAULT EXPRESS'—GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING AND PRINTING.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What sums of money were paid by the government during the years 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, for advertising, printing, or for any other purpose, or any other account whatever, to the 'Sault Express,' a newspaper published at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, or to any person, firm or company for, or in respect of, any work done by said newspaper for the government, or any department thereof?
2. For what purpose were such moneys paid and by what departments, respectively?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The hon. gentleman had better move for a return.

Question allowed to stand as notice of motion.

DREDGING PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, &c

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What contracts for dredging in the St. Mary's river, Kaministiquia river, Port Arthur harbour, Fort William harbour, Thunder bay and Mission river, have been let during the years 1905, 1906 and 1907?
2. Was the work, in each case let by tender? If so, who were the tenderers in each case, what was the amount of each tender, and to whom were the contracts awarded, respectively?
3. What was the nature and extent of the work in each case, and at what price was it let?
4. If any bonds were taken to secure the due performance of the work, who were the securities in each case?
5. If such security was furnished by deposit of marked cheques, whose cheque in each case was deposited, and for what amounts, and on what banks?
6. Are such cheques still held by the government? If not, why not?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). That had better be in the form of a motion for a return.

Question allowed to stand as notice of motion.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of the report made by the agents and lighthouse inspectors of the Department of Marine and Fisheries during the last session, as well as a copy of the classification of lighthouses, the names of the keepers and captains of floating lighthouses, their present salaries, and the salaries proposed by the commission of agents and inspectors.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a return showing what sums have been expended by the government, since confederation, for improvements in the port of Quebec, such as elevators, dredgings, basins, wharfs, sheds, &c.—Mr. Paquet.

For a return showing the number of immigrants who reached and settled in Canada during the fiscal years of 1905-6 and 1906-7, and from what countries they came.—Mr. Paquet.

For a return showing: 1. The number of fishing licenses, the names of the parties to whom issued, and also the amounts of the revenues received from each license, on any or all of the lakes in the province of Saskatchewan.

2. For a copy of all correspondence in connection with each license so issued and in force, or about to be issued.

3. Also for a copy of the different forms used for fishing licenses in the province of Saskatchewan.—Mr. T. Chisholm.

For a copy of all offers, reports, valuations, plans, deeds of purchase, correspondence and other papers of every description in connection with the purchase of site for the new Montreal examining warehouse, together with a statement of all expenditure and all indebtedness incurred to date in this connection.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing: The amounts paid by the various departments of the government since July, 1896, for sites for the following purposes, respectively: (a) court-houses, (b) Royal Northwest Mounted Police purpose, (c) jails or penitentiaries, (d) armouries, (e) post offices, (f) Dominion lands office, (g) land titles offices, (h) customs offices, (i) Inland Revenue, (j) Weights and Measures, (k) other Dominion government purposes, in the following villages, towns, or cities, respectively: Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Moosejaw, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Calgary, Macleod, Cardston, Pincher Creek, Red Deer, Lacombe, Wetaskiwin, Edmonton, Battleford, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Yorkton and Dauphin.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

For a copy of any declarations or affidavits made by Robert Cruickshank, or other persons in the Regina lands district, or any other complaints in regard to alleged improper or unauthorized charges by individuals, whether in the service of the government or not, for locating settlers on homesteads, or obtaining for them entries for homesteads, by cancellation or otherwise, together with all correspondence, reports or other papers on the subject; also all communications, reports, correspondence, or other papers between the Department of the Interior and any of its officials and any person or persons in regard to homestead entries, cancellations, protections, inspectors' reports, &c., for the southwest quarter-section 16 and the northwest quarter-section 20, and the northwest and southwest quarter-section 36, all in township 14, range 9, west second meridian.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing all coal lands leased, sold or otherwise disposed of from March 1, 1907, to date, giving the area disposed of, the party to whom, the consideration therefor, the assignments made, if any, the date thereof and the name of the assignee in each case.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing, in respect of all grants of right to divert water and construct ditches made under the provisions of the Yukon Placer Mining Act, 1906, the number of the claim, name and address of the grantee, date of issue, length of term, source of water, quantity that may be diverted, estimated expenditure within one year, time limit for construction, sum paid for the privilege and the name and address of present holder, if rights have been transferred.—Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of all applications, reports, correspondence, leases, contracts, deeds of sale and documents of every description in connection with the purchase of coal mining lands either on their own behalf or on behalf of clients, by the firm of Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, or by any individual member of said firm, together with a copy of the regulations governing the sale of such rights at the time of purchase.—Mr. Herron.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo) moved :

That in the opinion of this House steps should be taken to restrict the influx of oriental immigrants into Canada; and inasmuch as the policy of the government concerning Chinese immigration has proved entirely satisfactory, a definite policy should be immediately put into operation looking to the accomplishment of equally satisfactory results with regard to all other oriental immigrants.

He said : In moving the resolution which stands in my name, calling upon the government to restrict the incoming of oriental labour into British Columbia with regard to the Japanese to the same extent as they have done with regard to the Chinese, I am fully aware how the discussions on this question have been associated in the minds of certain members of the House who have not had the western experience of this question, with the principle of provincialism and race prejudice.

In 1902, when I addressed this House on this question previous to the imposition of the head tax on Chinese, one good old Presbyterian, a conscientious old gentleman, in this House, rose and said that in his opinion the policy I had advocated was contrary altogether to the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Sir, it was easy to associate a discussion of this question with provincialism. I have heard it stated repeatedly that the oriental question was a provincial question. It is true that the agitation on this subject is confined to British Columbia, because the effects are more directly felt in British Columbia. I do not think it is possible for the members of this House to have a correct conception of the importance of this question until they have had a personal experience of it in the west. I have known leading members of this House, on both sides of it, who, some years ago, expressed strong views against the anti-oriental agitation, but after they paid a visit to British Columbia and came in contact with the actual circumstances and conditions, when they met the facts face to face, they came back to this House willing to favour restrictions being placed upon that class of immigrants. This is not a provincial question. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, as a representative from British Columbia, that we, the representatives of that province, are supposed to be informed of the actual circumstances surrounding this question. I desire to say to this House that I do not support the principle of restriction on this kind of immigration because I think it would be beneficial only to British Columbia ; I want to take the broader stand that what is bad for British Columbia is so because its ultimate results would be bad for Canada as a whole. I want to take the position in this House that what is good for British Columbia can only be so considered when it can be conclusively proved that the operation of the same principle will be good for Canada. I am prepared frankly to make the statement and allow myself to be placed on record, that though it may appear at first sight as peculiarly affecting the interests of British Columbia, that ultimately it will be detrimental to Canada. This is a national parliament, and I am not advocating a provincial question. If it is a good thing to allow unrestricted oriental immigration into British Columbia then it must be also in the interests of Canada. Why, Sir, the protection of British people in British Columbia, the development of her industries on proper lines, are evidently and undoubtedly in the interest of the whole people of Canada.

Then this discussion has been associated by its opponents with race prejudice. Mr. Speaker, there always was a race prejudice. So far as I am concerned, I have been trying all my life to practice a belief in the equality of races and of men, and I am not easily influenced to do anything or to say anything contrary to the principle of the equality of races. But no man with observation and experience will say that there is not a race prejudice, that there is not an influence in that direction affecting men's minds. That influence has to be recognized, it is a universal principle that cannot be obliterated by any revolutionary process in a few minutes, or in a short period. Why, Sir, race prejudice is part and parcel of the inequalities existing as a consequence of the depravity of the human race, and is seen not only in the conflict of man against man but of race against race. The antagonisms existing in systems of government and in economic conditions are based on the same principle as race prejudice. I have faith enough however to believe that the words of the Scotch poet will come true :

> When man to man the world o'er
> Shall brothers be, and all that.

But we know by experience, we know in our business operations, we know by the ordinary competition of man against man, of member against member in this House, that jealousies associated with race exist wherever we go. Then the advocates of this principle have also been associated with spoliation and injustice. I have heard it stated by members of this House that the agitation against oriental immigration into British Columbia might be considered a system of spoliation and injustice. My view is that an unrestricted system of oriental immigration into British Columbia is a system of spoliation and injustice to the British people in British Columbia. I do not think that laws protecting the interests of employees in mines, factories and railways in British Columbia can be considered a system of spoliation and injustice.

While the prosperity of the country may not consist in the enlargement and develop-

ment of railway systems, factories, and the operation of mines, it is quite possible to be grinding out, by a system of alien and low priced labour, any amount of high dividends and enormous profits, but in spite of such prosperity and development it is possible that we may not be grinding out these profits in the best interests of the country. I do not regard this condition as a system of spoliation and injustice, but I do regard a system which has for its object the promotion of the personal and private interests of the few as against the welfare of the people of the country as a whole as a system of spoliation and injustice. We are very apt to be tainted and affected by the excitement which is associated with this question in British Columbia. All level-headed and sensible men in British Columbia have had to bring pressure to bear to restrain the explosive tendencies of the province. Every sensible man who wanted to view this question without prejudice, to consider it from every standpoint, to be fair and to take into consideration every interest, has had to use his influence to restrain feelings that can so easily be aroused under such conditions as these. It has been difficult for the representatives of the people in parliament to impress upon the public mind of British Columbia the seriousness of this question from every standpoint. The disposition, in consequence of that natural excitement, is not to look at and see the national or international aspects of this question. I regard it as a most important question, and while some men have been ready to try to use this question in the interest of party politics, in so far as I am concerned, I desire to say that I have too strong an opinion in regard to the seriousness of the subject, as it is associated with the social and industrial life of British Columbia and of Canada, and as it is associated with international considerations in every part of the world, to sympathize with any attempt on the part of any one who make it serve political ends. It is an important question. It is important because of its international features. We stand in this House for peace and harmony. We stand in this House as representatives prepared to give every consideration to international affiliations and interests. We recognize our responsibility as representatives in this House for maintaining the closest feelings and connections with the other portions of the empire. When any question affecting a local interest is likely to involve anything that would injuriously affect the association of Canada with the British Empire, it is an important consideration. Although there may be on the surface an evil that may directly affect a local interest with which I am associated, still I am prepared, in the consideration of that question, to look at it only as it affects the international interests with which we are associated. This is an empire problem and it must be looked at in the light of our empire. What is bad for Canada cannot be very good for the empire. If the settlement of this question is good for British Columbia it is good for Canada, and what is good for Canada is good for the empire. We cannot disassociate these several interests. The strength of the empire depends absolutely upon the quality and condition of the units that constitute that empire, and any weakness or any supposed injustice felt by any people in any section or portion of the empire is something that creates a weakness in the link connecting together the various parts of that empire. It is a serious question because there is an attempt on the part of the imperial authorities to suddenly work out the assimilation of alien races. The disposition of the British government is to make settlements in the interest of peace, of trade and of more close and friendly relations with alien powers. It is in the line of the advancement of civilization. It is the duty and the business of this government—and we believe it is a part of the great prerogative of the British empire—to seek to influence and to bring about conditions of peace and friendly relations with every alien country in the world in the interest of her own commerce and people. But, it does strike me that with the disposition of the British government in creating treaties with oriental countries like Japan there has been a tendency to seek to bring about an association of alien races on a plan that is more sudden than it is possible to work it out. There is existing in the minds of people generally, the idea that the Asiatic race cannot be brought to suddenly assimilate with the occidental race. I know that it is generally supposed that the prejudice is all on the side of the occidental. It is common to hear the statement in Canada that Canadians are prejudiced against the orientals. I could occupy the time of this House by giving instances from literary men who have lived in those countries, who have written works connected with the history of those countries, who have had an experience of those countries to show the bitterness of the jealousy existing in the mind of the oriental against the occidental. It is not the occidental against the oriental, but it is vice versa. To say the least, it is as much on one side as it is on the other. Centuries have developed insurmountable divergencies between the oriental and occidental races and it may take centuries to obliterate the divergencies which have been created. I am hopeful that it can be done. Still, there are some people who do not believe that it can. I am absolutely certain that it is not within immediate reach, and I am also certain that a process of slow and intellectual moral development and a change of system must take place to bring about the eradication of the prejudice that exists between these two races. It is a

serious problem also because it may mean a tremendous oriental invasion. Let me draw a picture for this House ; let me look at two aspects of the question. Some philosopher in British Columbia, not confined to the man on the street, has prophesied that it may mean a military invasion by the Japanese on the Pacific coast. That has never bothered me for one minute. It is stated in British Columbia that Japanese spies have been making observations of the British portion of the Pacific coast, laying out their plan of operations and finding out, with minuteness and completeness, the whole situation. This has been interpreted as evidence of a spirit and a disposition on the part of the Japanese authorities to look to a military invasion of Canada. Well, Sir, so far as I am concerned, that is too remote, too far off, to enter into the domain of practical politics. I have neither the time nor the mind to deal with a theory of that kind, and personally I do not believe there is any such contemplation in the minds of even the Japanese themselves.

But, I want to remind this House that whilst there may not be a military invasion contemplated, a labour invasion is easily within practical accomplishment. Let me mention two things—in the orient are eight hundred millions of starving, competing people, without the spirit (except within these few later years) without the spirit of enterprise connected with the full development of their own country. It is not sufficiently enterprising to provide labour and to afford a livelihood for its own people. That is a picture of the orientals at home. On the other hand Asia is easily accessible to the Pacific coast of Canada; it is within a few days reach of what? It is within a few days reach of a land in their imagination to be flowing with milk and honey, a rich country sparsely settled, a country of tremendously large areas beginning to be populated, a country where men are becoming rich by labour, in comparison with conditions of remuneration in Japan and China, and these depressed, and impoverished, and starving millions have heard of this prosperous land. Can we wonder that they come to this country, and can we not see that if unrestrained; if the barriers are thrown down, or if the present restrictions are not raised, that within sight there is an easy possibility of an overwhelming labour invasion from the orient into the Pacific province of Canada? Now, Sir, I contend, as I contended in reference to the Chinese question, that an argument on a question of national importance is not good if when driven to its logical conclusion it is defective in any degree. If it is good that we should have 25,000 orientals in British Columbia for the purpose of developing industrial enterprise, why should it not be good if that principle were absolutely unrestrained and unlimited, and that these eight hundred millions of starving labourers be given an opportunity to come to all of Canada to develop her resources ? If it is a good thing that the industries of British Columbia should have the benefit of the immigration of the Asiatics into that province, why is it not good for the Northwest, why is it not good for Ontario? Why should the mill operator in Ontario, or Quebec, or Nova Scotia or any other province, be deprived of the supposed benefit of the oriental labour if it is good for the mill operator in British Columbia? If it is good for British Columbia to have this partial invasion of Asiatics, then drive the argument to its logical conclusion and say it would be good for all Canada. If that argument holds, then, where you have a labour market of 800,000,000 why should we not bring in orientals to develop and make Canada a prosperous and enormously rich country; why should we not go to the logical extreme and say : let the orientals spread over all Canada; they will open up the country, they will develop enterprise, they will enrich the country; let us bring them in ?

Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, under existing conditions it is absolutely necessary at this present minute that we should consider effective and permanent methods of restricting the invasion of oriental immigrants, and especially of Japanese immigrants into British Columbia. Now, I anticipate difficulties with regard to this phase of the question no matter what policy we may pursue. If this immigration is absolutely restricted it is quite possible that European and American capital will organize and enter the countries of the orient to develop them, and to promote commerce within them. Japan is in a position of great advantage in that she is able to supply every want of her own markets. The probability therefore is that European and American capital will seek a field in that country, and will develop its great resources so that in the next decade we may expect a mighty competition in the commercial markets of the world, and a reversal of the existing commercial relations between the west and the east. British capital invested in that country with its tremendous resources and with an inexhaustible supply of the cheapest kind of labour, is going to present to Canada in future years a tremendous commercial competition, and that in my mind will be the aspect in which the question will have to be considered in years to come. Old ideas of Asia have to be modified to-day ; we cannot regard her in the same light as we have been accustomed to in the past. Asia has awakened, and she is in competition with the United States and with Canada in every respect. We are forced to realize that fact. Now, whenever the commercial interests of Canada are in jeopardy we

have no hesitation at all in deciding to protect these interests. We are always in this House ready to raise a barrier of restriction with the view of placing the commercial interests of Canada in a position of equality with those of any other country. One side of this House may not be quite as ready to give that protection to exactly the same extent as the other side, but the principle of commercial protection to Canada as against the cheap productions of other countries appears to be the well settled policy of this parliament. And why should not that principle apply to the immigration of cheap labour just as it does to the importation of cheap goods?

There are two things which it is very difficult for us to understand, and especially is it difficult for people who live in the east to understand them. One is, that the Asiatic can always under-live and under-sell the white man. We have to make that confession when we come to consider this question. The old argument we used against the Chinaman does not apply here. We used, fifteen years ago, to say in British Columbia that one white man was worth two Chinamen. Well I never said so; I always said that if one white man was equal to two Chinamen there would not be any competition in labour, and therefore there would not be any Chinese question. However, that may be, it is generally recognized that to-day, we have to change the formula, and we have to be prepared to admit that industrially and economically the Japanese comes in and makes it impossible—either in the commercial or industrial world of Canada—makes it impossible for a citizen of this country to compete with him. Some people may consider that a very serious admission, but whatever they may think it is an admission that must be made. Our old conception of the inferiority of the Asiatic race in industry and commerce has to be revised. To-day we do not want the Japanese in, not because he is inferior industrially, but for very different reasons; because industrially and commercially he is evidently in some trades our superior. Let me remind the House of this—when the agitation on the Chinese question was strong in British Columbia you could not get the commercial interests of British Columbia to support that agitation with the same earnestness as the industrial classes did. Why? Because the Chinee was simply a labourer; he did not enter into competition with the commercial interests; the commercial interests of the country on the whole got a benefit out of him, and in some sense and to some degree the commercial interests employed him. That aspect of the question has completely changed. To-day, the commercial men of British Columbia fear the Japanee as the industrial classes ten years ago feared the Chinaman. The Chinese coolie entered into the industrial competition with the man who had to work with the pick and the shovel, the hewer of wood and the drawer of water; but the Japanee—and this accounts for the extraordinary excitement and position of antagonism against the Oriental in British Columbia at the present time—the Japanee enters into competition with the commercial classes of British Columbia, which fact has extended the problem from the industrial into the commercial world. Every business man in British Columbia today is just as ready to sign the petition and is just as enthusiastic on the subject as the industrial classes themselves.

Now, let us see what has been the experience of other countries in which restrictive legislation has been tried. The United States was obliged half a century ago to adopt restrictive legislation against the importation of Chinese; yet, strange to say, there are more Chinese in the United States to-day than in any other single country in the world outside of China itself. The United States has also been placing restrictions upon Japanese immigration, very important and very strong restrictions, and when the people of the United States thought that under the operation of this restrictive legislation the whole question of oriental immigration was settled, there arose, about a year ago, in connection with the regulation of the public schools in San Francisco, an agitation which started a movement from one end of the United States to the other, which has had the effect of bringing to the minds of United States statesmen the absolute necessity of further regulations on this question.

In Natal, where there has been restrictive legislation against Asistic immigration for many years, the Legislative Assembly at its last session adopted anti-oriental legislation of the most drastic kind. There has been similar legislation in the Australian colonies and in New Zealand. Just a year ago a Chinese ambassador visited the Australian commonwealth, met the members of the Australian government and discussed with them the question of removing the restrictions on Chinese immigration, and what happened? When the parliament of the Australian commonwealth met six months afterwards, instead of diminishing the pressure of the Asiatic exclusion law, they decided by a unanimous vote to carry out to the last possible degree the regulations against oriental immigration.

Take the case of the Transvaal, which shows how far-reaching is the opposition to oriental immigration. There are no Chinese in England or indeed in the British Isles, but suddenly, by a combination of circumstances which placed a large number of Chinese labourers in the Transvaal, there arose the mightiest political force that has existed in England in modern times. The Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, in the midst of the great conflict that was raging in South Africa, promised the labouring people

of England that the acquisition of the Transvaal would provide an outlet for the surplus labour of England at high wages, as it would bring the invaluable mines of that country under British control. He was returned to power on that proposition and made a settlement with the Transvaal in the interest of the British people. Did he send the surplus labour of England to the Transvaal? The same government negotiated, under an indenture with the people of China, for a supply of servile labour from China for the mines of the Transvaal. This does not seem to be pertinent to the subject, but this is the point I wish to make. What did the English people think of that transaction? What happened the moment they discovered that they and their friends had to compete in South Africa with this servile Chinese labour? They had never experienced the competition of Chinese labour before and knew nothing about it. But because British interests were being affected economically in one part of the empire, there arose in England the mightiest political force of modern times, which on that same question swept the Conservative government out of power, and the Liberal government was elected on the promise that it would change the condition of affairs in the Transvaal by giving that colony legislative authority to pass an ordinance doing away with Chinese labour. This is a clear evidence of the feeling of the British people on this subject when they are brought into contact with it.

What is the history of this question in Canada? Just twenty-five years ago the member for the district which I have the honour to represent in this House, Mr. Gordon, the member for Vancouver Island, submitted to this House the following resolution :

> That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to enact a law prohibiting the incoming of Chinese to that portion of Canada named British Columbia.

Sir John Macdonald requested the withdrawal of that resolution on the promise that he would appoint a royal commission to investigate the question. That commission was appointed in the following year, the commissioners being the Hon. the Secretary of State and the Hon. Justice Grey of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. At that time the Canadian Pacific Railway was under construction and hundreds of oriental immigrants had been brought into British Columbia for the purpose of working on that railway. The commissioners reported to the House that it seemed to them that that work could not be carried on without the assistance of Chinese labour. Now, Sir, I am not prepared to criticise the condition that existed twenty-five years ago. I am not prepared, even for a political reason, because a Conservative government was then in power and its ministers stated that in their opinion Chinese labour was a necessity to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to take the ground that they were mistaken in their judgment.

What I say is that that was the foundation of the importation in large numbers of orientals and that the Commissioners reported in favour of it. Two years later the government of the late Sir John Macdonald put on a head tax of $50. That was the year 1886. All through this period the people of British Columbia were petitioning and protesting against Chinese immigration. The whole question was supposed to have been settled up to 1899, when the matter was brought by the British Columbia members very strongly to the attention of this government. This government doubled the head tax from $50 to $100, and the following year it appointed a royal commission with instructions to inquire and report in order that this question might be finally settled. They made their report, I think, in 1902, and they reported in favour of a $500 head tax. The government carried out the suggestions of that commission. The people of British Columbia had never asked, through its representatives, for any larger restriction. There is not a petition in this House, ever made to any federal government, for any larger restriction than the imposition of a $500 head tax on Chinamen.

But there is an important argument in connection with the Japanese immigration. The Japanese has become a factor in British Columbia between the time when this commission began its inquiry and the date of its report. In 1898 there was no serious Japanese question in British Columbia. The Japanese began to come in at that period, and before this commission got through it had to consider the question of Japanese labour in that province. In 1901, at the last census, there were 4,300 Japanese in British Columbia. But I find in this report something very important, of which this House and the government ought to be reminded, and that is that during the sittings of that commission, the Japanese consul in Vancouver voluntarily proposed to the commission to use his influence in favour of the regulation of the Japanese influx into British Columbia. The commissioners reported that as the Japanese authorities had voluntarily consented to regulate the immigration of their people into Canada, it was important that this should be understood as a settlement of the question at any rate for that present time. And I think I am right in stating that, on the strength of that report, and based on the regulation which the Japanese consul had voluntarily accepted, the recommendation was made to this government that in consideration of this understanding there was no need for legislation against Japanese immigration; and no legislation was passed that time or since :—

The emigration of Japanese has for the present practically ceased, only fifty-six having arrived at Canadian ports in the last six months of 1901. This is doubtless owing to instructions given to local authorities by the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs for Japan instructing them to prohibit entirely the emigration of Japanese labourers destined for Canada or the United States. The commission was favoured by a copy of these instructions, through the Japanese Consul at Vancouver, which is as follows :—

Department of Foreign Affairs,
Tokio, Aug. 2, 1900.

To the Governors of the Prefectures.

You are hereby instructed to prohibit entirely for the time being the emigration of Japanese labourers for the Dominion of Canada or for the United States.

VISCOUNT AOKI,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The commissioners appreciated that instruction and reported to this government that they did not consider it at all necessary to pass any legislation, so long as that understanding was maintained. The question, to all practical intents and purposes, was settled up to 1906. Speaking only for myself, I want to state plainly to this House that from the period when the $500 head tax was imposed on the Chinese and from the time when there was an understanding between this government and the government of Japan, by reason of which no legislation was imposed against the Japanese—from that period up to last year, when the treaty was considered and endorsed, I am not aware that there was any serious Japanese or oriental question in British Columbia. Some will ask : Did not the legislature of British Columbia seek to impose restrictions during all this period? Is it not true that the legislature sought to impose regulations or restrictions, from year to year, during the very period when you say there was a complete settlement, and was it not through the influence of the imperial authorities on the Dominion government, that these provincial Acts were disallowed ? I want to say that there was no public agitation in favour of any restriction against the Japanese during that period. I am not prepared to say that politicians in the local legislature were not making a political football of this question, but what I do say is that during the period I have stated, from 1902 to the beginning of 1907, there was no public demand for any increased restrictive legislation against orientals coming into British Columbia by public petition to representatives in the House of Commons. So far as I am concerned, I understand, when I endorsed that treaty in January, 1907, that it was in the public interest. I endorsed that treaty because there was no demand made upon me in my district in favour of increased restriction and because I understood that that immigration was absolutely regulated by the understanding between the federal government and the government of Japan and that the practical results of that understanding were quite as effective up to that period as if there had been positive enactment. There is one thing more which it is important to mention. The Chinese question had become entirely obliterated, as the head tax had operated almost to their entire exclusion. Let me give the House the figure. The tax was imposed in 1903. In 1904, only three Chinamen came into British Columbia. Of course I am estimating the number of Chinese immigrants, by dividing the amount of tax collected by 500. There were only $1,500 collected in 1904, which would give only three Chinese. There were only eight Chinese imigrants in 1905. In 1906 there were 22, and in 1907, 91. But from the first day of January, 1907, up to the end of October of the same year, I am surprised to find there were 829. Before I am through I propose to try to account for this sudden increase.

For five years it was almost prohibited by the passage of that law and the imposition of the tax almost completely stopped this immigration. But, in this present year we see that 829 Chinese have paid the head tax to get into Canada, a matter with which I shall perhaps deal later on. After the endorsement of the British treaty by this parliament a very sudden change occurred in British Columbia. The Hindoos had then been coming in for a year before, and their appearance created some excitement, but was never considered by the commercial and industrial interests of British Columbia generally as being as serious a question as the importation of Chinese or Japanese. There were two reasons for this: The Hindo was not as great a commercial advantage to the average employer, he was not as suitable a workman, he could not be employed with the same percentage of benefit and interest, and in the second place neither the conditions nor the climate nor the surroundings were suitable to the individual himself. Thus the competition of the Hindoos in British Columbia was never regarded as serious as Japanese or Chinese. But the strange thing is that in this very period of 1907 nearly 900 Chinese paid the $500 head tax to get into British Columbia and enormous numbers of Japanese came in in the same period. I shall give to the House a statement to the immigration of orientals into Canada for the last seventeen months. According to my calculations and information gathered from the Immigration Department of the government, nearly 9,000 Japanese entered British Columbia in less than seventeen months. 1,000 Chinese came into British Columbia in the eight months of the present year and in the past seventeen months 4,080 Hindoos entered British

Columbia. I wish also to give a statement of the number of Hindoos alone entering British Columbia in the whole period, as I do not think it has ever been presented to this House.

Year.	Number of Hindoos.
1904-5	45
1905 6	387
1906-7	2,124
8 months of present year	1,956
Total	4,512

According to the best information I can gain, of that 4,512 British Indians who came into British Columbia, 1,421 left for the United States, leaving a balance of 3,091 remaining in British Columbia. Thus we see that 9,000 Japanese, 1,000 Chinese and 3,500 Hindoos have come into that province, according to my calculation, although I have not been able to arrive very definitely at the numbers. Still there are undoubtedly many thousands of Orientals in that province.

It seems to me important to find out the cause of this. How was it that a certain class of oriental labour was able to pay $500 a head to come into this country? How was it that such a number of Hindoos were brought into that province in the same year? How was it that such a large number of the Japanese, out of all proportion to the number of Japanese already in British Columbia, were brought in the same year 1907? The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) when he was in British Columbia spoke about this subject in Victoria, and I had the honour of listening to him. He suggested—he did not state very emphatically, in fact I think I should put it even more mildly and say he insinuated—but at least he left the impression that he knew the reason why Japanese had been brought into British Columbia. The reason he presented was very far-fetched, official correspondence and events have demonstrated that his theory was absolutely wrong, his reason was not a correct reason at all. He suggested the extraordinary reason that Mr. W. T. R. Preston, who was tragically described as a discredited official, who had been superintendent of immigration in Great Britain, who was not believed by his own colleagues, who could not be believed on oath, according to the views of some people was the cause of the Japanese immigration into British Columbia. I have no brief for Mr. Preston. I took the opportunity during the investigation of Mr. Preston's work in connection with the Labour Bureau in England to cross-examine Mr. Preston myself and I must admit that I am not absolutely sure that he did not do more than he was ever paid for doing and was understood to be doing in connection with the Immigration Department in England. But because he may have made mistakes in England in connection with immigration, it is a tremendous stretch of the imagination to think that as a commercial agent he would go to Japan and send the Japanese to British Columbia. I wish to remind my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that the Conservative press took that statement up after he left the province and I mention it here because we have had to meet that assertion. What have the British Columbian press to say upon this question, that this discredited official was taken hold of by the Department of Trade and Commerce and transferred to Japan, that the government had secretly endorsed a treaty and just after the treaty was settled this discredited agent, at the expense of the people of Canada, was sent to Japan and was the direct cause of the importation of Japanese. I made some inquiries about Mr. Preston's appointment, but if Mr. Preston cannot be believed on oath, then I suppose hon. gentlemen will say that those who would promote his interest could not be believed on oath, so perhaps it will be of no use to read the orders in council by which he was appointed commercial agent to Japan. I find that Mr. Preston was not in Japan until six months after the contracts were made in British Columbia under which the Japanese were brought into this country. I think it is fair to say that much in Mr. Preston's defence. I am not criticising the statement of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) for the sake of doing it, and I would not have referred to this except that it has been brought up in the Conservative press as a good argument and it shows that it must have been difficult for my hon. friend to find a reason.

I wish now to come to the real reason of the importation of a large number of orientals within such a short period. We have some information. The government sent Mr. Mackenzie King as a commissioner to British Columbia to look into this question, and I have before me two of the contracts that were made, part of the evidence given before the commissioner, that account absolutely for the immigration of the Japanese into British Columbia at this period. These contracts were made with the Wellington Coal Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. As regards the Grand Trunk Pacific, I cannot speak so positively. I have looked over the evidence to see if the Grand Trunk Pacific had made contracts to bring them in, but I did not find it. I looked over the evidence carefully, and according to that evidence I found that two contracts were made, one by the Wellington Coal Company and the other by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and these explain fully the large influx of orientals into British Columbia this year. I desire to call the nature of these contracts to the attention of the government. I do not think it ought to be possible for contracts to be made to bring orientals

into this country, or to bring in skilled labour of any kind, unless these contracts are authorized and supervised by responsible officers of the government. I hope the government will give some consideration to that opinion. These contracts do not constitute a voluntary agreement between free and independent men, but between an irresponsible company and corporate wealth in Canada. I do not think that any financial company ought to be authorized to bring in servile labour to Canada. Who compose the Wellington Coal Company? The Wellington Coal Company is presided over by Mr. Dunsmuir, the present Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia. I am not associating that position with the company, I am simply stating that the Dunsmuirs were the principal owners of this enterprise. Now the Wellington Coal Company has been enormously subsidized company for the purpose of building a railway from Victoria to Nanaimo on Vancouver Island. It has received a cash subsidy of $750,000, and 1,900,000 acres of land, free for ever from taxation. The Wellington Coal Company entered into negotiations with certain Japanese who were at the head of an organization called the Canadian Nippon Supply Company, to bring in 500 Japanese labourers to work in the coal mines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that while there is an intense feeling in British Columbia against the coming in of Japanese, there is a special objection to the employment of Japanese in coal mines. Every piece of restrictive legislation in the provincial legislature has been particularly directed against the employment of orientals in coal mines. No man who knows anything about coal mining can be ignorant of the cause of this legislation. Twenty years ago there were many serious disasters in the coal mines on Vancouver Island, which were traceable to the employment of orientals. The Wellington Coal Company and the Nanaimo Coal Company came together twenty years ago and made an agreement that they would never again employ orientals in their mines. But here is a contract made to bring in 500 orientals, for five years, to pay their wages over to this Canadian Nippon Supply Company, who will in turn pay them over to the labourers. Here are conditions in this contract making the company responsible for consequences if the white men strike against any unfavourable conditions the contractors must be responsible for keeping the Japanese at work, thereby bringing Japanese labour directly into competition with white labour. Then the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made the same contract for the same period, to bring in 2,000 Japanese. I want to say that I am entirely opposed to the possibility of such contracts being made in this country, under any circumstances, or unless, as I have already said, they are entirely supervised by the government. I think also that this principle should apply to the contracts regarding all kinds of labour. I hope the government, in framing their immigration policy will exercise more discrimination in allowing immigrants to come into this country under contract. I think legislation should be immediately passed forbidding the making of contracts in Canada to bring in labour from other countries.

Now, I will come back to the treaty. The British treaty was ratified by this parliament because it was thought it would be in the commercial interest of this country. It was not a question between Liberals and Conservatives, every member in this House agreed that it was a treaty commercially in the interest of Canada, and was likely to develop trade connection with Japan. It has been said, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said in Victoria, that the British Columbia members said nothing about it, that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) was the only man who said anything about it. My explanation has been given that we were acting under an agreement with Japan at that time and the treaty was endorsed by us on that understanding. I was as anxious as any member of this House to make arrangements whereby trade between this country and Japan could be fostered and increased, because I thought it was in the interest of the Pacific coast. I do not fear the result; I am prepared to meet the political effects of that assertion. I say that if the full development of British Columbia is to take place, we must have a share of oriental trade. The prosperity of that country, the development of its trade, require a market in the orient. Canada as well as the United States have goods that we are anxious to send to the orientals, and they have goods that we desire to purchase. What we need is a treaty which, while securing to both countries the benefits of commerce, will give each country reciprocal protection in regard to the immigration from one country to another if we cannot make such an arrangement then we must abandon oriental trade relations. I do not see, how, by diplomacy, a principle like that cannot be developed and worked out. Now, Sir, the trade with Japan, in my opinion, is tremendously important, and I have gone to the trouble of making a statement or two about it.

Exports to Japan.

	1897.	1906.
United States	$13,000,000	$35,000,000
Canada	65,000	500,000

The total increase of the export trade of the United States in ten years was $22,000,000 while the total increase in the export trade of Canada for ten years was $435,000. The export of Canadian goods to Japan is on the increase for in 1905 Cana-

dian exports to Japan were $365,399 and in 1906 they were $500,620 or an increase of $135,000. The increases of the exports to Japan from Canada are important because they affect the development of the western portion of this country. Wheat and flour were exported from Manitoba and Alberta, pig lead, lumber and fish from British Columbia, and rubber goods, paper and canned goods of different kinds from Ontario. I have also prepared a statement which I think it is important to give to the House on the invested Japanese capital in British Columbia, for as I have already explained, there is a strong commercial feeling against the investment of Japanese capital, and as a consequence the representatives of the commercial interests have joined in strongly in the campaign against the Japanese. The statement of invested capital is as follows :

Business.	Number.	Capital invested.	
General and provision stores.. ..	36	with capital of	$ 786,000
Copper mining..	1	"	100,000
Banking	1	"	50,000
Boarding houses	28	"	228,000
Lumbering	60	"	120,000
Contractors and brokers	6	"	229,000
Printing offices.	2	"	20,000
Restaurants ...	9	"	17,000
Shoemakers.. ..	2	"	4,000
Tailors	4	"	30,000
Rice mills	4	"	60,000
Liquor firm ...	1	"	10,000
Watchmaker ..	3	"	6,000
Barbers and.. bathhouses. ..	6	"	12,000
Farming	15	"	30,000
Property owners.	400	(market value)	1,200,000

Making a total invested capital of $3,250,000, all coming into competition with our peoples' commerical interests.

I want to deal for a little while with what I consider to be the remedies for this question. A day or two ago I was very much struck with the importance of looking up the comparison between the treaty of the United States and the treaty that was endorsed by this parliament in January of this year. I admit to the House that I was surprised at the very clever diplomatic method of the executive head of the United States in bringing about regulations that seem to me to cover all the advantages that we have obtained by the endorsement of the British treaty and yet maintaining their system of protection and regulations as against Japan—reciprocal of course, regulating one country as against the other. In the treaty between the United States and Japan, Article 1, which is practically the same as in the treaty between Great Britain and Japan, gives the Japanese full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the United States. But here is the point that I want to call to the attention of the House.

Mr. R. SMITH.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the date ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The date of the treaty with Japan was 1894. The American treaty was made in the same year as the British treaty. They received all the privileges of the favoured nation clause included in the British treaty, but here is a provision that I would call to the attention of the government.

It is, however, understood that stipulations contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of labourers which are in force or which may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries.

This, of course, as the House will see, is a reciprocal provision. United States labour had no objection to a stipulation in any treaty that United States labour should not go to Japan. The executive authority of the United States sought to protect the labour of that country by stipulation that the Japanese should not come to America and while it was made a reciprocal provision it does not seem to have been a grievance to the Japanese authorities at all, for the Americans continue to do the largest trade of any country in the world with Japan, and it does not seem in any way to have affected the conditions between these two countries. The United States Congress passed an Act called an Act to regulate the Immigration of Aliens into the United States. This is another point that I call to the attention of the government and the House. Provision was contained in the American treaty making it possible for the government of the United States to adopt regulations and enact laws affecting immigration. At the same time it did not interfere with the continuance and operation of the treaty. It gave them all the privileges that we British countries got by the treaty with Great Britain but they also were left free to legislate on the question of immigration. On the strength of this power provided for in their treaty they enacted, in January, 1907, what I regard as extraordinary legislation. The treaty operating, no conflict between Japan and the United States, the commerce of the United States maintained, trade constantly increasing and yet we find them, in January, 1907, according to the powers reserved by that provision of the treaty, enacting this clause :

Provided, further, that whenever the president shall be satisfied that passports issued by any foreign government to its citizens to go to any country other than the United States or to any insular possessions of the United States or the canal zone, are being used for the purpose of enabling the holders to come to the continental territory of the United States to the detriment of labour conditions therein, the president may refuse to permit such citizens of the country issuing such passport to enter the continentl territory of the United States from such other

country or from the canal zone, or from such insular possessions.

What does that mean ? Remember that in January, 1907, the United States passed a law making it impossible, notwithstanding their treaty, for Japanese with passports to the Insular Possessions of America to be landed in continental America. I want to call the attention of the House to a striking coincidence. In January, 1907, the United States passed that law, and is it not a strange coincidence that in the month of February of that very same year, by Japanese capital organized in Vancouver, 1,400 Japanese were landed from Honolulu into British Columbia. The Japanese who went to the Insular Possessions of the United States had to be landed somewhere else than in the continental portions of the United States ; it was easy to make contracts ; British Columbia was near at hand, and so by reason of this exclusive legislation of the United States in January these Japanese were landed in Vancouver. I want to mention another startling fact. In January, 1907, the United States passed an ordinance to this effect :

Any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such persons does not belong to one of the excluded classes, and that said ticket or passage was not paid by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly.

Now, Sir, I want to say that we have here a provision that directly affects the Japanese immigration into the United States, because in spite of the operation of that peaceful treaty between Japan and the United States, the Japanese cannot be taken into the United States under contract. That, to my mind, is a most important provision. Suppose we had had that provision in this country (as I have suggested to the government we should have), what would have happened in the matter of the oriental immigration to British Columbia? We have demonstrated to the House that the thousands of orientals that have been brought to British Columbia have been brought under contract, and under the influence of Canadian companies and of the Japanese authorities. If we had a provision in our immigration laws similar to that enacted in the United States in 1907, such contracts would be made illegal and it would be impossible for these immigrants to come here. Let me point to the government that just in proportion as the United States law prohibiting the entrance into the continental United States of Japanese with passports to the Insular Possessions of the United States ; just to the extent that law prohibited successfully, Canada was made the dumping ground for these very people. Honolulu is crowded with Japanese, and as the United States has declared that these Japanese even when they have passports to Honolulu cannot enter the continental United States, they are brought across the sea in thousands to Canada. They cannot be taken to the United States, they must be taken to Canada. And, Sir, if no provision is made against that system of contract ; if there is no supervision by this government, then we will have open contracts bringing these Japanese from the Insular Possessions of the United States and dumping them in Canada, while all the time the United States is in possession of its treaty with Japan which helps the Americans to do more business in Japan than is done by any other country in the world. If the industrial and commercial interests of Canada are to be protected from the effect of this special legislation of the United States, it seems to me it is necessary that the Canadian government should take this amendment very seriously into consideration, and just as soon as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up the time of the House to perhaps a greater extent than I expected, but I want to ask indulgence for a few more minutes so that I may refer to other aspects of this question. There never was a time when European and British labour was coming into British Columbia in anything like the same proportion as during the last one or two years. The advertisements about this rich and undeveloped country have recently attracted hundreds of British miners to the coal mines of Vancouver Island. These are men of the class we want; men who come with their wives and families to British Columbia to take up their homes there. And, Sir, I say to this House that the great misfortune is that just when these enterprising citizens were coming to the Pacific coast and getting themselves comfortably settled among us they had to face the competition of the contract labour brought over from Asia. How is it that we have experienced so much difficulty in inducing European people to come in British Columbia? The record of British Columbia with respect to oriental immigration is the answer to that question. I was in England some years ago, and when I asked English miners : why do you not come to British Columbia where you will find better opportunities, better conditions, and better prospects, the answer was : Why, that is an oriental country. During the last five or six years, on account of the successful operation of the law enacted by this parliament in 1903, that impression of British Columbia was gradually being obliterated, so that during the last twelve months or so British labour was being encouraged to come there to a greater extent than ever before. But just as this British labour had begun to endeavour to

change its fortunes and to seek a home in a British province on the Pacific coast, it finds itself face to face with an influx of ten thousand or eleven thousand Asiatics in sixteen months. The impression will surely go forth that if these contracting companies are allowed the right and the privilege to contract for oriental labour, then there can be no room and no opportunity for European labour in this British country. That is the case I put before the government and before this parliament. I say that the attitude of the government from 1903 to 1906 was successful in preventing the invasion of British Columbia by orientals. I take the responsibility of that opinion as a member of this House; I say it here, I say it everywhere. But I do say, that when looking over the remedies for the present grievances, and remembering the restrictive legislation that has been provided by the United States in spite of the international treaty they have with Japan ; it is the duty of this Canadian government to take action immediately—and by that I mean as soon as possible. I do not know what is the result of the negotiations of the Minister of Labour in Japan ; I have no opportunity of knowing. I cannot prophesy what we may expect to be the result of these negotiations. What I do expect is that we can continue the successful operation of the commercial understanding which we have with Japan to the commercial advantage of Canada, and yet make such a diplomatic arrangement with that country as shall afford a positive restriction upon the influx of Japanese into Canada which will settle the question for all time.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion moved by my good friend the hon. member for the city of Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), I wish to compliment him and to congratulate the House upon the very excellent manner in which he has put this question before this parliament and before the people of Canada. I suppose that there has been no question brought up in this House since I have been a member of it that opens a wider door for the demagogue than this anti-oriental question. It is easy for the man on the street to denounce anybody and everybody in connection with oriental immigration, because the man in Canada finds his fellow with a skin not the colour of his own coming into the country, and immediately that which is latent in the mind and heart of every white man, the question of colour, comes up. I do not wish to approach this question in any demagogic spirit, nor do I wish to draw the colour line too clearly while dealing with it. I would rather approach the question from the broad standpoint of Canadian citizenship and the best interests of our country. An attempt has been made to throw into the political cockpit this oriental question. My good friend the leader of the opposition, in his pilgrimage to the Pacific coast, opening his tour with a meeting in the city of Vancouver, brought this question into the sphere of active politics by an attack upon the government and an attack upon myself. A little later on I will give reasons for my belief that the hon. gentleman's position was not correct, and I am prepared to stand or fall in the estimation of the part of the country I represent as to whether or not my actions have been correct. A few months ago there was brought down to this House by the right hon. leader of the government a Bill for the ratification of the treaty which had been entered into between Great Britain and Japan, and which included Canada. At that time there was not, inside or outside of this House, any question as to whether or not we should enter into that treaty. There was no Japanese question at that time, as nobody could know better than myself, who lives in a hotbed of anti-orientalism in British Columbia. When that treaty was before this House, the hon. member for the city of New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) brought up the question, whether or not free intercourse would be allowed between Japan and Canada, that is, whether Japanese and Canadians might come and go freely in their respective countries. At that time we had the assurance in writing of the Consul General of Japan, which every hon. member of this House was prepared to accept, which I accepted, that a restricted number only of Japanese would be allowed to come into Canada. Upon that assurance I relied and this House relied, and upon that assurance the right hon. leader of the government put through the treaty, which made Canada a party to it. The hon. leader of the opposition, when in Vancouver, said : Where was the hon. member for Vancouver when this treaty went through ? I was in my seat in this House ; and if that question can be asked of me as a private member, much more can it be asked of the hon. leader of the opposition: where was he as the leader of a great party when an important question like that was brought before this House ? If it is asked why I did not open my mouth, I ask, why did the hon. leader of the opposition sit as dumb as an oyster in its shell when the question was brought before this House? I stated on the platform in Vancouver, and I state here, that I had no reason to raise my voice on the question, because there was at that time no question on which any man was called on to speak in regard to that treaty. I ask the hon. leader of the opposition, where was he when that treaty went through ? Why, Sir, he was just as ignorant of the question as he was dumb on the question, and I was exactly in the same position, and so was every other man in Canada, because it was not then known and could not be conceived that so soon would

come this bolt from the blue in the crisis that arose in Vancouver last summer. Therefore I say it ill becomes the leader of a great party to throw into the political cockpit a question of this kind.

Nor do I wish to shirk the responsibility placed upon me in this matter. No man can foresee the future, and every man's hind sight is better than his foresight. We can look back and appreciate the mistakes we have committed ; but so far as the government of Canada is concerned, there was no mistake other than their putting faith in promises which were not lived up to, but which they had every reason to believe would be respected. I am not saying that the government of Japan broke their promise. They may have lived up to the letter of their agreement. But what I say is that it was made possible for the citizens of Japan, over whom Canadians had no control, to wink at the letter of the law and break it in spirit, as has been done during the last four or five months. When the treaty became law there was an understanding between this government and the government of Japan that only one passport per month would be given from each of the Japanese provinces to Japanese citizens to come to Canada. There is a considerable number of provinces in Japan from which there is no emigration ; and taking into consideration the number of provinces from which emigrants might come, it was estimated that not more than 600 or 700 a year could possibly come to our shores. However, after we had entered into this arrangement, we suddenly found ourselves confronted in British Columbia with a very serious influx of Japanese from Honolulu, and every man from that island was in possession of a Japanese passport from Tokio to Honolulu, dated May and June. There were three vessels, two belonging to the Weis line and one flying the French flag, which were chartered by boarding-house keepers in Honolulu to carry emigrants to Vancouver. The first boat to land was the Admiral Jukeberry, which brought out 500 or 600. Two weeks later the Kennerie landed with 1,187 men, every one of whom was in possession of a passport from Tokio, dated May and June, and to Honolulu only. Another boat, the Indianapolis, was on her way and had arrangements made to carry nearly 2,000. The Kennerie was to go back and bring out 1,200 more. They had all arrangements made for carrying a vast number of Japanese to our shores, and apparently we were helpless to stop the influx. People living east of the Rocky Mountains cannot understand or appreciate the position we took. We saw coming to our shores these numbers of Japanese, apparently prepared to come in thousands more, who would oust our people from our country. That may be said to be a strong view and the average man will tell you that it is a very extreme one. But, Sir, we have in British Columbia a country rich beyond the dreams of avarice. Its mines are rich, it has fertile valleys and teeming fisheries, all of which are waiting to be developed. It is a country with a territory of 387,000 square miles and less than one person to every square mile. Within two weeks journey of that country across the Pacific is another country, with a territory of only 10,000 square miles and a population of 46,000,000 people or 400 people per square mile. They see in British Columbia a country in which they can make as much in one day as they can in their own in a week, and where they will enjoy every privilege, a country only waiting for the hand of man to develop it. It has been said that the Japanese will not come to us because they have Corea and the southern Manchurian peninsula to go to since the Russian war. But Corea is a poor country and Manchuria is already in the hands of the Manchurians and the Japanese cannot oust them. There is nowhere any country in which they can do so well as the Pacific coast, and that country is the Eldorado, where they hope to make a great deal of money and still remain Japanese. You may say that is no reason why we should object to them. Well, I am not objecting to them because they are industrious and diligent, but on broader grounds. In this Dominion the white people are as yet but a small community. We have an immense heritage and a great future, but no country can be great which depends solely upon the riches of its soil and its mines and its wealth in lumber and fisheries. No country can become great whose people are not great. You cannot build up a great country by mixing the occident and the orient together. It is impossible to bring about cohesion between races which are so directly opposite in views as the oriental and the Caucasian. It is just as impossible to do this as to mix oil and water. Perhaps in two hundred, three hundred or four hundred years, some amalgamation may take place, but in that time your history will be written in bloodshed, and we cannot afford to allow any considerable number of people to come to our shores out of whom we cannot make good Canadian subjects. That may seem to some members of this House to be exceedingly strong language, but I am convinced that if we are to have a great nation in Canada, if we are to have such a country as we would wish to leave to our children and our children's children it must be a country developed by the white races of our land ; it never can be done by letting down the bars to the free and easy access of the hundreds and thousands and millions of orientals who are ready to come to our shores.

Reverting to the position in Canada at the time the treaty became effective, it may be said that there was then no oriental question bothering us in British Columbia. It may be said also that the local legisla-

ture in every session for the last eight or ten years has passed and repassed an Act which practically prohibited orientals coming into the country. I accept that as a fact. It has been passed, but there are few men in the British Columbia legislature who are manly enough to get up and say that they were merely embalming laws on the statute-books, because that was an act entirely beyond the purview of the local legislature, and for that reason was of no effect. The British Columbia legislature can pass Natal Acts, which are only educational tests, until the crack of doom; they will never stop one Oriental from coming in to the country. To carry that question to its logical conclusion, they may watch the border line of our country and our seaports, but they must not forget that British Columbia borders on the province of Alberta, and they cannot prevent orientals from coming into the province from another province. I do not think it requires the training of a constitutional lawyer to recognize the fact that the province of British Columbia was entirely outside its jurisdiction when it passed the Natal Act; the only authority that can handle this question is the Federal government at Ottawa, and to the Federal government at Ottawa we look for the solution of this problem.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I was endeavouring to show the attitude, the false attitude, I think, of the British Columbia government in passing what is called the Natal Act. The reason why I call their position a false one is this, that the British Columbia government in passing the Natal Act arrogated to itself a power entirely outside their sphere, that is, the regulation of immigration into the province. Now, Sir, the passing of the Natal Act has become a hardy annual in the province of British Columbia. There have been very few members in that province who would care to get up and declare they were wasting their time and going outside their prerogative in passing such an Act, for the reason, apparently, that they were afraid their action might be misconstrued when it came to the point of facing their electors at a re-election. However, I maintain that the Natal Act, so far as British Columbia is concerned, is just so much waste paper. The only authority who can satisfy us on this question is the federal government at Ottawa.

The reason why the people of British Columbia are so strongly opposed to oriental immigration is not far to seek. I remember very well when I first went to British Columbia twenty years ago that the fisheries were entirely in the hands of white men and Indians; there were very few orientals engaged in that industry. Mining was also in the hands of white men, and the lumber industry was entirely in the hands of white men. These are the three principal industries of our province, and we have endeavoured, so far as we possibly could, to keep them in the hands of men who would help to build up a white Canada. The fisheries upon the Fraser river, that one time employed five or six thousand white men and Indians, are to-day entirely in the hands of the Japanese; you will see three or four thousand Japanese engaged in that industry and very few white men. The canneries are entirely in the hands of orientals; so far as the fisheries of British Columbia are concerned, they are to-day entirely at the mercy of orientals. If these people were to take it into their heads at any time to stop work, there would be no fish caught and no fish canned in Canada. That is a rather serious phase of the question, that one of the biggest industries we have in our province is entirely in the hands of orientals, when it might just as well be entirely in the hands of white men who would build up the country. It is the same way in the lumbering industry. A few years ago it was a rare thing to see a Japanese or a Chinese in the lumber woods, but to-day it is becoming a rare thing to see a white man there.

Yet the people in the rest of Canada tell us that we must have cheap labour, we must have oriental labour or we cannot carry on the industries of the country. Now if that is so, why is it that no other part of this great Canada has been obliged to bring in orientals to develop their industries? Why does not the province of Alberta require them? Why does not the province of Saskatchewan require them, or the province of Manitoba, or the old province of Ontario? None of these provinces ever attempted to bring in orientals to build up any other part of Canada. I think the cry that you must have cheap labour by orientals to work in the different industries in the province of British Columbia, is the curse of our country to-day. I maintain that we have as much right to say to the rest of Canada that they shall have orientals as the rest of Canada has to say that British Columbia shall have them.

Another reason why we object to orientals is that we are the buffer province of Canada. It seems when we go east to the Rocky Mountains that we find a different view point prevailing, every thing is viewed from a different standpoint west of the Rocky Mountains. They appear to be the dividing line. During the troubles we had in British Columbia this summer we found little or no sympathy, either from public men or from the press, east of the Rocky Mountains. The sympathy that we found was entirely along the Pacific coast. We found a lot of sympathy down on the Ame-

rican side, and the Americans found sympathy on our side when they had the same troubles that we had. The American people on the Pacific coast did not find any sympathy east of the Rocky Mountains, neither did we in Canada find any sympathy east of the Rocky Mountains. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I state that the people of eastern Canada fail to grasp the seriousness of this question in British Columbia and as it affects the Pacific coast, I make a statement that is well backed up by facts. Had there been a few more ship loads of oriental immigrants, such as we saw in the city of Vancouver when 1,100 were landed in one day, had we had a recurrence of that four or five times, I myself, Mr. Speaker, am afraid to say what the consequences might have been for the rest of Canada. I am afraid to say how long we would have stood quiet seeing our country flooded with orientals, and being told that we must submit to it because it was necessary in the interest of British connection. I am of the opinion that there is no British connection strong enough to justify any part of Great Britain, or any dependency of Great Britain, sacrificing itself for the sake of such connection. Now that may be a strong statement to make, but we have an evidence of that fact in the history of British people. The man who says that we must endure this for the sake of an ally of Great Britain, that we must sacrifice any part of Canada for that purpose, is saying something which is not borne out by the facts of history. I say that no part of Canada should be sacrificed on account of that treaty, and I do not believe the treaty calls upon us to make a sacrifice to that extent. We believe that legislation can be passed by this government which will remove for all time any danger of a further influx of orientals into our country. The Japanese are not the only people we object to, we also object to Hindoos, but we are told we must allow them to come in because India is a British possession. Well, Sir, Hindoos cannot go into Australia, and that is a British possession, Hindoos cannot go into New Zealand, and that is a British possession. They cannot go into Natal, and that is a British possession. Surely we in Canada can afford to make laws against the influx of orientals as any other part of the empire.

This is a question, Mr. Speaker, that I have a great deal of difficulty in approaching in a calm and satisfied manner. I think I could make myself a little better understood if I were outside of this House. I find that I have a litttle difficulty in restraining myself when we are told that we must, for the sake of peace and quietness, accept the situation and that we are powerless and helpless. I say that we are neither helpless nor powerless, and so long as I have a voice in the public affairs of this country so long shall I raise up my voice against any further oriental immigration into this Dominion. We have, at the present time, Mr. Lemieux, one of our ministers, over in Japan treating with the Japanese government, seeing if proper arrangements can be made and seeing if the Japanese government will pass such legislation themselves as will stop any further influx of Japanese into Canada. I maintain that we have to do our part as well. I maintain that we have to keep our fence up and meet them half way in their keeping their fence up. If the Japanese government say they will not allow any more Japanese to come to our country beyond a certain number, as they said in a letter to the government in 1902, then, there is no reason why the Japanese government should object to our saying that none but those who are holding passports from Japan to Canada shall be allowed to land; so that it would be impossible for us to have a recurrence of the practice of using the Island of Honolulu as a bridge from Japan to Canada. If we do not stop the influx into Canada I maintain that we will soon find a greater number of orientals in British Columbia than white people. I maintain that in a very short time, we would lose a very important part of Canada if any trouble should ever arise between the orient and Great Britain. The Japanese, Chinese and Hindus would have a surplus of population as compared with the white people in our province, and they would have no difficulty in taking possession of the Pacific coast. It is my opinion that the yellow peril is much closer than the people of this country have any appreciation of. Even if it is not, it is a wise precaution, on the part of our government in view of what has taken place in the last few months, to take such measures as shall practically and thoroughly stop any further influx such as we have had during the last few months. The city of Vancouver has given an object lesson to the rest of Canada. I am not in sympathy with popular outbreaks, which suggest the idea of a riot, because we are a law-abiding people, and we endeavour to protect those who come to our shores, but if a few more shiploads of these orientals come it will only intensify that feeling and an intensification of that feeling would work disaster for the rest of Canada.

Mr. WILLIAM SLOAN (Comox-Atlin). Mr. Speaker, the motion now before us for discussion brings prominently to the people of this country a question which has been less or more engaging public attention not only in Canada and many other colonies of Great Britain, but also in the United States. From the fact that I have spent a period of my life in the orient, I will deal with the question from a not altogether local point of view. In its present aspect the question of oriental immigration and its consequent effect upon our country

is to my mind the most vital, the most important matter which has been before parliament since confederation. And I do not concur in any sense with the efforts which have been put forth to make this a merely sectional or political issue. Holding the views which I do upon the subject I desire to discuss it from the standpoint of loyalty to my own native Canada, of loyalty to the flag under which we live. The hon. members who have preceded me have dealt very fully and ably with various features connected with the question, and it will not be necessary to give in further detail or cite the many able efforts which were made by those opposed to Chinese and Japanese immigration, efforts which resulted in parliament declaring, feebly it is true, in 1885 for a white Canada by imposing a head tax of $50 upon Chinese entering our Dominion. Again, in 1900, with more emphasis the parliament of Canada declared for the principle of a white Canada by increasing the head tax to $100. In 1903 parliament again declared in no uncertain voice for a white Canada when the head tax on Chinese was increased to $500, and this was coupled with the statement made upon the floor of this House that Japan had agreed to restrict the emigration of labourers to this country. Sir, I was one of those who favoured at that time a policy of exclusion, and I have not changed in that regard my views then held. The action of parliament, however, was accepted by the great majority as settling the question accepted by all as a compromise, and thus disposed of and regarded as definitely settled. Recent events have shown that we were unduly optimistic, that a $500 tax does not altogether exclude, for within the past seven months some 900 Chinese have paid the head tax and the understanding given to this government by the then and still accredited representative of Japan, has been evaded, in that the maximum was 600 Japanese labourers, as I understood it, to arrive in Canada in any one year. The arrivals, however, from 1st July, 1904, to 30th November, 1907, are 11,113 (of whom 10,000 have arrived in past few months), and as has been pointed out another new and disturbing feature also is the influx of Hindoos, over 4,000 having arrived in the past two years. And thus we have again reopened the question of whether this Dominion of ours or any portion of it is to be white or yellow. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has stated that the situation as far as Japan is concerned is different. I agree with him fully in that statement, but from the very fact that it is different and more difficult it is the more dangerous and the remedy naturally must be the more drastic. Sir, by those who favour—and they are not a few—oriental immigration into Canada, the statement is made that labour was scarce in the west. That may be true, but it was equally true as regards Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia or the prairie provinces. Labour in all parts has been sharing to a less or more extent some degree of our prosperity. But you would seek to rob the labourer of his legitimate share of this prosperity by an unjust competition. And as has been pointed out not only the labourer but all classes and conditions are affected by the influx of Japanese, and other orientals. The potent result being naturally to discourage those of our own race who would, were different conditions prevailing, be more readily inclined to settle on our western shores. Again it has been contended that we must have cheap labour to develop our natural resources. The natural resources of Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec, the prairie provinces have been developed by white labour, and it is a gross libel to say that the Pacific province with resources more varied, more extensive, more valuable, cannot be developed with white labour. It will mean a more equal division of the wealth produced. It may mean a decrease in dividends and a consequent shrinkage of unearned stock values to a proper legitimate basis, to employ white labour, but the final result will be good business for Canada, for Canadian enterprise and Canadian dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We are just rounding off the first century of British dominion on the Northwest coast of America. In that brief space of time through the indifference of Imperial statesmanship we have lost large areas of territory and coast line both on the south and north of what we now hold. And my firm conviction is in view of past history and present conditions that unless there is a complete reversal of policy, time will see our present possessions of British Columbia from the Rocky Mountains westward to the Pacific ocean become a colony, and ultimately a possession of a united orient.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never, never.

Mr. SLOAN. Hon. members say 'never, never.' We can all subscribe to that sentiment, but never, never, does not stop the locust swarm of Asiatics now coming, nor is it in any sense a check on the uncounted millions of the far east. Who can pretend to say what the outcome will or will not be. I state my convictions viewed in the light of past and present policy.

We have to trace England's rise to greatness to her position as a great world power, to her present position of naval and commercial supremacy through a long gradual process of development. We see in our own generation looming up on the horizon of the Pacific, appearing with meteoric suddenness another great world power, both commercial and naval, a nation young, vigorous, aggressive, with recuperative powers as yet undimmed by devastating wars, a giant undoubted, with possibly limitless ambition. Who can tell? That

Japan aims to become the commercial and naval power of the Pacific is unquestioned. That she has also ambitions to sovereignty over the orient would appear from the recent utterances of Count Okuma, who has been prominent in financial and commercial affairs of Japan, and who, in a speech at Kobe, 'declared that Japan would surely disappoint the people of India if she failed to afford protection to the millions there now being oppressed by Europe.' Their ambition may also extend to the occident, and furthermore it is undeniable that the inevitable overflow of a new over densely populated country will follow the lines of least resistance.

England guards with jealous eye and with her best blood the northern passes of India. Mistress of the Pacific and with rapidly increasing colonies on our western shores will not a united and land hungry Orient turn a trained and calculating eye upon the passes of the Rocky Mountains. It will be noticed as an almost universal law that the political boundaries of nations of the old world are the mountain ranges creating and maintaining distinct national and racial divisions. In North America where the struggle for land has not yet become acute we have penetrated the mountain barriers unopposed. We have upset this almost universal law of the eastern hemisphere, although unconsciously it has appeared in the provincial and state divisions of territory. The All Red Line from which we expect so much is a bond drawing together the outposts of the British dominions. It narrows to a slender thread in the defiles of the Rockies. Guard well then the west; fill it with people who will be loyal to our ideals of national life. Guard well the strategic position which is not only of dominion but of empire.

An eminent statesman of the United States stated :

> The Pacific ocean, its shores, its islands and the vast regions beyond will become the chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter.

In fifty years more the fulfilment of that prophecy will be past history. England has made an alliance with this new world power, but this alliance and all other treaties or compacts of an Eurasian complexion can never endure. They can at best possess only the elemets of expediency. They can never possess the elements of permanence or stability. It is impossible, it is impracticable, nay more, it is unnatural. As individuals the races do not and never will assimiliate. As nations their ultimate individual destiny, their world-wide interests, their undying ambitious centre in channels as opposite as the poles. Canada recently accepted this treaty made by Great Britain. Whether this was done at the request of the Imperial authorities or of her own volition matters little. It is claimed that trade relations with Japan and the orient are of paramount importance. It will be found on investigation that trade with Japan is not an important factor as yet. Take the report of our Commissioner of Japan, Mr. McLean, it is not at all optimistic especially with reference to one of our principal exports, the item of flour. Let me read from weekly report No. 197, dated 4th November, 1907, page 615 :

> Recent correspondence may be recited in order to show, what has already been shown from time to time in these reports that the unreadiness on the part of Canada to entertain any considerable export trade to the far east is disappointingly evident.

And again on page 618 :

> It will be noticed that one correspondent of June 10, cites the milling trade as of the opinion that their sales to the orient have been so far at a loss or at a less net profit than if done at home. Another under date of August 12, states the objection to the Japanese market to be that it leaves no profit whatsoever. This simply goes to show that Canadian flour can get a better price than the market in Japan will offer which is a comfortable situation.

Those familiar with conditions upon the Pacific coast are well assured that this is not permanent. Already we have within a short time a remedy for the existing state of affairs.

Let us consider the present volume of trade with Japan.

Our total imports from Japan for the years 1902-1906 inclusive were..	$6,644,381
Our total exports to Japan for the same period were..	1,793,892
The export item of salt fish, the product of Japanese labour in British Columbia, is..	729,348
The export item of flour..	350,000
Leaving a balance of..	714,000

made up of miscellaneous items of which lumber is about one-third.

Japan's commercial and manufacturing activities are rapidly increasing and those who are now pressing for trade relations will in a few years be praying for relief for protection against the cheaper manufactures of oriental origin. The United States is not disturbed over trade relations with the orient. Why should Canada ? I quote from House documents of 29th Congress, first session, in the report of the Department of Commerce and Labour, 1905-06, page 50 :

> China offers a fertile field for American products and American manufactures but if the price to be paid for trade with China is the unrestricted immigration of Chinese of all classes, then in the interest of American labour, and American citizenship we had better forego entirely that trade.

Oriental trade will flow in the most favourable competing channels and when we consider that the ports of Vancouver, Victoria and Alberni are 600 miles nearer Hong

Kong than San Francisco, it gives Canada an undeniable advantage, and again, Prince Rupert with a harbour equalled by few and surpassed by none in the North Pacific Ocean east or west (and I have visited all those of importance with the exception of Port Arthur and Vladivostock), Prince Rupert occupies the commanding position from the fact that the distance to the orient is 350 miles less than Vancouver, and nearly 1,000 miles less than San Francisco. Prince Rupert backed by the grain fields of Alberta and Saskatchewan equipped with elevators and terminal facilities is destined to command the trans-Pacific trade, irrespective of oriental restrictions.

It has, however, only taken a few months' experiment with this treaty to manifest the weakness of our position in so far as immigration is concerned, and it has been found necessary to send a plenipotentiary in the person of the Minister of Labour to Japan, with a view to more definite understanding. That our representative to Tokio will be firm, even to the verge of failure, is my hope for Canada at this time, thus leaving the government in a position to carry out their avowed policy of 1903, and I trust that legislation will be introduced this session with that in view. Canada should not and must not recede from the position that immigration to this country should be controlled from within and not dictated from without. Other self-governing colonies assume and maintain this position ; that we, the connecting link, of British Dominions should do likewise is doubly imperative.

I notice in the recent press despatches from Tokio a statement credited to Baron Ishii, chief of the Bureau of Commerce of the Japanese Foreign office, who has just returned to Japan from a trip to the United States and Canada investigating the immigration problem. The essence of his statement is that Japan would bow with deference to the wishes of the United States and discontinue sending her labourers to that country, but would continue to send a limited number to Canada. If it be true that Japan has yielded to the wishes of the United States, disregarding the understanding with this government as expressed on the floor of this House, the position of Canada as a colony of Great Britain is indeed humiliating.

It has been charged that the whole question of oriental immigration was largely the result of labour agitators and labour unions. Speaking for myself the charge is absurd. The interest I have in this is a national interest. In my constituency I have not even a labour union, much less a labour agitator. I merely mention this matter of local interest to corroborate what I say. I have no sympathy with mob demonstration or mob violence. But I do sympathize with legitimate agitation, the recognized weapon of every free-born British subject. Are we to stand idly by and see our Canadian national life degraded to the standard of a contract slave ? Are we to saddle upon our offspring and the future generations of Canada the blighting prospect of everlasting competition with the outpourings of the Orient ? Are we to allow our Dominion to be sacrificed to commercial and corporation greed or expediency ? Why should we not agitate, agitate for the future of our country, agitate for a white Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific ?

It has been stated that this is a problem for the west. To that I must take exception. In my opinion it demands the highest consideration of statesmanship and diplomacy, both Colonial and Imperial. That this problem presents many difficulties no one can deny. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has solved many difficult problems with lasting advantages to Canada and the enrichment of his fame for statesmanship, and I trust that in this he will acquit himself also with dignity to his country and added honour to his name. This is not a question for the West, Mr. Speaker, it is for Canada and the Empire.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, the problem of dealing with Asiatics is no new one ; indeed, the question is as old as the sons of Noah. For many centuries, the people of Europe were threatened by what is popularly known as the Yellow Peril, and it was not until about five centuries ago that the ascendancy of the white man became clear and decisive. The Europeans went on voyages of discovery, and took possession of the vacant lands, and afterwards retained possession of those lands by a free use of gunpowder. As a writer in the 'Edinburgh Review,' points out:

> The white man fails to realize that he has owed his ability to dictate terms to the men of other colours, far less to the mental superiority in which he prides himself, than to the restless spirit of dispute and inquiry, which led him from one discovery to another. The invention of gunpowder, about the same time, enabled the white man to obtain supremacy over his less fortunate neighbour, and that supremacy, although sometimes threatened, has been maintained until the present.

Under such conditions, a great disparity in the density of population, so far as the different races were concerned, was bound to come. 800,000,000 persons of the yellow races, occupy 7,000,000 square miles of the southern and eastern fringe of Asia. Of these 350,000,000 people, or over 20,000,000 square miles, are under white government. 600,000,000 persons of the white race occupy, to a greater or less extent, some 25,000,000 square miles in all parts of the earth ; and control 13,00,000 or 14,000,000 more. In other words, the proportion in favour of the whites is about five to one.

Ambitious yellow men are determined to

remove this inequality, and, as Rudyard Kipling stated in his Ottawa speech, they no longer have the same exalted idea of us that we have of ourselves. The most convenient vacant spots for these people are on the Pacific slope of the American continent, and while these spots remain vacant, inrushes of orientals can naturally be expected.

One has only to learn of the way in which the people of China live to be convinced that the desire of these people to secure more land, is a natural one. Malthus, on population, speaking of China:

> The whole surface of the empire, is with trifling exceptions, dedicated to the production of food for man alone. There is no meadow, and very little pasture; neither are the fields cultivated in oats, beans or turnips, for the support of cattle of any kind. Little land is taken up for roads, which are few and narrow, the chief communication being by water. There are no commons or lands suffered to lie waste by the neglect or the caprice or for the sport of great proprietors. No arable land lies fallow. The soil under a hot and fertilizing sun, yields annually, in most instances, double crops.

Notwithstanding that the great majority of the people live under such frugal conditions, the prodigious number of them occasions a great deal of misery, and the same authority quotes the following :—

> The country, however extensive and fertile it may be, is not sufficient to support its inhabitants. Four times as much territory would be necessary to place them at their ease. In Canton alone there is, without exaggeration, more than a million souls, and in a town three or four leagues distant, a still greater number. But what is this to the whole empire, which contains fifteen great provinces all equally peopled? A third part of this infinite population would hardly find sufficient rice to support itself properly. It is well known that extreme misery impels people to the most dreadful excesses. It cannot be said in China, as in Europe, that the poor are idle, and might gain a subsistence if they would work. The labours and efforts of these poor people are beyond conception. A Chinese will pass whole days in digging the earth, sometimes up to his knees in water, and in the evening is happy to eat a little spoonful of rice, and to drink insipid water in which it was boiled. This is all that they have in general.

What is true of China is true to a less extent of Japan and other Asiatic countries. France always maintained a proper proportion of people to its area. Poverty is scarcely known there, and people generally are able to live comfortably, and save for a rainy day. If we take France as maintaining a proper density of population and compare it to China and Japan, we find that there are millions upon millions of people in these countries without room to live. Is it any wonder then that at the investigation recently held by Mr. Mackenzie King, in Vancouver, a Chinese contractor and employer of labour, who is thoroughly acquainted with conditions in his own country, should have made a statement to the effect that if the $500 head tax were removed half the people of China would come to this country of their own accord looking for work.

But there are poor people in countries outside of China and Japan. Great Britain is not without her poor, largely because the area is limited, and a portion of the land is in the hands of individual owners, who do not cultivate it. As one writer puts it :

> But in London there is no escape. Base, brutalizing poverty sweeps along Park Lane, and gazes with sorrowful, hungry, cowardly eyes, at the palaces of South African millionaires. It crowds the June morning parade of smart ladies in Bond street. It touts for cabs or needlessly sweeps crossings in front of the restaurants. It fills the Strand with drunkards and Piccadilly with prostitutes. It is to be seen in the squares of the fashionable neighbourhoods where its presentment is drunken women asleep with their babies in their arms. England may be the richest country in the world, but London is a swamp of dreadful poverty. In degree, the provincial cities are as bad. Who that has ever seen them can forget the palpable miseries of the poor of Edinburgh and Glasgow and Dublin? There is little choice between Manchester, the home of Richard Cobden, and Birmingham, the home of Joseph Chamberlain.

So that while we have a large amount of sympathy for the yellow race, it should not be sufficiently expansive to crowd out that sympathy we ought to have for the people of our own race blood.

British Columbia entered confederation some thirty-six years ago. It is easily the richest province in the Dominion of Canada. The opportunities for peopling it were many, and it offered every possible attraction to the settler. But British Columbia seldom received any encouragement from the government or parliament of Canada, and imperial statesmen refused to appreciate its importance as a factor in the building up of the empire. The requests of its mere handful of people were generally treated with contempt. In the general scramble for appropriations, some wise and some otherwise, that were made since confederation, and are still being made, there was nothing left for poor British Columbia, after the fellows with more votes got what they wanted. Secession was threatened in the early days, because the then government refused to carry out the terms of union, and finally, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the eastern people said, now those British Columbians should be satisfied for all time to come, and this federal government took the position that the people of British Columbia could not expect any more when a railway was built for them. But the construction of the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway did little or nothing to open up and develop British Columbia. From the time it enters the Rockies, until it reaches the delta of the Fraser, it runs through the poorest portion of the province, with the exception of a very limited area. It opens up no valleys, and it practically escapes the mineral bearing sections. You closed our free ports in which we could buy the cheapest goods that were to be used in the development of our great natural resources, and you thereby forced us to buy your highly protected eastern wares, hauled to us by a railway that was absolutely under no control, and which charged us every dollar they could extract from us. It is quite true that incidental to the completion of the road, a great city grew up at its western terminus, but this was about the only benefit British Columbia received from the construction of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The people clamoured for railways to open up the valleys of the province, to give transportation facilities to its mineral and timber resources, but while this parliament generously voted large subventions for development roads elsewhere, for many years it turned a deaf ear to the representations of British Columbian representatives.

The federal government spent thousands of dollars in encouraging immigrants to the Northwest, but not one dollar in getting emigrants for British Columbia. Arrangements were made with transportation companies for cheap rates to the Northwest, and the self same companies were allowed to compensate themselves for these reductions by soaking those who had the courage to venture to British Columbia. So far as British Columbia was concerned, its chief function as a part of confederation, was to produce revenue, to be expended elsewher, in making this a great country. An hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Armstrong) exemplified this same selfish policy when he introduced a resolution calling for free rural postal delivery. By this resolution he simply declared that we ought to starve the undeveloped portions of this country in the interests of the more populous eastern portions.

Honourable gentlemen seem to think that the picture has been over-drawn, but I have resurrected an authority which should appeal, at least, to the honourable gentlemen opposite. A number of them will remember Hon. Col. Prior, who represented Victoria in this House, for a number of years. He was a Tory of the Tories, whose party loyalty could not be questioned, but he ran up against the studied neglect of British Columbian interests, and finally, driven to desperation he wrote to Sir John Macdonald, the Premier of Canada, a letter which substantiates to the fullest extent, the statements which I make. This letter bears date December 12, 1890, and in part, follows :

Mr. D. ROSS.

Dear Sir John,—Both Earle and myself see the matter in the same light and are heartily sick of trying to do our duty to our constituents without being able to accomplish anything.... I consider that ever since I have been in the House you never tried to do justice to Victoria. When I say 'you' of course I mean your government.

Nothing that I asked for to amount to anything has been granted, although I never asked for anything out of reason.... All I want to do is to get what is fair for my constituents.... In conjunction with my colleague I repeatedly brought to the notice of different ministers the necessity of new post-office and customs buildings here, but no notice whatever, is taken of our application.... When a minister comes here he accepts a banquet, takes a drive around a block and is off again. He never takes the trouble to see for himself what our requirements are, and even when he is told by the representatives, he makes a note of them, perhaps, and that is the last of it.... I shall call a public meeting, explain the whole matter, and resign my seat. I know it wont make much difference to you, and you will say: 'Let the young fool resign' . . If Victoria is not to get what she is justly entitled to, I do not wish any longer to be her representative.

(Sgd.) E. G. PRIOR.

Needless to say Col. Prior did not resign, and the same conditions prevailed until this government came into power in 1896.

An elaborate defence of the policy of this government need not be made. There were times when it could not rid itself of the traditions of the past, and it listened to the tempter, in the shape of the importunate easterners with a greater voting power, but it can be safely said that when the history of Canada is written due credit must be given the Laurier government for its early appreciation of the fact that the destiny of this country, if it were to become great, was bound up in the west, and in its efforts to develop and people that portion of the Dominion, British Columbia received substantial recognition.

The construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway did more to develop British Columbia than any other factor. The government was severely criticised by honourable gentlemen opposite for its policy in this connection, but no more profitable investment of money was ever made by any country than that by Canada when she granted a few million dollars to aid in the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Coal mines were opened up, lumber mills were established, the fertile portions of the valley were brought under cultivation, with the result that to-day from Medicine Hat to Kootenay Landing, is a valley of prosperous growing towns and villages.

The main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway runs a little over a hundred miles north of the international boundary line, and practically all the development of British Columbia, except portions of Lillooet and Cariboo, and a portion of the

coast, is south of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line. This is accounted for by the fact that there are no railways north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and while the hurricane deck of a cayouse and the stage coach are interesting and picturesque, they do not tend to hasten settlement or development. British Columbia is seven hundred miles in length, from the United States to its northern boundary. About one-sixth of its area—the southern portion is partially developed; five-sixths remains undeveloped. The country north of the Canadian Pacific Railway is just as rich in mineral resources, in timber, and in agricultural lands. Again, this government endeavoured to bring about the construction of a railway through the northern portion of the province by which a promising district would be opened up, and the trade of the Yukon conserved for Canadian people, but when honourable gentlemen opposite could not defeat the project themselves, they had it defeated in another place. During the fat years of the Yukon trade, Seattle got the cream, and Northern British Columbia remained unpeopled and its resources undeveloped.

But the great colonization road is the Grand Trunk Pacific. It will run through the centre of the undeveloped five-sixths. From the time it leaves Tete Juan Cache, until it reaches Prince Rupert, it will open up a country of the most desirable kind for settlement. The great Peace River Valley with its ten million acres of agricultural lands in British Columbia, is brought nearer. The Bulkley, Kispyox, Oosta Lake, Nechacho, and other valleys will be invaded, and an illimitable wealth of mineral and timber will be made available, while the branches which are sure to be built to make southern connections with this railway, will open up districts equally desirable. British Columbia is coming to her own after long years of not very patient waiting. Had statesmen of the past, either Canadian or imperial, realized the importance of British Columbia from an imperial point of view, we would have to-day one million white people in British Columbia, instead of less than two hundred and fifty thousand; and with one million white people in British Columbia, the oriental question would scarcely be worth discussing. Our own people would then have possession of the land, and they would be strong enough to retain possession. But see the situation to-day, Mr. Speaker. There is room for the million people, yes for two or three million people, the opportunities are there, and the vacant places are fast being made available. The settlement of British Columbia can no longer be retarded; but the choice of settlement has to be made. Shall it be white or yellow? The struggling, starving masses of the orient look across the Pacific, and see in British Columbia a veritable promised land, overflowing with everything necessary for the comfort of man. Are we going to let them come? British Columbia has room for a million or more of either one class or the other, but there is not room for both. As well try to mix water and oil, as mix white and yellow. Race prejudice has existed since the day when an all-wise though inscrutable Providence, took sides by bestowing a special blessing on the sons of Japhet, and will continue to exist for all time.

We cannot appreciate the oriental mind. We cannot understand his ways, nor he ours. Summing up Lafcadio Hearn's Works on Japan, the 'Edinburgh Review' places the whole situation in a nutshell as follows :—

> The conclusions which we are entitled to draw from Hearn, conclusions which have the sanction not only of the most thoughtful writers on Japan, but of the Japanese themselves, warn us in our dealings with the country to avoid equally an attitude of susceptive admiration or of Pharisaical superiority. The Japanese are no worse than ourselves; they may possibly—Heaven help them—be no better. But they are, and they will remain, fundamentally different. Should they conceivably or inconceivably, adopt Christianity, they will produce an entirely different sort of Christian; should they break themselves into the Roman character, they will still read life from right to left. We shall never be abe to foretell their mental processes more accurately than those of the cat upon the hearth-rug, even had we as favourable opportunities for study.
>
> We might in a dozen ways and with untold profit to ourselves, take Japan for an example; we might strive to shame our timorous apathy with the contrast of her determination; but even should we sit at her feet we must never imagine that we do, or can, understand her. That she will outwit us for good or evil, we may take for granted.

Meredith Townsend, another well-known writer, speaks of the 'dull unconquerable unmitigable, distaste of Asiatics for white men.' Is it any wonder that this feeling is reciprocated?

Such, then, are the people who are looking with longing eyes on British Columbia, anxious to take possession. No greater mistake could be made by the British empire, there could be no graver menace to its future, than to allow the Pacific province to become filled with orientals. We are told that we should do nothing to disturb the friendly relations between two great world powers. There can be no umbrage taken from our desire to regulate our immigration as we see fit. It is a fundamental maxim of international law that 'every state has the right to regulate immigration to its territories as is most convenient to the safety and prosperity of the country,' and such regulations do not violate any rule of international comity. It is quite true that the relations between Great Britain and Japan are cordial to-day, but what of to-morrow? What

of a people whose mental process we cannot gauge more accurately than that of the cat upon the hearthrug? In the event of trouble, we cannot denationalize the Jap, within our borders. Once a Jap, always a Jap. From Vancouver to the summit of the rockies, our great national military railway, the safest and surest means of convoy between Great Britain and the orient, is manned to-day by subjects of the Mikado. The alert, aggressive little brown men, do sentry duty at 'The Loop' and other high trestles, that are the marvel of engineering skill. Should trouble come, a stick of dynamite would destroy one of these trestles and our national military railway would be out of commission. This is only one instance to show that there may be other questions to be considered besides that of welcoming a people we do not want, and do not understand.

The people of the Pacific province have been severely criticised for their language and their actions, in connection with this question. Violence is to be deprecated, but the people of British Columbia have said nothing and done nothing that had not been said and done before in other British countries, where they had the problem to solve, and where they invariably solved it as we want it solved in British Columbia. My hon. friend, who represents Vancouver, has been censured for having made some referenc to a modernized repetition of the 'Boston tea-party,' a reference which he repudiates, but even if he were guilty, he would have been not without a distinguished precedent. A gentleman who was knighted in recognition of his valuable services to the empire, and who happened to be the leader of the government of New South Wales, was guilty of giving utterance to the following, in 1888. Speaking on the Chinese Restriction Bill, he said:

> In this crisis of the Chinese question, and it is a crisis, we have acted calmly with a desire to see clearly the way before us; but at the same time we have acted with decision, and we don't mean to turn back. Neither for Her Majesty's ships of war, nor for Her Majesty's representative on the spot, nor for the Secretary of State for the Colonies, do we intend to turn aside from our purpose, which is to terminate the landing of Chinese on these shores for ever, except under the restrictions imposed by the Bill, which will amount and which are intended to amount to practical prohibition.

The gentleman was Sir Henry Parks. Needless to say, his views prevailed, and his name goes down to history as that of a statesman not an agitator.

Some ministers of the Gospel have been manufacturing biblical platitudes and firing them at us for our position on this question. Conspicuous among them, has been Rev. Dr. Johnston, of the American Presbyterian Church, Montreal. He visited British Columbia this summer, (and we were glad to see him) and he happened to be in Vancouver at the time of the riot. He returned home full of information about the oriental question, and, availing himself of an opportunity to address a banquet of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, he won their plaudits by denouncing what he has been pleased to call the narrow views of the people of British Columbia. Now, the Rev. Dr. Johnston is a gentleman entitled to the very highest regard, but it may be stated that the American Presbyterian Church in Montreal is not the best place in the world to study all the economic and socialogical phases of the oriental question, and the plaudits which he received from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association should have warned him that his final summing up must be entirely wrong, and not in the best interests of this country.

Rev. Dr. Johnston could get another view, another outlook, by studying life at closer quarters, and in its more varied phases in the great city of Montreal. Let him leave Dorchester street, where his church is situated, let him cease admiring the beauties of Dominion Park. Let him desert his comfortable, wealthy congregation, for the nonce, and let him go down into the city below the hill, where we are told the people are so crowded that if the denizens of a block stood shoulder to shoulder they would completely encircle it. There, he may find a new light on this question, and he might ask: can we escape our responsibilities in connection with these people, whose condition cannot be improved without some effort on our part, by boosting for an alien race who will come and fill our vacant spots without any effort on our part and then, having asked himself what we are going to do with these and the millions of others of our own race, who are even less fortunate, he might go back to his early school days and his Canadian history, and read the following extract from Lord Durham's report of Canada:

> These great waste lands of the empire were the rightful patrimony of the English people. The ample appenage which God and nature had set aside in the new world for those whose lot had assigned them but insufficient portions in the old.

The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) during his recent pilgrimage to the west, earnestly and conscientiously strove to make some political capital for his own party out of the situation in British Columbia. With his efforts in this direction no fault can be found. He had a good deal to say about the fact that the seven members from British Columbia uttered no protest when the Japanese treaty came before this House for ratification. We appreciate the compliment very much when he delegates to the members from British Columbia, the duties and the functions of the opposition, but he can

scarcely escape his share of the responsibility in that way. If any objections could be offered to the ratification of the Japanese treaty, it was surely the duty of the opposition who are here to analyse, to criticise, to oppose the measures of the government, to have found these objections. They cannot escape the responsibility for not having made these objections by saying that the members from British Columbia took no part in this discussion or offered no protest at that time. We heard the discussion when the Japanese treaty was submitted to parliament for ratification, and we had the assurance of the government that the friendly arrangements entered into between this government and that of Japan, in reference to the restriction of immigration, would be carried out notwithstanding the ratification of this treaty. We had not only these assurances but the assurance was again given by the Japanese consul that notwithstanding the ratification of the treaty these restrictions would be lived up to by the government of Japan. And, having these assurances, we saw no good reason then why the treaty should not be ratified.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman referring to assurances that were given in the House ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am referring to assurances that were given in the House and outside the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What were the assurances given outside the House ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The assurances given outside the House were contained in a letter which was written by the representative of Japan to the government, that, notwithstanding the ratification of this treaty, he would undertake, on the part of his government, to carry out these restrictions. Now, the hon. leader of the opposition not only did not oppose the ratification of the treaty, but if any criticism at all were offered it was in the nature of attacking what he and his friends were pleased to call the dilatory methods of this government in not securing the ratification of the treaty at an earlier date. I remember the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) protesting because this treaty was not ratified in connection with some grievance, I presume, that some constituent of his had in regard to trade with Japan. On May 15, 1906—I am quoting from "Hansard"—the hon. leader of the opposition spoke as follows :

It seems to me that prompt measures should be taken so that those who desire to ship to Japan should have the advantage of the treaty at the earliest possible moment. I do not know that we have taken sufficient pains up to the present to promote and develop commercial relations between Canada and Japan. It is generally conceded that a very large business might be done in certain lines and it would be a great disappointment to those who propose to develop that business if they were to find that there are still difficulties in the way.

So that you see, Sir, that if any criticism were offered at all by the hon. leader of the opposition or any of his supporters, it was to urge the government to procure the ratification of this treaty. When the treaty was up for discussion in connection with its ratification I find that the hon. leader of the opposition took part in the discussion. As the leader of a great party looking at legislation which was certainly an innovation in this country, practically delegating to an oriental country the right to dictate to us our own policy with reference to immigration,—I say as the leader of a great party he took part in that discussion and I will again quote his remarks in that connection. You will find them at page 1547 of 'Hansard,' 1906-7, vol. 1 :

"Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the value of a yen ?"

That is the only contribution to this important debate made by the hon. leader of the opposition and yet he will go out to the province of British Columbia and endeavour, as I have said before, to get some political advantage out of this question. He will tell the people there that the members from British Columbia took no part in this discussion when he himself as leader of a party only offered a mercenary argument in asking the question : 'What is the value of a yen' ?

Mr. BLAIN. What were the seven Liberal members from British Columbia doing?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I thought I explained to the House what they were doing. As I pointed out, when this treaty came up for ratification the government stated to the House that the arrangements then entered into with the government of Japan and which were then being carried out to the satisfaction of the people of British Columbia would still be carried out notwithstanding the ratification of the treaty and with the other assurance that the Japanese consul, living in the city of Ottawa, had written to the government that he would undertake on the part of his government to see that these restrictions were carried out, we did exactly what every member, whether a supporter of the government or the opposition, did in this House —we unanimously supported the ratification of the treaty.

I am willing to take my share of the responsibility in that connection, but the leader of the opposition cannot escape his share. What I do object to is that the leader of a great party, sitting in his seat in this House and using no argument except to ask the question: What is the value of a yen? should go to the province of British Columbia and denounce us because we

took no part in that discussion and offered no objection to the measure. It is quite true that after leaving the province of British Columbia where this question was a live one, he regaled his audience in Winnipeg with extracts from 'Hansard' to show that he had sounded a note of warning in reference to Japan, but he did not tell his audience that these remarks of his were delivered some two years before the treaty was ratified by parliament, and that when the treaty was up for ratification, he did not have any comment to offer. As one who takes a keen interest in the welfare of the hon. gentleman, might I be permitted to suggest that the criticism of the hon. leader of the opposition would be far more effective if it did not generally come two years too soon, or a year too late.

The objection of the people of British Columbia to unrestricted oriental immigration have been ably stated by preceding speakers, and those objections are not dissimilar to the objections offered in every self-governing British colony where climatic and other conditions make the land desirable for the residence of the white man. I desire to put the objections of the people of British Columbia in concrete form. They object to the Asiatic:

Because they usually get a grip on the country they enter.

Because, while they may come as hewers of wood and drawers of water, they do not remain in a servile position.

Because they are incapable of assimilation.

Because they are strangers to our civilization.

Because they are out of sympathy with our aspirations.

Because they are unfitted for our free institutions.

Because they create in our own people a degraded estimate of manual labour, similar to those in communities where African slavery has been permitted.

Because they inevitably force a lower standard of living for white working classes.

Because, given an opportunity, they become capable of doing expert work, and then as all work would be 'niggers' work, there would be nothing for a white man to do.

Because as they consume less than white men, they are worth less, commercially, to the empire.

Because they make the country of no value as a home for the surplus population of Great Britain.

Because we want to preserve the British type in our population.

Now, as to the remedy. The policy of this government in arranging with the governments of countries whence these people come, to keep their people from coming here, is a satisfactory solution of the question if such policy can be made effective. But the orientals must be kept out of this country, and if satisfactory arrangements cannot be made by diplomacy then we must pass legislation with that object in view. Hon. gentlemen have criticised the action of the Prime Minister in reference to the difference of the treatment accorded Chinese and Japanese. He has even been accused of immoral conduct because of it. I am bound to say that the position of the right hon. gentleman in connection with this question is ethically correct and diplomatically sound. China is a large country with an enormous population and with a weak government absolutely incapable of controlling its own people. Even if we entered into such an arrangement with China as we have with Japan, and even if the government of China agreed to such an arrangement they are absolutely incapable of carrying it out. It therefore became necessary for us to pass legislation against Chinese immigration. But the situation in Japan is different. Japan has a strong government which has demonstrated its authority over its own people, and if the government of Japan imposes satisfactory restrictions, and if these can be secured by diplomatic negotiations, the people of British Columbia are satisfied. But if they cannot be secured by diplomacy, then we insist that this parliament and this government shall pass legislation that will restrict the Japanese and other orientals from coming here. Our right to legislate with this object in view without violating any international law is unquestioned. Such legislation has been passed and carried into effect in other self-governing British countries. The most practical way of restricting oriental immigration is by passing what is popularly known as 'The Natal Act.' It assumes that the only desirable immigrants are those which come from European countries, and that the surest and easiest way of determining whether they are from a European country or not is by applying a test as to their knowledge of a European language. If the time should ever come when it is absolutely necessary to secure a class of labour that cannot be found in this country, or from Great Britain, or from a European country, then that class of labour might be obtained from the orient, but only upon such conditions being imposed by the Canadian government as would provide for the repatriation of these people after the specific work for which they come here had been completed. I thoroughly agree with the view expressed by the member from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), that in all cases of contract labour the Canadian government should exercise supervision over such contracts, and that no contract labour should be imported without the consent of this government. It has been asked: should we legislate against the immigration of Hindoos who are British subjects. Why not? We are legislating to-day against

British subjects who come from the shadow of Downing Street; our immigration laws declare that we shall only take those who come up to the standard we want whether they come from Great Britain or elsewhere. If we do that in connection with British subjects coming from Great Britain why should we not do it in connection with British subjects coming from Calcutta or Bombay?

Mr. SPROULE. Because of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not understand my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. I say, because of the contract entered into with the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I still cannot understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) says: If we only take from Great Britain those immigrants whom we want, why cannot we do the same with regard to other countries, and I say it is because of the contract entered into with the North Atlantic Trading Company with reference to the immigrants coming here.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. There was nothing in the contract entered with the North Atlantic Trading Company that interfered in any way with the strict enforcement of any immigration laws which this parliament might pass, and possibly one of the strong reasons for cancelling the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was because under the contract we were not getting the class of people that we did want.

In this connection may I be permitted to speak very briefly of the situation which developed in the Transvaal. The imperial government conceded the right of the government there to pass legislation against British Indians, and placed its stamp of approval upon the legislation. Under President Kruger, the Transvaal attempted to enforce restrictive legislation against Hindoes, but the British government objected, and the subsequent respresentative of the British Indian claims subsequently made, before the British government, stated that they had 'cherished the anticipation that the war had for one of its main objects the rescue of British Indians from the harsh treatment to which they were subjected by the late Boer republic.' After the war the government of the Transvaal passed legislation far more restrictive than that inforced by the Boer republics, and on the advice of Sir Arthur Lawley, Lieutenant-Governor of the Transvaal, and Lord Milner, High Commissioner in Africa, the imperial government refused to interfere with the legislation of a self-governing colony, and British Indians became subjected to restrictive immigration laws, in a British colony, far harsher than those which the Boer republic desired to impose upon them before the war. If the Transvaal without the same measure of self-government that Canada enjoys, is allowed to pass such legislation, Canada's right to pass similar legislation cannot be questioned. The issues involved in legislation of this character are fully dealt with in a letter of Sir Arthur Lawley, Lieutenant-Governor of the Transvaal and a covering letter by Lord Milner, High Commissioner for South Africa, transmitting Sir Arthur Lawley's letter to the Colonial Secretary. These letters are too long to be inserted in 'Hansard,' but they may be found as an appendix to L. E. Neames' work, 'The Asiatic Danger in the Colonies,' a work which is well worth the study of any one who takes an interest in the subject.

But, after all, Mr. Speaker, the best solution of the question is summed up in Rudyard Kipling's watchword, 'pump in the whites.' This policy cannot be made a success without the support and encouragement of this parliament and this government. Every possible attention, every posible assistance, should be given to opening up the desirable portions of the province of British Columbia by aiding the construction of railways, by improving our harbour facilities, by greater expenditure on public works, by offering every possible encouragement to the white man to go and settle there.

No portion of the Dominion, nor of the world, for that matter, lends itself more to becoming the ideal white man's country than the province of British Columbia. Its climate, its scenery, its soil, the nature of the industries which can be developed, all combine to make British Columbia the most desirable home of the white man. Some years ago the Princess Louise visited British Columbia, and she wrote Her Royal Mother that she was in Victoria, midway between Balmoral and heaven; and, in later years, a vice-regal representative, having seen the country for himself, stated that the Princess Louise erred in placing Victoria so near Balmoral. The same vice-regal representative, in discussing fruit-growing, at the opening of the New Westminster fair, said:

> Fruit growing in your province has acquired the distinction of being a beautiful art, as well as a most profitable industry. After a maximum term of five years, I understand the settler may look forward with reasonable certainty to a net income of from $100 to $150 per acre, after all expenses of cultivation have been paid. Gentlemen, here is a state of things which appears to offer the opportunity of living under such ideal conditions as struggling humanity has only succeeded in reaching, in one or two of the most favoured spots upon the earth. There are thousands of families living in England to-day, families of refinement and culture, and distinction, families such as you would welcome among you with both arms, who would be only too glad to come out and occupy a log hut on five acres of an apple or pear orchard in Canada, if they could do so at a reasonable cost.

It is well within the mark to say that there are one million acres of fruit lands in British Columbia. Five acres of fruit land are equal to 100 acres of wheat land, and will maintain a family of five. With the development of this industry to its fullest extent, a population of over a million would be assured. Allow the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Hindoos to engage in this industry, to take possession of the land and to cultivate it, and you completely destroy the industry, so far as the white man is concerned. No white man would do 'niggers' work in the south, and the south for years remained dormant and undeveloped, because the dignity of labour was destroyed. No white man or woman in British Columbia is going to do chink's work, and once the oriental gets a grip on any industry, the white man will no longer engage in it. Foolish prejudice, you will say ; but it is a prejudice which we must face, because it cannot be eradicated.

It is well within the mark to say that there are 15,000,000 acres of agricultural lands in British Columbia. We have boasted of our efforts to people the vacant lands of the Northwest with a desirable class of settlers, but there is a limit to the unsettled area of the Northwest. The hon. member for St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) made a calculation in this House during the session of 1905, to the effect that at the then rate of alienating the public domain, there would be no further lands available for settlement in 1910. I am not particularly enamoured of my authority on Northwest matters, but there is sufficient in the statement to warrant the conclusion that some other vacant spots must be made available in the near future if the good work of taking hold of our own people who may be unfortunate through no fault of their own, is to continue, and by settling them on the land they are given an opportunity to become something worth while.

Again, British Columbia is the most attractive field for this work ; but allow it to be filled up with orientals and these people might as well starve at home as starve in British Columbia, because there won't be room for both, and the yellow man has, through thousands of years of patient trying, learned how to live upon less than enough to keep a white man from starving.

With coal measures sufficient to supply the world for centuries, with the greatest compact area of merchantable timber on the American continent, with mines which have already produced 300,000,000 of dollars, and the mineral area has scarcely been touched, with fisheries whose annual revenue is from $7,000,000 to $8,000,000, and which are only in the initial stages of development, with agricultural and fruit lands much more extensive than the mountainous character of the country would indicate, and which offer compensation for physical disadvantages, by yielding far more per acre than land anywhere else in Canada, with millions of acres of pulp wood, with petroleum deposits, whose extent cannot yet be determined, and with inexhaustible measures of iron ore, all inviting capital and industry ; with all those advantages, together with a climate, which easily reaches the white man's ideal, is it any wonder that we, who live in British Columbia and get enthused over its potentialities and possibilities, should be anxious to keep this province for our own race ? Let us develop it. Let us build up a country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and people it, not with an unassimilative rabble of different races and colours but by strong white men, proud of the country in which they live, and prouder still, that under the old flag conditions will be such as to enable them to maintain the land for themselves, their children, and their children's children.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster) Mr. Speaker there has been so much said on this question already, the subject has been so well handled by the different speakers who have addressed the House, that there is very little left for me to say. As some of you will remember, when the treaty with Japan was submitted to us for ratification last session, I gave my views on the question, as I thought, very plainly and briefly. There was a very thin House at the time, and a great many of the members do not know yet that I said anything. I have been asked to-day how it was that nothing was said on this question last session, and I notice that the Conservative papers in British Columbia made a point of declaring that the solid seven Liberals from British Columbia sat mum when the treaty was before the House. They evidently did not know either that I said anything or they did not choose to know: However, if any one doubts, what I said is to be found in the Hansard of last session, page 1548.

However as there were so few present then, I may be pardoned if I repeat a little of what I did say, and I do not think that it will hurt any one to hear it the second time. We in British Columbia feel very keenly on this matter. Some people have the idea that we are simply making an agitation for political purposes ; but I think I can show before I am through that I at least have not been influenced in any shape or form by any such motive in the stand I have always taken. I went to British Columbia in 1877. There were not so many Chinamen there then as there are now and very few Japanese, but there was a very curious conglomeration of different colours from the South Sea Islands as well as from China. When I went out, I found it necessary to work as a common labourer, but that was not very troublesome to me because I was brought up on a farm, and I was one of those settlers who took the first job that came along. I had to compete with Chinamen, and I speak from experience when I say that at that time any

white labourer going to that country and having nothing before him but the work of his hands to depend on, would think it a very good place to get out of as fast as he could. I would not have stayed there long if I had not thought that I was able for something better than ordinary day labour, and that it would not be very long before I got beyond it. I was right in my surmise. I have been thirty years in that country, and after the first few months I became myself an employer of labour, and I had, in conjunction with some of my fellow men with whom I was in partnership, to employ Chinese labour, but I always made it a point to employ white men whenever I could get them, and keep the Chinese out. I have followed out that principle and policy ever since, and I am convinced that we could very easily get all the white labour we required if every one would act on that principle. But there are so many large corporations, and so many people anxious to make money, and so many people who are always talking about the necessity of cheap labour, that white labour has a very poor chance. I must say that I have always considered cheap labour degraded labour. But there are so many of these people who will give preference to cheap labour, that the Chinamen nearly always gets plenty of work, while the poor white man is obliged to go somewhere else to look for it.

In 1885, as you were told this afternoon by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), a commission was appointed to investigate the whole matter. You were told who composed that commission so that I need not repeat the information. That commission issued a number of questions to the employers of labour and people in different walks of life generally in British Columbia, to be answered at length. There were twenty-seven questions in all. One of these blanks was sent to me and I answered all the questions. I need not inflict all these answers on you to-night, as that would be trespassing too much on your patience. I shall simply quote the last question and my reply :

Q. Can you give any statistical or other information, or furnish any facts bearing on the general question now being considered by the commission, which will facilitate its work or make its labours more complete.—A. My ideas on the whole question have been formed and are entirely governed by what I call a common sense view of the situation, and not by statistics furnished by any authorities, either here or elsewhere. The Chinese come here in swarms; nearly all are single men and none of them will marry here. If any women come with them, they are common prostitutes. Scores of them will crowd together in one small building that would barely suffice for one ordinary white labourer's family. They become proprietors to a very limited extent, and do very little building in proportion to their numbers, ninety-nine per cent of them raise no family, and none of them take any part or interest in either municipal, political or educational matters. Unlike those of other nationalities, they do not become assimilated to our customs, dress, manner of living, or even laws, any more than they are obliged to by law. Is it possible then that our province can prosper as well with labourers of this class as with the class of white settlers who are now coming into the country in limited numbers, and in many cases bringing families with them, and who would come in much larger numbers if the Chinese did not stand in their way. This latter class will live in houses, not dens; will send their children to school and church; will take an intelligent part in municipal, political and educational matters; will become largely proprietors of the soil, and thus be permanent settlers, while their children will grow up to be our future city and county councillors, and in some cases our future legislators, as well as to fill many positions of both public and private importance. As an example: Look at one of our sawmills employing other labour than Chinese. In the immediate neighbourhood there springs up quite a village, with store, school-house, church and other places of public benefit ; while a cannery with the same capital invested, and employing mostly Chinese will only show one large barn-like building for their use, and probably one or two houses for the proprietor and overseer. I know that the white labouring class here has in the past been largely composed of single men, who were ready to move off at any time, but that state of affairs is rapidly changing with the opening up of the country. I know that during the present summer many white labourers have had to leave this town and district, because so many Chinamen are employed in our mills and canneries, as well as in the wood-cutting business; and I consider the loss of one permanent settler as greater to the country at large than that of ten who only intend staying long enough to make a little money.

That was my opinion in 1885 and at that time I had not the slightest idea of ever being in politics, so I could not be accused of holding those ideas for political purposes.

One thing about these yellow men, both Chinese and Japanese, to which we object very strongly is that they are brought here in a state of semi-slavery. You heard my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) to-day read a copy of a contract that had been made with both the Canadian Pacific Railway and a coal company whereby a certain number of these men are brought out for a given time by a certain company. The men are never consulted in this matter at all, the business is all done with the company, the wages are paid to the company, and the employers in this country do not know whether these men receive any wages or not. As I told the House last session, if an employer of labour wants a number of Chinese or Japanese, he does not engage them individually, but goes to a 'boss' and employs so many men at a certain wage, and he knows nothing about the wages they receive, or if they receive any. I consider that slavery to a certain extent, and something that should not exist in this country of ours which has always made a boast that we

never had slavery here. What chance has a white labourer to live as a white man should and compete with men like these ? It is all very well for clergymen and philanthropists to talk about what should be done for the labourers and what the labouring classes should do, how they should be elevated and made to live a higher and better life than they do. How can they do that if they have to compete with men who live as the Chinamen and Japanese live. Let any one, as I said last session, follow a number of these Chinese and Japanese to their homes and see how they live and then ask himself if any white man could compete with men like them and keep a family, or even clothe himself decently and live as a white man should. It is utterly impossible. I do not know better how to bring this matter home to the members of this House than by giving them a few examples near home. Most of us are acquainted with the city of Hull across the river from Otttawa. If you go to Hull you will find that most of the men of that city work for the E. B. Eddy concern. Let us suppose for a moment that that concern was manned almost entirely by Japanese or Chinamen, then where would Hull be ? There would be no city, it would not be even a village. There would not be 100 houses in the whole place. The same thing would apply to any manufacturing town or city in the province of Ontario, or Quebec, Peterborough, Chatham, Guelph, Galt, Valleyfield, or even the large cities. Let Chinese or Japanese take the places of the men who are doing the unskilled labour in these towns, and the people of the eastern provinces would soon realize that the people of British Columbia have good grounds for the objection they make to the importation of orientals in the large numbers that we are now receiving. Many people have the idea that white labourers cannot be obtained out there. They cannot be obtained until we get rid of the others, because the presence of the Chinese and Japanese there has degraded labour to a certain extent ; cheap labour is always degraded labour, and until we are willing to pay white labour decent wages, so that the men can live as they should, we cannot expect many to go to the country.

Those who drew up the treaty with Japan evidently did not think of the difference that exists between the two nations, Great Britain and Japan. I pointed this out last session. Japan has a very large population but has no outside colonies of her own to which she can send her surplus population Great Britain, on the other hand, has many large colonies which can absorb all her surplus population, and I do not think that Britain should have made any such treaty as the one she did make with Japan, the very first article of which recites :

> The subjects of each of the two high contracting parties shall have liberty to enter, travel or reside in any part of the dominions and possessions of the other contracting party and shall enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property.

They might well have changed or omitted that clause. It certainly would have been a very great benefit to all the other colonies as well as to British Columbia. We are told in some quarters that British Columbia can look nowhere else for trade than to the orient, China and Japan. We do considerable business with other countries. A great deal of lumber is cut in British Columbia, and I do not think so much of it is shipped to either Japan or China. It goes to Australia, South America, and Mexico. I noticed the other day in the ' Labour Gazette,' that Mr. William White, second vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway who was in Vancouver, made the following statement :

> It is the intention of the company to reserve sites for grain elevators on the Vancouver water front. This idea is being kept in view in the yard improvements now being carried out, as it is impossible to tell what effect the building of the Panama canal may have on the export movement of wheat from the prairie provinces. One result may be that the very large percentage of the grain may seek an outlet via Vancouver instead of reaching Liverpool market via the St. Lawrence river route. Under these circumstances we have felt justified in making provisions for future contingencies. If the grain from a big area of the Canadian west can be hauled here and loaded on steamers, making the passage of the Panama canal and landing it in Liverpool, only one transhipment being involved, as compared with elevator charges for transhipment at Fort William and Montreal—I say if this can be done more cheaply via Vancouver, then the business is bound to come this way.

The officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway may be credited with a good deal of far sightedness in business matters, and I think they have seen a good way ahead in relation to this question. They have shown us that the ports of British Columbia are not obliged to look to Japan and China for their business. But even if they had, I would say that no matter how important the business of China and Japan may be to Canada, better that we should lose that business than allow our country to be filled with aliens, and our own labouring classes driven back to this end of the Dominion. Who would be most benefited by this oriental commerce ? None but a few capitalists. It is all very well for the Manufacturers' Association to talk in this way, but they care nothing for the welfare of the labouring classes of the Dominion at large.

Now we have heard to-day some reference to statements by political leaders. I am not going to give one party much more credit than the other in their attitude on this matter, although the present government have done what no Conservative government ever did, in that they have raised the head tax on Chinese to $500. I only

wish we could get the government to do the same thing to the Japanese. But both political leaders seem to be a little shy on this question. Why, I can hardly understand. It is not very long since nearly all the writers in the religious press of the country took strong ground against any thing being done to keep these people out of Canada; but I notice that a great change has taken place within a year or two. I notice that a change has taken place in the Presbyterian Church to which I myself belong; and if any one will take the trouble to look at the 'Presbyterian Record' of last October or November, he will see a sensible article written in a very different spirit from that of the articles which used to appear in the same paper. I think that a similar change is going on in all the denominations. They are now beginning to see exactly how the question stands, they are beginning to realize that the people of British Columbia have a substantial grievance, and one that is well worthy their consideration.

I do not think it is much use to take up more time of the House. This question has been thoroughly discussed, arguments have been advanced from many different standpoints, and I think by this time the House must be convinced that British Columbia has a grievance, and that the members of that province are justified in trying to force the government to take some action. Of course until we hear the result of the hon. Mr. Lemieux's mission, we do not need to press the matter. But in the meantime, I would like every member of the House to ask himself how he would look at this question supposing the same trouble arose in his own constituency. Would he not look at it in much the same way as we do? In conclusion, I have to say that I hope this motion will be passed without any opposition.

On motion of Mr. M. S. McCarthy the debate was adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Government Bills.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 17, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—Mr. H. G. Schell.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No 40) respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada. —Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

CHRISTMAS RECESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That when this House adjourns on Thursday the 19th instant it will stand adjourned until Wednesday, the eighth day of January, 1908.

He said: This motion has been on the order paper for some time and it has been suggested to me that instead of adjourning on Thursday, the House should adjourn to-morrow (Wednesday).

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are altogether in the hands of the House, and if it be the wish of the House we will comply with it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then as it seems to be the wish of the House, I move that the motion be amended to read as follows:—

That when the House adjourns on Wednesday the 18th instant it will stand adjourned until Wednesday the 8th of January next.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SURVEYS AND SURVEYORS.

Bill (No. 9) respecting surveys of public lands of the Dominion and the surveyors entitled to make such surveys—Mr. Oliver—read a second time and the House went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. LAKE. Is this identical with the Act passed last year?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. (Minister of the Interior). Practically identical. There are verbal changes so that this Bill will stand by itself on the statute-books, but to all intents and purposes this is the same Bill as was agreed to last session.

On section 6,—Fees.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You omit from this section the words 'Registering assignments;' how did they get in there in the first place?

Mr. OLIVER. In practice they are not required in the Act. It is not conceivable there could be an assignment that would require to be dealt with under this Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is why I ask how they came to be inserted originally.

Mr. OLIVER. This was a part of the Lands Act before, and these words no doubt had some reference to the general provisions of that Act.

On section 8,—qualified to survey.

Mr. EMMERSON. I notice that by this section, only those who were qualified in the provinces previous to the 14th of April, 1872, are qualified for work under the provisions of this Act. Why is it that they are limited to a qualification which they received previous to April, 1873 ? There are in the provinces very many competent land surveyors who qualified subsequent to that time, and why they should be shut out should it be necessary at any time to secure their services is a question I think is very pertinent.

Mr. OLIVER. They are not shut out, but they are required to pass an examination provided for in this Act in order to qualify as Dominion land surveyors. Those who were qualified before that date are accepted on that qualification, they being held to have a vested right.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the difference between a provincial land surveyor who qualified before 1872 and one who has qualified since, if they underwent the same examination based on the same curriculum ?

Mr. OLIVER. There may be no difference ; it is not a question of difference. The point is that for good or bad reasons it has been assumed, not only in this Bill, but in the Act already existing, that the provincial land surveyor who was qualified before that date had a vested right, which it would not be proper for this government to deprive him of, while those who became qualified after that date have not that vested right, and the Dominion government was warranted in requiring them to conform to the regulations set down for the qualification of Dominion land surveyors before permitting them to practice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that provision was inserted in the Act when it was passed ; that is the real explanation. The Act was passed in 1872. It was then provided that persons who were then qualified in any province of Canada to practice would be qualified under that Act, but that persons qualifying afterwards should qualify under the provisions of the Act as it was then passed.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer but I am satisfied that the explanation given by the hon. leader of the opposition is the correct explanation.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then, why should it be so ? In all the provinces there are duly qualified surveyors, and I think it is not too much to say that they are as well qualified as those who qualify under the Dominion statute. If it was right in 1872 to recognize the provincial qualifications, it seems to me that the examination held in the provinces for Crown land surveyors should be recognized to-day. Frequently before this parliament we hear very potent arguments in favour of general qualifications for physicians and other professional men. It seems to me that this parliament should recognize surveyors who are qualified under the provisions of the laws of the respective provinces, and I can see no reason for continuing these words in this Act. You might properly put in the words, after the 17th day of December, 1907, the time of the passing of this Act, rather than the date named, which was the date on which the original Act was passed. The hon. leader of the opposition has given the true reason and the only reason why that date appeared, and it seems to me that the hon. Minister of the Interior should change the date in this Bill, and make it the 17th day of December, 1907.

Mr. OLIVER. In this connection I would like to repeat what I said to the House last year, that it was not my desire or my intention, in dealing with this question of Dominion land surveys and surveyors, to make any changes in principle, but merely minor changes to facilitate administration. The change suggested by my hon. friend is of course a very radical change in principle. While it is a perfectly fair matter for discussion, I would not feel warranted in accepting the change suggested. The Bill is almost solely a consolidation of provisions already on the statute-book. I would assume that reasons which have stood good on the statute-book for thirty-five years may very well be accepted as good still, unless we know of some strong reasons to the contrary, which my hon. friend has not brought forward. Although I am not responsible for the provision and not even responsible for its being in the present Bill beyond the point I have stated, still I think it is only fair to say that there is a reason for it, and the reason is not that a provincial surveyor may not be in every way as qualified to make a survey as a Dominion surveyor. That is not the purpose of the section, but the purpose is this, that dealings which necessarily take place on the responsibility of this government shall take place through men who, in their qualifications, are responsible to this government. It is a question of fixing and continuing responsibility, not a question of the respective qualifications of provincial or Dominion land surveyors. If the provincial land surveyor is qualified, he has no difficulty in becoming a Dominion land surveyor under the provisions of this Act, and

thereby becoming responsible to this government for the work he does under this government, for which work this government must be responsible to the people who are affected by it.

On section 12—examinations,

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not wish to raise any further question respecting this provision, but it is well that we should understand it. One would have to qualify, in the first place, as a student before this board and then serve an apprenticeship, and later on qualify by examination, before he becomes a full fledged Dominion land surveyor. No one, no matter what his qualifications may be to do the work, can be employed by the government unless he conforms to the provisions of this Bill. For instance, assuming that Dominion lands have to be surveyed in the Saskatchewan and there was a surveyor who had qualified under the laws of Manitoba, he could not be employed by the government to do this work. If that is the desire of the committee, well and good, but we must recognize exactly what we are doing. That may have been the law heretofore—certainly I had not supposed it was—but we are confirming it now, and the Bill is deserving of some consideration before we decide whether we should go that far.

Mr. OLIVER. Look at section 21. Provision is there made for the qualifying of provincial land surveyors as Dominion land surveyors, according to their previous qualification. Section 21 is for the purpose of meeting the cases my hon. friend mentioned and is the same as the present law with verbal changes only.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does this take the examination of Dominion land surveyors out of the hands of the Dominion land surveyors of Canada and leave it in the hands of the commission appointed under this Bill? In the Yukon a man entitled to be a land surveyor because he was a graduate of the Royal Military College of Kingston, was not allowed to qualify because of some technicality in the regulations. People in the Yukon required a surveyor and he was prepared to do the work and wanted to qualify, but was not allowed to qualify because of some technicality.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps he had not served a term under articles to a surveyor.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, he seemed to have complied, so far as the lay mind could see, with all the provisions of the law, but there was some technicality he could not overcome. I understand it was because the Dominion land surveyors themselves had an association which prevented applicants of that character from being examined.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not familiar with the case mentioned, but it seems to me that I did hear something of the case of a military graduate who wished to qualify as a surveyor; and if I recollect rightly, it was decided, on reference to the department here, that he was entitled to a certificate and had the right to practice.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad to know that. At the time, he could not qualify because of some technicality. Have the surveyors themselves an association which would interfere in any way with the carrying out of this clause?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say whether they have an association or not, but certainly the purpose of this Bill is that the authority of the government shall be supreme and that there shall be no delegated authority which shall prevail against that of the government.

Mr. HAGGART. Who constitute the board? Are they appointed by the government or by the Dominion surveyors' association?

Mr. EMMERSON. The 9th clause governs that.

Mr. OLIVER. The board consists of a surveyor general and two Dominion topographical surveyors appointed from time to time by the Governor in Council.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it possible to extend that board so that the minister may be able to appoint a man in a district territory without sending the board out there to examine him or having him come here?

Mr. EMMERSON. My reading of the Bill is that no one can be appointed unless he has been examined for admission as articled pupil in the first place and then serve an apprenticeship under a qualified surveyor, after which he must pass his examination. I apprehend that the obstacle in the way of the gentleman mentioned by the hon. member from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) a gentleman who has qualified by reason of his attendance at the Royal Military College was that he had not served a term as articled pupil or apprentice.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 12 provides that special examination may be held, under rules provided by the board, by persons appointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. THOMPSON. Independent of the board.

Mr. OLIVER. Not exactly but without the immediate presence of the board—under the rules of the board.

On section 18—variation of form when pupil is of age—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand that section. If you substitute the word 'then' for the word 'and,' immediately before the words 'in the event of his being

transferred,' it would make sense. It does not make sense as it is at present.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is the idea, but I am not certain. If agreeable to the committee, I will take a note of the suggestion and will hold the section over for consultation with the surveyor general. The Bill is highly technical in character, and I do not wish to make changes unless I have good authority for doing so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I dare say the minister has the same difficulty that I have in understanding the section as it is at present.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I do not care to make any dangerous admissions.

Mr. THOMPSON. As to section 12, I would like to ask a question. Would the men who are now Dominion land surveyors become, automatically, Dominion land surveyors under this Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then we could have an examination made by a man who was qualified in the Yukon as a Dominion land surveyor.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 18 stands.

On section 22—as to surveyors qualified otherwise than under this Act—

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In the explanatory note to this section I see it stated that:

> It is expected that the board will admit under this clause land surveyors from New Zealand, Australia and Cape Colony, the standard of examinations in these colonies being very high.

Can the minister tell us what the laws of these countries provide in this regard? That is to say, would there be reciprocity in regard to the qualification of land surveyors between these countries and Canada? Is there an association of Dominion land surveyors that would be likely to raise a protest against this clause unless there was a reciprocal arrangement between Canada and the countries mentioned?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able, at the moment, to answer that question. In discussing this clause with the surveyor general, we had in view the momentary requirements of this country in regard to land surveyors. That is to say, we have not as many surveyors at the moment as we really need to keep up with our work and it is a question of what surveyors we could afford to admit while still being sure that we would have good work done. Therefore, I did not discuss the point my hon. friend has mentioned. If he lays stress on the point I shall reserve the section and ask the surveyor general to place the House in possession of the information later on.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to have the point noted, because if there is a paucity of surveyors I think it would be wise of the Dominion to permit the provincial surveyors to have the precedence, to widen rather than to restrict the field from which they may be taken.

Mr. OLIVER. Has my hon. friend read section 21 which makes very wide provisions for provincial land surveyors?

Section allowed to stand.

On section 30—allowances to members of board, secretary and special examiners.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I notice in reading that section in connection with section 11, which deals with the appointment of a secretary to the board, that the minister is taking unto himself the power to appoint a secretary. Heretofore I understand that power has been vested in the board itself. Was it because of any failure on the part of the board to appoint a suitable and qualified person that the minister is making the change or is it to have more patronage at his disposal?

Mr. OLIVER. The change is made on the recommendation of the surveyor general. The principle, I think, is mentioned in the section, that as the secretary is a departmental officer it is proper that the minister should have control of the appointment.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. One member of the board of examiners is the surveyor general, who should be a competent judge as to the proper person to be chosen as secretary.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill has been prepared by the surveyor general, and this change is made on his express recommendation.

On section 42—townships, road allowances and sections—

Mr. LAKE. When this or a similar Bill, was up before the House last year, I drew the attention of the minister to the fact that it was very desirable that there should be a road allowance around each section instead of around every two sections as at present. He promised to take the matter into consideration and consult the authorities of the local governments in the Northwest in regard to the matter. I should be glad to hear whether he did so, and whether he proposes to make any change in the present system.

Mr. OLIVER. My observation in regard to the question has not led me to suggest any change from the present system. The government of the province of Alberta made a certain recommendation to me in regard to road allowances, which, it seems to me, would probably meet the immediate re-

quirements of the case. It was this: that provision should be made for reserving out of a quarter-section granted as a homestead, up to two and a half acres which might be taken as a special road allowance by authority of the provincial government. This would not apply after the land had been patented. But during the time it was held by the homesteader without patent it would be competent for the provincial government to force a road allowance to the extent of two and a half acres across the quarter-section. In the hilly country even a road every mile does not necessarily strike a place where a road could be made; it is necessary in the case of river valleys and hilly country that a road should be placed wherever it is possible to place it, and it was thought advisable instead of providing for a legal road allowance every mile running north and south, that there should be a road allowance every two miles with this provision for forcing a road where necessary. We thought we were meeting the wishes of the people better by doing that.

Mr. LAKE. This is an important departure and it seems to me that the fact of having a road allowance surveyed around every section would assist the minister in carrying out his idea, because then, instead of taking away two and a half acres from a man you could exchange with him part of the regular allowance for the proposed road through his land. My experience as a member of the local legislature has led me to the conclusion that it is important to provide a road every mile. I presume the surveys made this year have only provided for a road allowance every two miles, but I would impress upon the minister the importance of leaving a road allowance every mile in future surveys. The minister might take up that matter with the local governments.

Mr. HERRON. No one knows better than the minister (Mr. Oliver) the importance of having a road allowance every square mile. It is difficult to provide for that where the country is developed, but where new country is being surveyed it would be a great improvement. It would be a great injustice to the settler to force a road through his land to the extent of his losing two and a half acres. But I am glad to have the assurance of the minister that such a provision is not being made in this present Bill. If it should come before the House I will have something to say on it.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this matter arose because of the question raised in the legislature of Alberta with reference to buying road allowances ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not finally decided that they would have to buy the road allowance in every instance where they departed from the regular survey?

Mr. LAKE. In the newer settlements, as a general rule, the question of a regular road allowance will not come up until the people have been two or three years on the land, and by that time they will likely have their patents so that the remedy proposed by the minister would be ineffective. I adhere to my strongly expressed opinion that there should be a road allowance every mile.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the remedy proposed by the minister ?

Mr. OLIVER. The evil is that in many cases there are not sufficient east and west road allowances to give proper facilities to the settlers, there being a road allowance every second mile. My investigation leads me to believe that where the country is level and accessible, that is not a grievance; but where the country is broken by rivers, valleys or hills it may happen that one of these road allowances is impossible, so that there would be four miles between the roads instead of two. At the request of the provincial government we are providing for the forcing of a road where the provincial government may see fit according to the needs of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. It is an injustice to the land owner to take his land from him without compensation. In Ontario there is a road allowance called a blind line between the two concessions, and that may be opened up if any one desires the use of it, but otherwise it is divided between the parties whose land adjoins it. It would be convenient if such an arrangement were made in the Northwest.

Mr. OLIVER. The suggestion I have placed before the House is exactly in line with the Ontario practice. In the west there is a road allowance each alternate two miles and it is proposed that the provincial government may open a road allowance on that blind line if it pleases.

Mr. LAKE. Without compensation ?

Mr. OLIVER. Without compensation.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there a hundred acres of land for each of these parties, exclusive of that road allowance? He occupies that in addition, if it is not needed.

Mr. HERRON. I understand the case to be a little different to that. The provincial government is asking for more than authority to force a road on a blind line. It is asking for authority to go through any man's quarter-section, which I think would be a great injustice to the settlers, and I hope the hon. minister will consider the question fairly before giving that authority.

Mr. OLIVER. We do not deal with that matter in this Bill at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I confess that I do not understand the view that the minister has put forward. Is it suggested that after any homesteader receives his patent, this government is in a position to authorize the provincial government to do anything with that man's land ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I assume that after the man has his patent, it becomes a question of civil rights and will thereafter be entirely under the jurisdiction of the provincial government.

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, what the minister is dealing with is something different, that is, a road allowance which is still vested in the Crown by the right of the Dominion?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And he proposes to confer on the provincial government the right of judgment as to whether or not a road allowance is necessary—is that it?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has stated the case exactly.

Mr. SPROULE. That would seem to be an amendment to the constitution rather than to the law.

Mr. LAKE. The point I wish to make is this, that you propose to give the local government the right to take away from the homesteader two and a half acres of his quarter-section. I suggest that if you make an additional road allowance so that there will be a road allowance to every mile, you will be able to give the settler the part of the road allowance around his section which is not used in return for the road allowance you are taking through the section. In that way you would not be depriving him of a portion of the land for which he has entered.

Section agreed to.

On section 54—surveying to be by contract or tender—

Mr. SPROULE. How is the minister having the surveys run now? Is it by a fixed tariff of so much a day or so much a township, or otherwise, and what rate is he paying?

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable to give the actual rate, but there is a tariff per mile of line for what are called subdivision surveys, the tariff varying according to the nature of the country. For prairie there is one rate, for scrub another, for timber another, and the contract is let to surveyors at these rates. Base lines, and block surveys which inclose four townships, are run by surveyors working by the day. I do not at the moment know of any cases of subdivision surveys being done by the day. Of course, there may be such cases, but as a general rule they are done by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister know what rate he is paying now either for blocking or subdividing ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the information at hand, but I can bring it to the House if desired.

Section agreed to.

On section 58—resurvey of land disposed of—

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). How will the minister fix the amount—on the report of a surveyor or any other officer of the department ?

Mr. OLIVER. It will be a matter of taking evidence.

Mr. CARNEY. Will the owner of the property have to bear a portion of the costs or will the government stand the loss ?

Mr. OLIVER. As in ordinary cases, if the complainant does not make good his complaint, it would be reasonable that he should stand the costs.

Mr. SPROULE. Under this a surveyor may make a change whether a man has or has not the right to the land.

Mr. OLIVER. The idea is that where a patent has been issued, there can be no change without the consent of the patentee. Where a patent has not been issued, a change may be made under certain circumstances ; but if there be improvements on the land, the man who has made the improvements, and who is their owner, is entitled to compensation. It is the ownership of the improvements which must be compensated and not of the land.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not apply to patented lands ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, only to unpatented lands.

Mr. CARNEY. Would it not be better to have the compensation fixed by arbitrators rather than the minister ? A man on the ground is more capable of giving a decision than one who is distant from it.

Mr. OLIVER. In the first place the error must be an error of fact, and that can only be settled by a qualified surveyor. Then, if there be an error, some one must give an opinion as to whether it is advisable, under all the circumstances, to correct it. There may be cases where an error has been made and yet where it may not be advisable to make a correction ; but somebody has to be vested with that discretion, and under our system of responsible government, the minister should be the one in

whom to vest that discretion. Then there is no getting behind the record. If a proper decision be not given, everybody knows who can be attacked for it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). But should there not be an impartial tribunal to decide what compensation should be given for improvements ? A good deal of trouble may arise as to the value of these improvements.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend's point is well taken, but it seems to me that in practice, if they were valuable improvements, there would not, in the ordinary exercise of discretion, be any change made. If one of the parties made valuable improvements, it would be for the minister to decide in his discretion whether a change should be made in the boundary or not.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE : The section speaks about the error being more than five chains, in which case it may be corrected. Then the minister may, without the consent of the holder, authorize the correction of the error, but the person acquiring any improvements, through such correction, may be taxed for compensation as the minister may decide. There might easily arise such a case as I have suggested.

Mr. OLIVER. The point would be well taken, if the change were mandatory. But, as I understand the section, it is discretionary with the minister, and I think that discretion would turn very largely, or almost altogether, on the question of the value of the improvements. Therefore, the minister would naturally be aware of the value of the improvements in reaching a decision as to moving the boundary. Then it could be arranged that provision would be made for an arbitration. Such provision, of course, is cumbersome, and it seems to me that, under the actual circumstances as they are, it is scarcely necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister has discretionary power in making the change, he may impose loss upon the person who has hitherto held the land. The minister has the power to determine what amount shall be paid as compensation. It seems to me that it would be fair to give the owner the option of an arbitration. Let it be determined by the minister, as a summary method of dealing with the case, subject to this option of an arbitration. A man might want an arbitration for the purpose of calling witnesses and having his rights dealt with as they would be dealt with in the courts.

Mr. OLIVER. I think there would be no objection to that. Of course, it will involve the burdening of the Bill with considerable machinery unless my hon. friend would suggest some wording to cover the arbitration provision more simply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should say that a few words would accomplish it. For instance, it may read: 'As may be fixed by the minister, or at the option of the owner, by arbitration under the laws of the province.' I do not give that as a final draft, but as a suggestion.

Mr. OLIVER. Hold the section over and I will have an amendment drafted as suggested.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 58 stands.

On section 59—resurveys—finding of original monument after resurvey—

Mr. LAKE. Has the minister decided to adopt the suggestion made last year to place the monuments every half mile instead of every mile along certain lines? I think it would be a great advantage on a certain number of the resurveys if we had more monuments.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the necessity for resurveys has arisen rather from the fact that former survey lines were marked by wooden posts than from any other reason. Now, I think, all surveys are marked by iron posts, and it is fair to suppose that these are much more permanent than the wooden ones. The cost of surveys, of course, is very considerable, and, while the cost of the greater number of posts is, possibly, not very great, still we have tried to be as economical as possible and have not, so far, undertaken to place the posts every half mile.

Mr. LAKE. It would be a great convenience.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a great deal to be said in favour of my hon. friend's suggestion. I will discuss it with the surveyor when I am discussing the other things that have been held over. I shall be able to say more on the subject to my hon. friend when the Bill comes up again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 59 stands.

Progress reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Auditor General's Report, Vol. II., for nine months ended March 31, 1907.—Mr. Fielding.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 10) to amend the Irrigation Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. minister give us an idea what the Bill contemplates?

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill contains practically three amendments. One of these may be said to be simply verbal. In describing the sources of water mention is made of

'river, stream, watercourse, lake, creek,' but mention is not made of 'spring,' and as a spring is an important source and may be thought not to be included in the meaning of the other words, it has been thought well to insert the word 'spring.' Therefore, three clauses of the proposed Bill are merely for the purpose of inserting the word 'spring' amongst the descriptions of water supply. The first of the two important provisions is to preserve to municipal authority municipal rights within the limits of the municipality as against irrigation rights. No provision was made in the original Irrigation Act for the preservation of municipal rights which might be affected by irrigation schemes. Since the establishment of the provinces and the general development of the country it has been found to be possible for a conflict to arise between an irrigation scheme and a municipality, the irrigation proposition claiming rights under Dominion legisation which would ignore the municipal rights granted under provincial authority. It is thought that this is not well and that, within the municipality, municipal rights should prevail. Section 4 of the Bill proposes to meet that condition. Section 5 is provided to meet a condition which arises when the user of water acquired from the irrigation system has to lead that water to his property from the main ditch. It is to give him the right to cross the property of other people; that is to say to give to a man who wants to use water which he takes out of the main ditch of the irrigation enterprise the same right to cross other property as the main scheme itself has. That is found to be necessary in order that the general proposition of irrigation may be worked out. Otherwise, a man whose property is, technically speaking, under the ditch, and who may desire to get water, may be prevented from getting it by people holding land between his land and the ditch. This section is intended to provide that he can make a connection between the ditch and the land that he wishes to irrigate.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 3—section 25 amended—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the effect of that?

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of this amendment is in regard to provincial and municipal rights as to highways. It is believed that under the present wording of the clause, those constructing irrigation works under the provisions of this Act are required to keep open only such public highways as are then travelled. In a new country there are many cases in which the surveyed road allowance may not be travelled and the understanding of the irrigation companies is that they are not required to keep such open. A road allowance that may not be in use to-day may be required to be used a year hence, and provision is made requiring them to keep open any road allowance whether it is travelled or not.

Mr. SPROULE. The wording of this amendment does not seem to carry out that idea.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest that the word 'theretofore' should be retained in the section so as to make its meaning quite clear.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be better if we struck out the words 'theretofore publicly travelled as such,' and I move that the section be so amended.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 4—consent of municipality to construction of work—

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Has it occurred to the minister that no machinery is provided for appealing from the decision of a municipality in this matter? That may be right in the case of a city or town but in a scattered municipality considerable difficulty might arise because of the absence of such an appeal. Does this Act apply to the railway belt the same as to the other Dominion lands?

Mr. OLIVER. It does not apply to the railway belt.

Mr. SPROULE. In private Bills empowering telegraph and telephone lines to enter municipalities, we not only provide that the companies shall get the consent of the municipalities but that they shall carry on their works under the supervision and direction of the municipal officers. We omit that provision in this Bill. If the ruling of the court be that as an irrigation company they have a right under their Dominion charter to carry on their works, the municipality is bound to consent; then in this Bill there is no provision that the work shall be carried on under municipal control within the municipality.

Mr. OLIVER. I should think that the municipality has the right to refuse an irrigation enterprise to be carried on within its limits.

Mr. SPROULE. This is practically the same question as has arisen with regard to telephone lines. As far back as 1879, I objected to interference with municipal rights without giving the municipal authorities control, and it was then said that if the municipality did not consent the company could not go on with its work. But the courts have held that the federal parliament having empowered them to build and oper-

ate, the municipality was bound to consent. It has been found necessary for us to make provision in telephone and telegraph Acts that all work within a municipality should be under the direction of the municipality, and I believe it is equally necessary we should make similar provision in the case of irrigation companies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be better to follow as closely as possible the language which was incorporated, after careful consideration, in Bills relating to telephone companies and other corporations of that character. There seems to be a possible criticism of the language of this clause because it does not express how the consent of the municipal council shall be given. It might be possible for a question to arise as to whether or not oral consent of a sufficient character might not be given, and it should be provided that the consent should be written consent or consent by by-law.

Mr. OLIVER. It might be just as well to specify in what form the consent should be given so as to make it definite. But I am unable to follow the contention of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) that because a company has a Dominion charter it would have authority to force its works within the limits of a municipality. This is an amendment or addition to the general Act, which I should think would necessarily govern any private Act, and a private Act could not trespass on the limits of a general Act without an amendment being made to the general Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the point was this. We provide here that they shall not enter without consent. The hon. gentleman for East Grey suggests that you should also provide that the work shall be maintained under such regulations as the municipal council or other authority shall prescribe, so that when they have once given their consent they shall also have power to provide that the work must be maintained under such conditions as shall not endanger life or property.

Mr. OLIVER. There is something to be said in favour of that contention, and I will hold the clause for further consideration on that point. But the condition is not exactly the same as that of the establishment of a telephone service in a city. Handling the water supply of an irrigation ditch is a very different matter, and it might possibly render the irrigation proposition unserviceable or ineffective if it were placed under the same jurisdiction of a municipality as it is perfectly right and proper that a telephone system should be placed. The purpose of the amendment is to recognize the right of the municipality, and so far as we are able to do that and preserve the efficiency of the irrigation work, we want to do it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think as far as the section goes it is all right, but it does not go far enough.

Section allowed to stand, and progress reported.

SUPPLY—NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about the celebrated North Atlantic Trading company and the financial relations between that company and the government as disclosed by a recent answer given by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. It has been said by some journals in this country, and the statement has been repeated in this House, that during my recent tour of the west of Canada some of the scandals which have come out in such great numbers during the past two sessions were not discussed. I would like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and to those journals, that if we did not discuss all these scandals at every meeting, it was due to the great number of the scandals and to the lack of time to deal with them all. As far as the time at our command served us, we did discuss every one of these scandals, whether in the west or in the east of Canada ; and I wish to say that if my right hon. friend the Prime Minister sees fit to make that tour in the west next summer which has been prophesied by some of the public journals, I shall be only too happy to accompany him and discuss every one of those scandals on any platform in the west, or in the east either, for that matter.

Among the scandals to which allusion has been made is that of the North Atlantic Trading Company, and I desire to apologize for certain inaccuracies in my statements in regard to that company—to apologize to the enterprise of the company and to the facility of the government in disposing of public moneys. I have said throughout the length and breadth of this country that this company, or the persons, whoever they may be, into whose rapacious pockets these large sums of public money have gone, had received about $300,000 from the public treasury of Canada. I did these people a great injustice, for according to the statement of the Minister of the Interior they have received $367,245.85 ; so that I did them an injustice to the extent of nearly $100,000. There is another circumstance connected with the financial relations between this company and the government which merits a moment's attention. Taking the figures from a return which was brought down in the last session of parliament, I find that from the 30th of June

1903, to the 30th June 1906, or it may be to September 19, 1906, this company received $204,585.20 ; and, according to the recent answer of the Minister of the Interior, they have received since the date last mentioned the further sum of $61,234.83, making in all for the past three years a receipt by this company out of the public treasury of this country of no less than $265,820.03.

Now, an officer of the Department of the Interior has been sent to the continent of Europe for the purpose of examining the accounts of these gentlemen, whoever they may be, and ascertaining whether or not during that period they have fulfilled the terms of the contract by expending the sum of, I think, about $20,000 a year. He made this report, which I have under my hand. That report declares that not only have these gentlemen paid out the amount required, under the terms of the contract, but a little more, so that their total disbursements from the 30th June, 1903, to the present—I assume it is up to the present because this officer who makes the report gives no further expenditure—is $84,-428.61. If you deduct from their receipts during that period, amounting to $265,820.03, the expenditure I have just mentioned, $84,-428.61, you find that these fortunate friends of the government, whoever they may be, received a net profit during the past three years of no less than $181,391.42. A very fair profit indeed upon a total expenditure of but little over $84,000. Under these circumstances, we may very well ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to give us some account of the system under which bonuses are being paid for immigrants at present. It is supposed by some persons throughout the country that although these gentlemen have ceased to benefit at the public expense to the extent of $60,000 a year, under the name of the North Atlantic Trading Company, the same concern, the same parties, are still receiving bonuses for bringing out immigrants. That conjecture may be entirely without foundation, but that is the belief held by some people in this country who say they have good warrant for holding it. What is the government doing at present with regard to bonuses ? Is it true, as has been stated in the public press, that they have issued instructions to their agents in England to discourage the immigration of people of a certain class ? But before coming to that, I would like to say a few words more regarding the disbursing of these sums to the North Atlantic Trading Company. That company, as I have said, on an expenditure of a little more than $84,-000 in three years, netted a profit of over $60,000 a year, or $181,391.42 in the three years.

What was the object of making this contract behind the back of parliament, behind the back of the people of this country, by which these gentlemen were enabled to take that money out of the public treasury and put it into their own pockets ? What good purpose was subserved by that contract ? If these men were carrying on any work not forbidden by the laws of the countries in which they were operating, why did not this government itself disburse that money and accomplish the same results ? Are there not officers of this government who could have done all the trifling work, which these men did, in distributing literature and carying on correspondence with intending imigrants, just as effectively as did these men ? That is a very fair question, one which demands an answer from the government, and especially the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who, although not personally responsible for this contract, is politically responsible inasmuch as he is the successor in the cabinet of the gentleman under whose auspices that contract was made. I assume that these gentlemen were to do nothing, under their contract with this government, which was forbidden by the laws of the country in which they operated. Why then put $181,000 of public money into the hands of these mysterious individuals, when the work they did could have been properly and as well carried on by our own officials ? On the other hand, if this work was not such work as could be properly carried on under the laws of the countries where these immigrants were sought, why did this government enter into any such contract at all ? This government were not justified in undertaking, by means of the North Atlantic Trading Company, any operations in these foreign countries, which could not be properly carried on by its own officials.

From day to day communications come to me from all over the country pointing out that there are men in our great cities, who were induced to come to Canada at the instigation of some person—very often people who claimed to represent this government—and who, when they land, are without work and have to be supported by charity. I have here a copy of a circular which was received in Great Britain by a man who is now without employment in Toronto. That circular is as follows :

Established 1879.

W. E. RUMSEY.

Licensed by the Board of Trade to issue first, second and third class passages by steamship lines leaving Great Britain for United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, India, China, South America, Canadian emigration and land agent.

Free and assisted passages for Australia and New Zealand, &c.

Telegrams—' Rumsey,' Shrewsbury.

Market Chambers, 1 Market street,
Shrewsbury, November 2, 1907.

Weavers for Toronto, Canada.

Dear sir,—I am in a position to find immediate employment with a firm at Toronto for twenty experienced weavers at wages from $17 (£3 10s. 10d.) to $20 (£4 3s. 4d.) on a Brussels loom. In order to earn the latter amount it

is necessary to weave forty yards per day. Good weavers are guaranteed constant work the year round.

Those selected must furnish references as to ability and also pay their own fare to Toronto, which is as follows:

Ocean fare..	£5 10 0
Rail fare..	1 13 9
Total, Liverpool to Toronto.. ..	7 3 9

I shall be glad to know at once if you are prepared to accept this offer, as I have a large number of applications to choose from.

Those going out will be placed in employment on arrival at Toronto.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) WALTER E. RUMSEY.

I am acting in this matter for the Grand Trunk Railway Company who cabled over for the men. There are two going from Stoneport next Friday.

(Sgd.) W. E. R.

A most extraordinary postscript. I do not believe that the Grand Trunk Railway ever gave this man any such information or direction. It is inconceivable that the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway company should be telegraphing this man to send out weavers to Canada. It is the most remarkable statement I ever saw in a communication of this kind. Inasmuch as this man puts on his note paper the statement that he is the Canadian Emigration and Land Agent, it behooves the government to look into this question and ascertain what all this means. The man to whom this letter was sent is in Toronto to-day. He was brought out as a weaver. I understand that the Grand Trunk Railway claim, and no doubt truly, that they know nothing about it. This man is now in Toronto without money and unable to get back to the old country where he left a good situation in order to come to Canada on the strength of this circular. Under the circumstances, I am doing no more than my duty in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and asking what all this means and whether there are men, claiming to be immigration and land agents of this government in the United Kingdom, who are sending people to Canada at this time upon promises of employment which prove absolutely illusory when these immigrants reach our shores.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). With regard to the last question of my hon. friend, as to whether this gentleman who advertises himself so elaborately is an agent of this government, I can only say that he is not an agent of this government so far as this government is aware. I fancy, however, from the nature of his advertisement, that he is an agent of an institution known as the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, with which this government has had some correspondence. The nature of the correspondence was this: the association has urged the government to use its agents in the old country for the purpose of inducing artisans, such as the weavers mentioned, to come out and take employment in manufacturing establishments in Canada; and to these demands the government has always given an absolute refusal to act as an employment agency for any interest in Canada except those of agriculture, railway construction and domestic service. The instructions of the government to its agents in Great Britain are specific on this subject. And its policy is such that, if the agent whose name has been mentioned has in the past been acting as an agent of this government—that is to say, has been using his license under the British government as authorization for soliciting immigrants to Canada, and has been recognized in that capacity by the government of Canada—if this agent has had business dealings with the government of Canada in the past as an immigration agent, or in the work of soliciting immigrants, the knowledge that he has issued such an advertisement as that referred to would preclude his doing business for the government of Canada again. That is our policy; that is our system of administration. We have had to cut out of our dealings men who have abused their position, as this gentleman has done, so that, even although they should hereafter secure desirable and suitable immigrants to Canada, we would refuse to pay them a bonus upon those immigrants. We have laid it down as a rule that we will not have dealings with people whom we cannot depend upon in their advertisements and in the representation that they make in Great Britain. I may say that one of the agents of the Manufacturers' Association, who has, in that position, solicited recognition from this government in the sending out of immigrants, and has represented to us that, although he is an agent of the Manufacturers' Association, and that, as such, his business in London is to send out artisans and competitors with the labouring classes of this country under the instruction of this Manufacturers' Association, at the same time he was able to send out to us agricultural immigrants, people suitable for railway labour and people suitable for domestic service. And he said: Why should I be cut off from the same bonus as another agent who would send out such people? I have said to him—have been compelled to say to him—that, in pursuance of our policy in immigration, the fact that he was there as an agent carrying on business in that way, avowedly sending out immigrants whom we were not desirous of bringing, prevented us from having business dealings with him. I would like to give his name. Sometimes it is Louis Leopold and sometimes it is Leopold Lazarus. He now occupies the high and responsible position of labour agent of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in London, England. We have no objections to him, but, so long as

he is engaged in the business in which he is now engaged, we cannot have business dealings with him, nor with any other man in England, Ireland or Scotland, carrying on that line of business which is opposed to our policy.

Mr. BARKER. What about Preston ? You have kept him.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Preston is not in the employ of the Immigration Department; has not been in the employ of the Immigration Department for a matter of a year or a year and a half. I understand, as was said the other day in the House, that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) saw fit, when in Victoria, B.C., to accuse Mr. Preston of being the cause of the recent influx of Japanese into British Columbia some six months before Mr. Preston had set foot in Japan. With regard to the payment to the North Atlantic Trading Company——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister permit me? There was one thing I forgot to ask him. Is this so-called final payment accepted by the company in full of their contract and of all alleged damages under the terms of that contract?

Mr. OLIVER. It is accepted by the company in full of all claims for bonus. But, so far as I am aware, the question of its acceptance on account of damages is not——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is left open ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is left open.

Mr. SPROULE. The question is asked 'Are there any claims still outstanding?' And the answer is 'No.'

Mr. OLIVER. No claims outstanding for bonus. And, so far as we know, there is no claim outstanding for damages; but, of course, it is competent for the company to make any claim it likes. Our answer goes as far as our knowledge.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, they have not made such a claim?

Mr. OLIVER. Not formally. They have suggested the possibility of putting in such a claim. In regard to the question my hon. friend has asked as to the reason the agreement was entered into with the North Atlantic Trading Company. The answer, I think, is elementary. The reason was that this country desired immigrants. It had not been able to get immigrants in sufficient numbers before. It therefore entered into this agreement, and under this agreement it did get large numbers of immigrants. Under the agreement, certain payments of money were made by the government to the company. Under the agreement, these payments were large in amount, but the only reason that my hon. friends, when they had charge of the affairs of the country, did not make as large, or doubly as large, payments was that they did not bring in so many immigrants. For, I find that, from the year 1891 to 1895 the government of that day was prepared to pay $10 per head for immigrants from Continental Europe—$5 on landing, and $5 more when the immigrant had settled on land in the west.

The only reason they did not pay $364,000 was because they could not and did not get the necessary number of people—I presume the reason they did not was that they did not go the right way about it. I think my hon. friends have no good grounds for complaint against the amount of money that has been paid out to the North Atlantic Trading Company when they themselves undertook to pay out twice as much, and failed only because they did not succeed in getting the number of people they wanted.

This government did pay out a large amount of money; it did get a large number of immigrants; it did secure some 156,000 immigrants and it paid out bonuses on 57,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it was so good a contract why was it cancelled?

Mr. OLIVER. The conditions changed. The country was starving for people when this contract was entered into; the Northwest was still undeveloped, although it had been under the magnificent management of our hon. friends for some eighteen years and under the management of this government for a number of years. Under these circumstances this government entered into the North Atlantic Trading Company contract. It entered into an aggressive campaign in the United States to secure immigration. It entered into a similar campaign in Great Britain under the management of this person to whom so much objection is taken, Mr. Preston. In all quarters it achieved more or less success, and after a number of years of successful effort, when the country was no longer starving for people, when the Northwest was being rapidly filled up, when my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) declared that the time had come when Canada should cease to put forth any effort at all to secure immigration—when that time came it was not necessary to take the same means to secure immigration as had been necessary under previous conditions. We were getting large numbers of immigrants under the North Atlantic Trading Company contract. We were paying for some small proportion of those we were getting, but there were provisions in the contract which, in my humble estimation, were not being lived up to by the company. It seemed to me, as I stated at the time, that judging by results the company was not using the efforts they were expected to to secure immigrants from certain countries of Europe; we saw fit to cancel the contract, and we did cancel it for these reasons. It seemed to me that the reasons for entering

into the contract were good and the reasons for cancelling it were also good. When the country was starving for immigrants we were glad to get whomsoever we could get, but when the country commenced to fill up it was time for this government to adopt a different policy, and from time to time, as occasion arose, to meet the occasion, in immigration as in other matters. To-day we are dealing with the immigration question as it stands; we are not dealing with the North Atlantic Trading Company; we do not find it desirable under the circumstances I have mentioned to continue under that arrangement. We have to-day a certain measure of immigration effort in continental Europe, but my hon. friend may rest easy, it has no connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company. He has asked for information on the subject; I gave that information to the House last session, but I have no objection to repeating it. We provide that in certain countries of continental Europe, France, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Sweden, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Belgium and Switzerland, we give to selected booking agents a bonus of 10 shillings on each adult immigrant of the agricultural class sent to Canada.

Mr. OWEN. As the hon. minister is so generous, I would like to ask him if he would give us the names of the men constituting the North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. OLIVER. I may say, as I have had occasion to say previously, that I do not know the names of the members of the North Atlantic Trading Company; that I do not care what their names are or were; that I never felt that it was any concern of mine any more than it was to know who are the shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway or any Cobalt company or any other incorporated company. The whole question was results. If we got results we paid; if we did not, we did not pay; and if we did not like the contract we cancelled it. That was our connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company.

In the countries I have mentioned we pay a bonus of 10 shillings to selected booking agents for passengers of the classes we have desired to take to Canada. The names of the agencies have been placed on the table of the House in response to a question, so if my hon. friend is alarmed at the possibility that any of these people are members of the North Atlantic Trading Company or that the North Atlantic Trading Company has anything to do with them, he has all the information on the subject that I have and he is welcome to all the information he is able to secure.

In regard to our immigration effort in Great Britain, we have pursued there what we think has been a very successful campaign during the past year or two. We have succeeded in attracting British immigrants to a greater degree than ever before. That was partly because of the changed conditions in Canada. There was an insistent demand for labour in eastern as well as western Canada and we used reasonable efforts to fill that demand. We advertised in Great Britain; we employed agents and agencies in Great Britain; we paid a bonus to booking agents in Great Britain and we got a large number of people. To-day we find that our efforts have been perhaps too successful; and this year, instead of the immigration automatically and of itself ceasing or decreasing in the fall of the year, when labour has become overabundant in this country, we find that the stream of immigration is keeping up although the condition of the labour market in this country in the last few months has not been good. The ordinary absence of demand for labour in the winter is now upon us. Under these circumstances it became necessary to take action to prevent any unfortunate conditions such as might arise, and we have taken such action. We have notified the steamship companies and our agents in the old country that the market for labour at the present time in Canada is overstocked and to advise people not to come to Canada during the winter, or if they come between now and spring, if they are not coming to friends or assured employment, that they should have with them money to support them until employment can be secured when spring opens. That is our policy and system in the old country and I believe that our effort in the past has been acceptable to the people of Canada as well as to the people of the old country, and we believe that the people of Canada and the people of the old country as well, have sufficient good judgment to commend the efforts that we have made to bring people here when there was a demand for them and to commend with equal readiness our action in advising immigrants not to come when there is not a demand for them.

I beg to assure my hon. friend that we are keeping our eyes open; that we are keeping our finger on the pulse of immigration, and that it is just as much our interest to see that the demand is supplied as it is to see that the demand is not over-supplied. We are not able to achieve the impossible or to say that there would not at one time be too few or at another time too many people, but we are able to use reasonable endeavours to bring people into this country when necessary and we are just as able to use means from hindering them from coming when their arrival is not desirable.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister if the government has any special arrangement with the Salvation Army with respect to immigration?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, we have special arrangements with the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army is an organization differ-

ent from any other in immigration work from the fact that it not only solicits immigrants, but it also cares for them on their arrival. The proper distribution and care of immigrants is just as important and as expensive as the soliciting of them, and in view of that part of the policy of the Salvation Army this government does give the Salvation Army special consideration. We contribute to the rental of the army offices in the old country; we take a certain amount of advertising space in the army papers and we make a small grant to aid the army in its work of distribution in Canada. That is the extent of our assistance to the army. Otherwise they stand on exactly the same footing as all other immigration agencies in the old country. I have some further information on this subject that I would like to give the House, and I would be glad, Mr. Speaker, if you would be kind enough to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

BELLEVILLE, PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville, Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) who is promoting this Bill is not in his seat, and as there are certain interests to be considered, I ask that the Bill shall stand.

Order allowed to stand.

BANK OF VANCOUVER.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—Mr. Macpherson.

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill does not appear to be printed in English and French.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is printed in English.

Mr. LENNOX. I ask to have it stand.

Order allowed to stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Lindsay Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company. —Mr. Sam. Hughes.

SUPPLY—THE NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

House resumed debate on the motion for Committee of Supply.

Mr. OLIVER.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). When the House rose at six o'clock, I was proceeding to endeavour to gratify the desire of our hon. friends opposite, as expressed by the numerous questions they have put on the Order Paper from day to day, for further particulars in regard to the immigration policy of the government. Very shortly after I had the honour to become a member of this government the need of an active, may I say the need of a more active immigration policy so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, was brought to my attention. I became a member of the government on April the 7th or 8th, 1905, and I notice amongst the correspondence of the department dated Ottawa, 9th of May, 1905, the following letter addressed to the Hon. 'William' Oliver, Minister of the Interior, Ottawa:—

I am in receipt of the inclosed correspondence from the proprietor of the Employment and Information Bureau of Brantford, in which he makes special request to me to endeavour to forward to our city various classes of help that are at present urgently needed in that city and district. Would you oblige me by kindly noting the matter and advising me at your earliest convenience as to what method, if any, we can pursue to attain the required ends. The letter, I believe, contains fairly correct information and Mr. Hall, the proprietor, furnishes several letters of reference as to his standing and ability to place the various classes of labour required.

Hoping to receive an answer from you at an early date or, if convenient to wait upon you in connection with the matter, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

Mr. SPROULE. Whose is the signature?

Mr. OLIVER. I will give it in a minute. I find also the following letter dated Brantford, May 5th:

Referring to conversation with you some days ago regarding the immigration question as in connection with Brantford, I beg to advise, as proprietor of the Employment and Information Bureau, in this city, I have experienced considerable difficulty in supplying the demand for men, boys and girls. Help in all the various branches, is scarce and I have many applications for mechanics, moulders, farm hands, servants, factory hands, &c., &c. which have remained unfilled for the reason that labourers are not to be had.

At present, the call for men, especially, is greater than we can commence to meet. We have openings every day, for which, had we but the available material, we could furnish men with.

Then he gives a list of the labour wanted and the rate of wages paid, and he continues:

The above is by no means an exhaustive list, but will serve to give you a fair idea of the class of people we could accommodate.

You will note the calls for help are many and varied, and with our present limited

facilities, cannot be adequately answered. But, could we fall back upon and rely upon the Immigration Department, for help, we could not only supply the wants of many who now suffer inconvenience owing to vacancies which cannot be filled, but an avenue might be opened whereby we could aid a few of our less fortunate fellows and thus in a measure help to relieve the congestion of some of the overcrowded centres from whence come many of our immigrants.

You will, I am sure, agree with me that an immigration agency would be a good thing in this city. Brantford, as you know, is a growing city, whose watchword is 'forward,' and with the onrush of business and the ever increasing prosperity of the citizens now here, the class of people required, as above enumerated, is lessened, and Toronto, the seat of the nearest immigration office, being seventy-five miles distant, there is a wide radius of country round Brantford, which could be better reached from here.

That letter is signed by the proprietor of the Employment and Information Bureau of Brantford, Ont., and it is inclosed to me with a letter, which I previously read, by W. F. Cockshutt.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister did not give the name of the proprietor of the bureau?

Mr. OLIVER. So far as that is concerned, that is as dark and mysterious a secret as the names of the celebrated North Atlantic Trading Company. But our mutual friend (Mr. Cockshutt)——

Mr. BLAIN. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. OLIVER. The date of the letter from the employment company to Mr. Cockshutt is the 5th of May, 1905, and Mr. Cockshutt's letter is dated the 9th of May, 1905. As I have already stated, Mr. Cockshutt informs us that Mr. Hall is the proprietor of the immigration bureau. This is the gentleman who wants to empty the overcrowded tenements of England into the city of Brantford. It can hardly be believed that the same Mr. Cockshutt is one of the grand army on the other side of the House who has placed on the Order Paper a resolution as follows:—

That in consideration of the great congestion that at present prevails in the labour market in many of the industrial centres throughout the country, it is highly expedient that assisted immigration, excepting only the agricultural and domestic servant classes, should immediately cease, and that no further bonuses shall be paid to individual agents or companies for sending or bringing in such immigrants. Further, that the time has come for the strict enforcement of the law that requires that only the financially, morally and physically fit shall be allowed to enter this Dominion as settlers.

That is to say, on the 9th of May, 1905, our friend endorsed a proposition to empty the overcrowded tenements of England into the cities of Ontario, but on the 28th of November, 1907, he declares that assisted immigration, excepting only the agricultural and domestic servant classes should immediately cease, and that only those who are financially, morally and physically fit should be allowed to enter the Dominion. I am very glad to know that our friend from Brantford has seen the error of the position he took in 1905, and has become in this instance at any rate a straight supporter of the immigration policy of the government.

In regard to what was the policy of the government at that time, I will read the reply of the Superintendent of Immigration, dated May 29, 1905, to W. F. Cockshutt, Esq., M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa:

My office will not fail to do what it can to make known the need that exists at Brantford for various kinds of help, but I may tell you that the great majority of our immigrants make up their mind before leaving Europe or the United States that they will go to the Northwest and settle on the farm lands offered by the government there, or in the towns which are springing up as a consequence of the growth of the farming community in western Canada, and that it is difficult to dissuade them from this intention and to avail themselves of the openings in various employments such as are referred to in the present correspondence. The Immigration Department of the province of Ontario might do something in the matter, and I think it would be well for the proprietor of the employment and information bureau of Brantford, to write as fully as he has written to you to Mr. Thomas Southworth, Director of Colonization, Toronto.

But Mr. Cockshutt was not the only person who brought to the attention of the Immigration Department the needs of this country for immigrants. Here is a letter from the Ontario Malleable Iron Company, Limited, of Oshawa, Ont., addressed to the Immigration Bureau, Ottawa:

We are at the present time short of labourers, and write to ask if you could send along some men as Oshawa is an excellent point in the placing of men for labouring work.

We could ourselves take at the present time twenty men if we could get them, and there are other firms in town who are also looking for men.

Anything along this line that you could do for us will be appreciated.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the date of that?

Mr. OLIVER. October 4, 1905. The Secretary-Treasurer of the Dominion Textile Company, Limited, Montreal, on October 3, 1905, wrote:

We will consider it a great favour if you will be kind enough to advise Mr. Walker, also any of your other agents in Great Britain, that our company is desirous of obtaining weavers or any other good cotton mill help to work in our factories in this country. We have thirteen mills in operation, and at

the present time could give employment to several hundred good mill hands if we could secure them.

We have a letter from the Meaford Board of Trade, dated October 2, 1905, as follows:—

I am instructed by the president of the Meaford Board of Trade to write you explaining the position of matters here with regard to unskilled labour in the hope that you might be able to help us.

In addition to two tanneries, a foundry, canning factory and two sash and door factories we have a large furniture factory, employing 60 to 70 skilled hands and some 15 to 20 unskilled hands could they be got, the Seamen-Kent Company, who manufacture hardwood flooring and deal quite extensively in lumber, transhipping through here from vessels. Then there is another large factory nearly completed which will manufacture wheelbarrows and will be able to employ 20 or more unskilled hands at least. The three last-mentioned concerns are now and expect to be short of hands, both skilled and unskilled, and it occurred to us that possibly if we acquainted you with the position of matters here you might be able to steer some of the immigrants who desire to locate in towns in preference to taking up farming this way and so help both us and them.

In addition to the factories, the grain elevator, at the harbour, 750,000 bushels capacity, is short of shovellers. Pay there is 20 cents an hour. I believe work could be got here from now till navigation closes. Work for at least 30 hands could be given in and around the factories all winter, and in addition the Seamen-Kent Company will require to send men to the bush in connection with their sawmills.

If you think you could make use of this information to our mutual advantage we would be well repaid. Each of the factories could take on a number of boys from 15 to 18 years of age and train them. There is no strike on.

But there were other demands for labour. In 1904 the labour organizations made strong representations against the importation of skilled labour, and this brought forth resolutions from the county councils and other organizations of many Ontario counties. Here is a petition from the county of Halton, Ont., dated January, 1904:

The undersigned petitioners, having read the representations made to you as Minister of the Interior by representatives of labour organizations on January 4, 1904, in the city of Toronto, to the effect that more mechanics and farm labourers are not wanted in this country, we the County Council of the county of Halton, wish to emphatically protest against this most unwarranted statement, knowing as we do that exactly the reverse is the case. Hundreds of unfinished buildings and thousand of buildings projected have not been started that would have been built under favourable conditions of the labour market, which testifies to the undoubted fact that there has been throughout the province of Ontario during the past season an extraordinary scarcity of mechanics. And every farmer in Canada will testify that farm labour has been extremely scarce, indeed, almost unprocurable. This is largely due to two circumstances: First, the unprecedented number of people who have moved to the Northwest during recent years; second, to the fact that large numbers have drifted into the cities, where they have had no difficulty in procuring employment at high wages.

Your petitioners would therefore pray that every possible encouragement should be given by your government to induce farm labourers to come to Ontario, knowing as we do that profitable employment can be given to any number of people who can be induced to come here.

This petition was signed and sent to the Interior Department by some sixty organizations—county councils, farmers' institutes and agricultural associations of one kind and another. In response to the statements thus set out, in response to the demand of the agricultural community of the province of Ontario, in the response to demands made in parliament, not only by my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt), but by other members in their places, the Dominion government did expand its immigration policy in regard to Great Britain with a view of supplying these demands. But I want to point out that the Immigration Department did not accede to the whole of the demand. I have no wish to delay the House, but I would ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, while I read an extract or two from the printed circulars issued to booking agents in the United Kingdom on March 20th, 1906, after it was decided to carry on an aggressive campaign in Great Britain for the purpose of supplying the requirements here:

Bonuses will be paid provided the regulations of the department are complied with, upon tickets to Canada sold to British subjects, whose occupation in the United Kingdom has been for at least one year, one of the following namely: Farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway surface men, navvies or miners, who have signified their intention of following farming or railway construction work in Canada; and female domestic servants.

The bonus will be one pound on each person of prescribed classes, eighteen years of age or over, and ten shillings on those between one and eighteen years of age. No bonus on infants, tourists, returning Canadians, prepaid tickets or persons of other occupation than one of the above named, or on persons mentally or physically unfit.

This was supplemented by a circular sent to the booking agents, and I shall take the liberty of reading one or two clauses so as to set out more clearly the policy of the government, in order that the government may be judged, not on the policy ascribed to it, but on its actual policy. The booking agents are the people upon whom we depend for the spread of information which we desire to get before the British people. They are licensed to sell transportation under the laws of Great Britain they re-

ceive a commission from the transportation companies for whom they sell tickets, and it was thought that by adding to that commission on the tickets sold to Canada, we would thereby enlist their active assistance. But while we were glad to enlist their services, we were very careful to enlist them only on behalf of the classes of people we considered were required in this country. Besides we went beyond that and explained to them why we took that position. We said :

The classes of people on whom bonus is paid by the Canadian government are expected, by reason of their experience at home, to find scope for their abilities in the occupation of the vacant lands of Canada, in employment upon the lands now occupied and cultivated, or in the railway development now in progress. And while it is not asserted that people of other callings or conditions of life should not come to Canada, or may not find a career open to them in this country, it is desired to have it well understood that the government of Canada assumes no responsibility with respect to any other immigration than that of the classes mentioned as eligible for bonus payment. It is not asserted that the farmer or farm labourer is necessarily a more desirable citizen than any other, but it is a simple fact that the demand in Canada is for people to occupy the as yet vacant lands of the country, to aid in the cultivation of those already occupied, and also to assist in providing additional transportation facilities. This it is which justifies the government in assuming the expense of immigration effort. To go beyond the attempt to meet these requirements would be to use the money of certain classes of Canadian taxpayers for the purpose of securing competitors against them in their several callings, for which they would naturally hold the government to account.

Besides pointing out to the booking agents why we do not pay bonuses on others than the classes mentioned, we placed before them the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1906, passed for the purpose of promoting immigration from the British Isles. We did this because we believed that if we are to get the approval of the people, we must use every effort to bring out only desirable immigrants and should also use every reasonable effort to keep out undesirable people. Therefore at the same time that we increased the British bonus from seven shillings to twenty shillings per head, we enacted an Immigration Act which gave us the power to exclude undesirable people, as we were not able to do previously. We said to the booking agents :

It is important that the provision of the Canadian Immigration Act of last session, prohibiting the landing in Canada of certain classes of people, should be carefully studied (copy herewith), so that the booking agent will understand thoroughly that for his own credit and the advantage of his business he will not book people of these classes. They are liable to be returned to the place from which they came at the expense of the steamship company. This liability exists for two years after their landing in Canada. It will be noticed that the following classes of people are prohibited from landing and are subject to deportation within two years: Feeble minded, idiotic, insane, or who have been insane within five years, afflicted with any loathsome, contagious or infectious disease; anyone who is a pauper, who is destitute, who is a professional beggar or vagrant or who is likely to become a public charge, any prostitute or person who lives by the proceeds of prostitution, or any convicted criminal. Persons who are deaf and dumb, blind or infirm may be admitted if accompanied by members of the family who will be responsible for their support and safekeeping. Unless so accompanied they are subject to deportation.

We also dealt in this circular with cases such as were mentioned this afternoon by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), when he stated that a man who advertised himself in the old country as a government agent was sending out people of classes other than those upon whom we were willing to pay a bonus. In regard to that point, we had this to say :

In the past it has been found necessary on occasion to discontinue business relations with booking agencies for various reasons, such as presentation of improper claims, booking of undesirables, the special booking of artisans under contract, and improper advertising. It is hoped that no difficulties of this kind will arise in future; but as the Immigration Department is a part of the public business of Canada, it is necessary that its work and connections should be kept clear of misunderstandings of every kind. The department would prefer not to have relations with any agency with which it might find itself at cross purposes, and whose actions might subject its work to misrepresentation.

We have this further to say with regard to the kind of people wanted in this country :

It is not in the interest of the individual immigrant that he should remove to Canada unless there is reasonable prospect of his success here. The arrival of any large number of immigrants in this country who are unfitted for the conditions here, must necessarily re-act against the continuation of the immigration movement. In spite of the fact that his failure to succeed is due to personal causes, the unsuccessful man will blame the country, and complain to his friends at home, thereby deterring them from coming out, and the efforts of the Immigration Department will be discredited with the people of Canada who will therefore withdraw their support from those efforts. The men wanted in Canada are those who will do well here, who are recognized in the United Kingdom as being fit, but who are looking for the wider opportunities of the new country, not to be found at home. The efforts of the Canadian Immigration Department are not directed towards those who are merely looking for a place where they may live, but towards those who, while they are able to live under present conditions in the United Kingdom are on the look out for an opportunity to better their position in life.

That is the policy of the Immigration Department to-day and that was its policy in 1906. I would like the House to contrast it with the policy suggested by Mr. Hall, the proprietor of the employment and information bureau of Brantford, Ontario, as endorsed by Mr. Cockshutt, member of parliament, on the 9th May, 1905. I am sure the House will agree that I have reason to be pleased at the adhesion of Mr. Cockshutt to our policy, as expressed in his proposal placed on the Order Paper.

But I want to point out to the House that we not only have a definite policy, but we have carried it out. And we have been carrying it out under difficulties and opposition from people right here in this province of Ontario. But, before I come to that, I wish to read a circular letter addressed to steamship booking agents in Great Britain and Ireland, advising in regard to the destination of immigrants:

It is scarcely necessary to point out to you the desirability as far as possible of keeping these newly arrived immigrants out of the cities and the immigration branch has appointed a number of employment agents in the various counties of Ontario in order that you may send farm labourers, coming to this province, direct to the locality where their services are in demand. If immigrants are sent to the cities, it will be readily seen that the likelihood of their taking farm work is considerably lessened, especially if there is any demand for tradesmen or general labourers. It is therefore in the interest of the booking agent to direct immigrants to our employment agents.

I wish to place before the House part of a resolution of one of the most influential financial, and, I might say, political, bodies of this country, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. This resolution was communicated to us by Mr. G. M. Murray, secretary, under date May 28, 1907. Mr. Murray says:

By direction of the executive council of this association, I have the honour to inform you that, at their last meeting, the following resolution regarding the immigration policy of the Dominion government was unanimously adopted:

I need not read the 'whereases.' The main part of the resolution is as follows:—

Resolved, that the Dominion government be respectfully urged to encourage, through its present immigration officers, and by the appointment of special representatives, for this purpose, the immigration not only of farm labourers but also of skilled mechanics, where opportunities are known to exist, and thus assist in building up our national industries.

Under date of May 30, 1907, Mr. Murray wrote the department a letter in which the following appears:

I have been requested to remind you that the association opened an office in London in January last for the express purpose of engaging for its members skilled help which they were unable to procure in Canada. This being the case, we think it only reasonable that, pending a change in the government's immigration policy along the lines indicated in our resolution, instructions should be given to the immigration agents of the Canadian government in the United Kingdom to refer those who inquire of them as to the chances of securing work in Canada at the various trades to the London office of our association. It will be found at 15 Strand, London, W.C., and Mr. Louis Leopold who is in charge will cheerfully place at the disposal of such applicants all the information in his possession.

In reply to this, the following was sent to Mr. Murray under date June 6:

In reply to the resolution conveyed in the letter of May 28, I beg to inclose herewith copy of a circular to booking agents in the British Isles issued November 15, 1906, in which is set out the position at present taken by the Immigration Department in regard to the matter to which you allude. So far as I can see there are many difficulties in the way of the government acceding to the terms of the resolution, and at the moment I am unable to give any assurance of a change in the policy which is set out in the circular to booking agents to which I have alluded.

Mr. Murray 'came back' on June 22. Speaking of the association and its resolution, he said:

They make their request of the government in order that some means may be provided whereby the ever-increasing needs of our industrial establishments in the way of skilled labour will be taken care of. I need not point out to you that the country is enjoying unprecedented prosperity and our manufacturing establishments have been greatly taxed to supply the demands of the home market. If they are to continue to retain their hold on this trade, they must be in a position to take care of the orders that are turned in to them and they cannot do this unless their supply of labour is greatly increased. The department which this association has established for this purpose has itself engaged and shipped to Canada in four months over two hundred artisans and has orders on file for five hundred more. This, our committee think, should in itself be sufficient evidence of their absolute *bona fides*.

On July 11th Mr. Murray was replied to as follows:—

In reply to your inquiry I would say that the difficulty which we desire to guard against is a possible congestion of indigent immigrants in towns and cities which would result in causing an outcry against the policy which it might be alleged produced such congestion. It is in order to keep the department clear from any such charge that we confine our efforts absolutely to securing labourers for employment on the land and on railway construction work. This, however, does not apply to female domestic servants.

We had this further communication from the Manufacturers' Association, dated June 25, 1906:

I beg to inclose you herewith a resolution passed by the executive council of this association at its meeting held on the 21st inst., having reference to the importation of skilled workmen.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) J. F. M. STEWART,
Secretary.

IMPORTATION OF SKILLED WORKMEN.

Resolution unanimouly passed by the executive council of the Canadian Manufacturers Association (incorporated), at its regular monthly meeting held in Toronto, June 21, 1906:—

Resolved, that the executive council of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association reaffirm the resolution passed at the annual meeting of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association held in Montreal, September 20, 21 and 22, 1904, having reference to the importation of skilled workmen, as follows:—

1. That the Dominion Department of Labour as such should give equal consideration to the needs of employer and employee, that its exclusive system of labour correspondents should be abolished, and that it should, as far as possible, be constituted in policy and practice, an impartial tribunal to advance the interests of all classes in the Dominion.

2. That provision should be made for the lawful importation of skilled mechanics from any other country, provided that the help required cannot be obtained in the Dominion.

3. That the Immigration Department of the Dominion government should encourage and not discourage the emigration to Canada of the best classes of skilled workmen from other countries, provided that these workmen are required in Canadian industries and cannot be secured in Canada.

And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the government and members of the House of Commons.

I wish to point out to the House that the instructions to booking agents were not an empty form of words but that they were carried out in practice. I have here a copy of a letter dated June 30, from Mr. D. Bruce Walker, government agent in England, which reads:

I have written again and again to steamship booking agents, including Mr. Bardwell, pointing out that they ought to use the government employment agents in Ontario for all persons experienced or inexperienced who desire to go upon farms, and that, under no circumstances should they be sent to any of the large cities in Ontario, and that, under no circumstances, should mechanics or other skilled tradesmen be sent to these government employment agents. I have also pointed out again and again to Mr. Bardwell and others that men intended for railway construction may safely be booked to the steamship ports of Canada, but that on every occasion they should possess enough means to insure their transportation to where the work is, and that they should consult the government agent at that port for such information and other general guidance. This point is emphasized in your own circular as well as in my own, and I hope by constant repetition to bring conviction to the minds of booking agents as to what they should do in these circumstances.

I have also a letter from the department to Mr. Jas. S. Waugh, Canadian government employment agent at Chatham, Ontario, one of the agents appointed throughout the province to distribute farm labour, which reads:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, and in answer to your urgent request I immediately wired as follows:

'Department does not expect you to secure employment for immigrants except at farm work.'

With further reference to this matter and to other items in your letter, I beg to say that I had a number of complaints from employment agents that mechanics of all sorts were being sent to them with the understanding that the agents would secure for them employment at their respective trades. In every case where the matter has been brought to my attention I have endeavoured to communicate with the booking agent in the old country and notify him that he must not give cards of introduction to such men. In this connection I would be glad to have you send me any letters of introduction you receive in cases of this sort. On receipt of them I will be in a position to take the matter up and to prevent further difficulty.

I am pleased to know that men are taking to farm work and that some who at first refused it have gone back to you to be placed on farms. Commission will be allowed you on these immigrants providing, of course, you succeed in putting them on farms a short time after their arrival, but it will not be possible to allow you commission on persons placed at other occupations than farm work and domestic services, as the matter was fully discussed and finally decided before offering any appointments.

If you are receiving numbers of men who will not take farm work, the best thing to do is to notify me at once of the name of the organization sending such men out. The central (unemployed) body for London have sent out a good many men who have been accustomed to general labourers' work, but imagine that very few of their immigrants will have had experience in farm work. Probably the majority of inexperienced men you receive will be sent to you by a few societies or organizations similar to the above mentioned.

Mr. W. D. Scott, superintendant of immigration, writes to Messrs. E. Evans & Co., New Cross Roads, London, England, as follows:

Mr. John Patterson, Canadian government employment agent, Toronto Junction, Ontario, has sent me your advice form re Mr. George Simmons and Mr. Fred Parrott, due to sail on the 25th instant per steamship 'Sardinian.' I observe these men are fitters and engineers and wish to obtain similar employment in Canada, and I am writing this letter to draw your attention to the fact that Mr. Patterson is not responsible for obtaining employment at any other occupation than farm work and he will be obliged on the arrival of these two men to refuse assistance. I supposed that our circular was sufficiently explicit to have prevented this, and I would ask you to kindly

note that in all future bookings of mechanics or clerks of any sort such immigrants must not be directed to one of our employment agents.

As these men do not sail until the 25th instant I think you will have time to notify them that they must not expect Mr. Patterson to secure for them employment at any rate.

Here is another letter from Mr. Scott on the same subject:

I am in receipt of your favour of the 2nd instant and regret that you are dissatisfied on account of commission being disallowed on a mechanic placed by you. The department in carrying on its immigration propaganda in the United Kingdom advocates the emigration of farmers, farm labourers, domestics and railway labourers only and lays particular stress upon the fact that any one coming out with the intention of engaging in mechanical industries must do so entirely on his own responsibility and without any assistance from the departmental agents on this side. The booking agents as a class understand that this is the attitude of the department, and while there may be a few who issue cards of introduction to persons other than the specified classes, still the number acting in such manner is small and when a case such as the one you mention is brought to the attention of the department the booking agent is immediately notified to discontinue issuing such cards of introduction.

On November 28, 1906, Mr. Scott had occasion to send the following letter to our agent in England:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt in due course of your letter of the 14th instant, enclosing copies of correspondence between Captain Taylor, of Liverpool, and Mr. J. R. Ronald, of Montreal, and stating that as there appears to be a genuine demand for weavers you have told Captain Taylor that there will be no objection to his advertising for the men. I think that it would be well for you to hold entirely aloof from any business of this kind and to avoid expressing any opinion in the matter. It is sufficient in such cases to say that Canada is encouraging the immigration of farmers, farm labourers and domestic servants but that the government does not take the responsibility of expressing any opinion as to the probability of persons in other callings obtaining employment and doing well in this country, and that their coming here, if they do come, must be entirely their own affair.

I have tried to place before the House clearly and distinctly that the policy of this government in regard to immigration, while it was a policy of active encouragement of those who were especially desired, was a policy of just as active discouragement of those who were not desired, and if there is at this time in this country a congestion of immigrants such as is alleged in the resolution of Mr. Cockshutt, the blame, if blame there is, must be placed elsewhere than on the shoulders of the Immigration Department. I have already read to the House the action that is taken in the way of bringing out immigrants by that powerful organization the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. As well there are in England powerful organizations for the purpose of sending out those who have not employment in that country, organizations which are taking the suggestion of our friend Mr. Hall, recommended by Mr. Cockshutt, that it is desirable to empty the crowded tenements of Europe into the cities of Canada. There are a number of these organization, benevolent organizations, at work. There are the Self-Help Emigration Society, the East End Emigration Society, the Central Unemployed Body, the Central Emigration Board, the British Women's Emigration Society, the Church Emigration Society, the Church Army and the Salvation Army. I have read from the circular to booking agents the policy of the department and I think nothing can be more distinct than that, however well we may wish to the philanthropic instincts of the men who are engaged in these organizations, we do not recognize that what they assume to be their obligation is in any degree our obligation. That is to say, while we recognize their charitable efforts in trying to do well for the people of whom they have taken charge, we do not recognize any such obligation on our part. We deal with these people simply on their merits as prospective citizens of Canada, and if they come up to a sufficient physical standard and if they come with good intentions and if there is reasonable opportunity for their employment in Canada in the calling which we desire to have filled, we give those immigration societies the same consideration as we give any other booking agent. But, if their efforts do not result in the bringing of those whom we could, in accordance with our policy, admit and pay bonus on, then they have to do their work without any assistance from us, or, if they go too far, we exercise the powers given us under the Immigration Act and either reject or deport.

In regard to the total flow of immigration to the country during the year, I may give a few figures. The total arrivals numbered 273,009. From across the ocean there were 217,150, of whom 131,337 were from Great Britain, and 85,813 from the continent. There were 55,859 from the United States. We have no means of knowing how many of the 131,337 from Great Britain represented the work of charitable organizations, but we do know that the charitable organizations claimed bonus on 5,167. They were paid bonuses on 3,347. That is to say the claims of the charitable organizations on immigrants brought out were rejected to the number of nearly 2,000—I fancy a much larger number than will account for the total so-called congestion that there is in all this Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has given us the number who came from the United States. I saw somewhere—I think it was from government sources—some information as to the number of Canadians who went to the United States last year. Has he any information on that, and if so, would he kindly give it to the House?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no information on that subject at present. It, I fancy, would be available from the returns of the United States. I do not think we have those returns.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like to ask the hon. minister, if, from his last remarks, we are to take it that the charitable organizations to which he has referred attempted to obtain bonus on 2,000 people or thereabouts on false or pretended claims without any merit in them?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) thinks he is in the police court or not. I do not think his question is well put. I would like to say that the man who wants has a different point of view from the man who gives, and the charitable organizations may very well have a different view of what their rights are from that which the Immigration Department may have. But, as a matter of fact, I have given the hon. gentleman the figures of the claims made by the charitable organizations and of the number of those claims allowed by the Immigration Department. We were not able to see eye to eye with the charitable organizations with regard to the number of their claims any more than we are able to see eye to eye with them in regard to the purpose of their work. Their purpose is to do good to the unfortunate of the old country; our purpose is to get from the old country the best they have so as to improve and not to deteriorate the population of this country.

Regarding the effect of the payment of bonus in securing a desirable class of immigrants, I have already pointed out that the bonus is paid for the express purpose of giving an inducement to the booking agent to send us the man upon which he can get a bonus rather than the man upon whom he cannot get a bonus. As we have the endorsation of our hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) in regard to our immigration policy, I am especially glad to be able to refer the House to the endorsation of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in regard to the principle of our bonus policy. On April 9 last, the hon. leader of the opposition enlightened the House as follows:—

> It does not seem to me that the payment of bonuses in itself has any tendency to bring in a less rather than a more desirable class of people into this country. That would depend altogether on the way you work it out. If without the payment of bonuses you permit people to come in indiscriminately, if you use every possible means by advertising and otherwise in any particular country from which immigration is not very desirable, you might, without a system of bonusing at all, increase the tendency to bring in people who are not desirable. On the other hand, if you used the system of bonusing, you might attach to it such conditions as would not tend to bring in undesirable people.

I think the House will agree with me that in that particular we have met the requirements of the leader of the opposition. He says further:

> In a word, I would be inclined to restrict our efforts in so far as the system of bonusing is concerned to the people of the British isles.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). I would like to ask the minister what are the regulations governing the agents in the constituencies throughout the Dominion, and what are the conditions under which they are entitled to receive the bonus upon each immigrant placed? How long has an immigrant to be here before the agent is entitled to receive the bonus of $2?

Mr. OLIVER. The immigrant has to be in farm employment before the man who places him in that employment is entitled to the bonus of $2 for placing him.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to say to the minister, if I may be permitted, that in the riding which I have the honour to represent, Mr. James S. Waugh—in regard to whom I had a question the other day on the Order Paper although his name is there given as John S. Waugh—received $1,280 for placing immigrants whom he had brought to the county of Kent during the last year. I can say with all authority to the minister that 25 per cent of those immigrants for whom he was paid $2 apiece were not in the riding twenty days and I can also say that 50 per cent of the immigrants for whom he received $2 apiece were not in the riding twenty days after he received that bonus. They simply went across the border to the United States. I am opposed to paying a bonus of $2 a head For immigrants who come to this country, I believe the time has gone by when we should pay any money to induce immigrants to come to this country. I think we should get a bonus rather than pay one out.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Clements) has made a clear cut statement of policy on which we would be glad to take issue at any time and on any occasion which may seem convenient. I would like to say, however, in regard to his position as to the policy of bonuses and as to the requirement that if a man is placed on a farm he therefore must always stay on that farm that I do not at all agree with him; nor do I admit that the payment of $2 to an immigration agent thereby mort-

gages the body or soul of the immigrant so placed. The best we can do is to place a man in employment such as we undertake or desire to fill. If the employer and employee cannot agree we cannot do any better. We have done very well when we have placed with the farmers of Kent the number of men from the old country that has been stated, and if they have not been able to keep them that is something which is beyond our control.

Mr. CLEMENTS. My contention is that if you pay $2 to an agent for placing an immigrant on a farm in Kent or any other county in Canada, that immigrant should remain upon the farm a certain length of time before the agent receives the $2. I can tell the minister that the agent received $2 a head on account of immigrants in West Kent who did not remain on a farm for twenty-four hours; he simply got his certificate and that was the end of it.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not say that our representative in Kent is perhaps all that might be desired. We appointed a large number of agents throughout Ontario and we have to take our chance on the man we got, but I assume that the man we got in West Kent was fairly representative of West Kent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The minister evidently does not know that gentleman's reputation in the riding of West Kent.

Mr. OLIVER. I must admit I do not, but I am merely assuming that we got a fairly representative man and that his work is fairly representative also.

Mr. CLEMENTS. May I ask the minister who recommended that man for the office?

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable to give the hon. gentleman the information now but we can get it later on. I would like to place before the House some further information in regard to the situation as to the supply of labour at the present time, and as to the attitude of the department and its action thereon. In former years the rule was that the rush of immigration took place during the months of May and June; that it fell off greatly after June, and that there was practically no movement of immigrants in the fall and winter months. Therefore we concentrated our attention on the securing of immigrants such as fulfilled our requirements during the spring months, and the rest of the year took care of itself. Whether fortunately or unfortunately; whether because of favourable conditions in Canada or because of energetic advertising, or because of both, this year the flow of immigrants did not cease with the passing of the spring months but continued into the fall and apparently was likely to continue into the winter. That was a new condition and it required to be met. Naturally there is a falling off in the demand for labour as winter sets in, and there was some depression in financial conditions which added to the ordinary lack of work in the winter, and we found for the first time in some years a surplus of labour in some of the cities of Canada. We were not in any sense responsible for that congestion of labour. I have pointed out to the House that it was practically contrary to our policy; I have pointed out to the House the direct causes which brought that labour there and with which we were neither directly nor indirectly connected. But it was a fact that it was there to a certain degree, and it was for us to consider what our attitude should be. We believed that in the presence of more or less unemployed persons in the cities, accompanied by the fact that the demand for labour is slack during the winter, it was not desirable that the ranks of the unemployed should be increased by further arrivals of unemployed from the old country. Therefore on the 3rd of December we wired to Mr. Bruce Walker in London:

Advertise in newspapers and notify by circular, agents, booking agents and steamship companies, that the demand for labour of all kinds in Canada is over for the season. Strongly advise by same means all persons looking for employment in Canada not to sail earlier than April next and then only if they have employment assured or have sufficient cash to keep them until they secure employment.

On the 6th December we sent the following to steamship agents:—

In view of the condition of the labour market, immigrants landing should have sufficient money to keep them until spring; understand that a large number of immigrants are liable to land, bound en route to Toronto. If without sufficient funds, notify this office, giving particulars before landing.

Then the steamship agents who were willing to co-operate with us said:

You require passengers to have money if they have not employment or friends in view. How much money shall we insist they shall have?

On December 11 we wired as follows:—

Notify all steamship companies, booking agencies and government agents in British isles and on continent that immigrant passengers arriving Canada until the 15th of February must have $50, and from then to 1st April, $25 in addition to inland transportation unless they can show to the satisfaction of the emigration officers that they have assured employment or will be cared for by friends.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that apply to all comers?

Mr. OLIVER. It applies to those who have not employment or who have not friends to take care of them. It does not apply to the families of men already in this

country who are coming to join them ; it does not apply to men who know they are going to get work. It does apply to the ordinary immigrant who without friends and without employment must depend on somebody until work opens in the spring, and we think it is not unwise to give notice beforehand as to the conditions and as to the requirements.

Mr. SPROULE. The department is paying a bonus on certain classes and many of these may be included in this prohibition. Therefore you are trying to discourage them coming here while you are paying the companies to bring them here. That notice apparently does not restrict the bonus on farm labourers or domestic servants whether they have one dollar or fifty dollars, or whether or not they have immediate employment when they reach here.

Mr. OLIVER. If the men are excluded then no bonus will be paid on them. This circular is to the booking agents to inform them that this is an additional requirement and that if they book people without that requirement being fulfilled they must not expect that bonus.

Mr. SPROULE. No matter what lines come on?

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely. Our information is that farm work is slack at present and that possibly there are men enough in the country to fill all requirements, and therefore we do not wish to encourage men to come out at this season. We will be glad to have them later on, but we do not want to have them at the present time. It may be said we did not take this action soon enough and that we should have foreseen what was about to take place. But I may point out that there are others who were not more far-seeing than we, and in fact there are some who do not recognize even now that the condition is at all serious.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point, I would like to ask him if the condition that a man must have $50 in his pocket applies only to immigrants coming from the British Isles ? I saw a notice of that condition in the public press, and to my mind it was to that effect.

Mr. OLIVER. The notice says: 'Notify all steamship company's booking agencies and government agents in the British Isles and on the continent that immigrant passengers arriving in Canada until the 15th of February,' and so on. The Montreal 'Star.' on September 28, 1907, said:

The fact of the matter is that the demand for unskilled labour in Canada is greater than the supply.

The Toronto 'World' on March 22, 1907, in an article on its welcome bureau, said:

This year promises to being the high water mark of Canadian immigration, but let as many come as may, there is room and to spare for them many times over.

On November 23, 1907, the Edmonton 'Journal,' discussing an arrangement made by the British Columbia government and the Salvation Army, said:

The British Columbia government has concluded an arrangement with the Salvation Army, whereby the latter contracts to supply a given number of immigrant settlers and workingmen, the government thus expressing its confidence in the army's system. It would be a good thing for Alberta if our government would follow suit. We need men.

The Winnipeg 'Telegram,' on April 3, 1907, said :

Never in the history of western Canadian development has western Canada so desired men, skilled and unskilled in railway construction, building enterprise, &c. Never have the opportunities been greater for the man willing to work, and never has it been more important than that the labour market of the west shall be supplied to some degree proportionate to the crying demand at the present time.

The annual meeting of the Toronto branch of the Manufacturers' Association was held on July 11, 1907. The retiring chairman, Mr. John Firstbrook, gave an address, from which I quote:

The city was not attractive to the manufacturer unless there was plenty of skilled labour to be had, and this was where Toronto was sadly handicapped. Skilled help is even more difficult to obtain now than a year ago, and the situation was indeed an acute one, vitally concerning the welfare of the city as a whole. Factories had expanded altogether beyond the increase in the number of available mechanics. Notwithstanding the repeated agitations the government persisted in confining its efforts to the encouragement of the immigration of agriculturists and railway labourers, while the importation of skilled labour and factory hands was left to private initiative. This policy, which would inevitably throw the splendid markets of the rapidly developing Northwest into the hands of the United States manufacturer, had compelled the Canadian Manufacturers Association on February 1 last to open a labour department in London, Eng. In the short space of five months since then, in spite of all these difficulties for organizing such a bureau, over 800 skilled workers have been contracted for to come to Canada, of which nearly 300 have arrived to-day. Toronto was getting her quota of these, but they were a mere pittance through the industrial thirst. The situation demands the execution of the same aggressive government policy to encourage the immigration of skilled labour and factory hands generally that is now pursued in the case of agriculturists. From investigations carried on by the branch two months ago it is conservatively estimated that there is employment for 25,000 additional girls in Ontario alone, of whom 10,000 could easily be absorbed in Toronto. The number of male mechanics wanted is incalculable, but the

excessive dearth of labour is patent on all sides.

At the thirteenth annual meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade, held at St. John, N.B., on August 21 and 22, 1907, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, that the maritime provinces with their rich and varied resources afford in farming, lumber, fishing, mining and manufacturing, and in commercial life and other spheres of activity, exceptional opportunities for the obtaining of a comfortable livelihood, and the making of pleasant homes with all the surroundings essential to the highest degree of happiness, that there are here great opportunities for development and progress, and that all reasonable efforts should be put forth by the various provincial governments and municipalities as well as by the federal administration, to induce our young men to remain at home, and also to divert to the maritime provinces a portion of the ever increasing stream of immigration which is now flowing from the notherland and other European countries to the Canadian west.

In regard to the character of the immigration of this year, while the evidence may not be valuable, it still may be interesting. I quote from the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' of June 15, 1907:

The volume of immigration into the Canadian west continues to swell. In economic efficiency, as well as in numbers, the newcomers appear to be nearly all that is to be desired. The proportion coming from the United Kingdom shows a welcome increase.

On March 16, 1907, the 'Mail and Empire' had this to say:

Some leading employers of labour have sounded a note of alarm against the large inflow of immigration, fearing that should there be any shrinkage of demand for labour the country might have on its hands a large army of unemployed.

It concludes :

There is little danger that the country will be burdened with an excess of labour, for any considerable period, because the higher cost of living here and the cheapness of ocean steerage rates quickly enable any surplus to adjust itself to avoid unemployment.

On November 11, 1907, the 'Mail and Empire' said:

In these days of rapid growth and expansion there is a danger of dwelling too much on the undesirable element in immigration, forgetful of the great material prosperity that the average immigrant family brings with him to this country.

The Montreal 'Star,' in a lucid interval, had this to say on December 9, 1907 :

Members from the west are speaking out in support of assisted immigration. They seem fearful that the feeling against it engendered by the pathetic spectacle of men and women brought from Europe at this season of the year to swell the numbers of the unemployed in our cities, may lessen the activity of the

Immigration Department in bringing in new settlers for the prairie country. But there is really nothing in common between the two classes of immigration except the ocean voyage. The man who comes prepared to take up and stock a farm in the west is a man who proposes to give employment to himself and possibly others. He will not join the unemployed, but the employers.

It is something, I think, upon which the government may be congratulated, that it has the support of the 'Star' in its immigration policy. The Winnipeg 'Telegram' on November 1, 1907, speaking of emigration from Great Britain, says:

Statistics all show that the class which left the country last year, and those who have since left, has been the very best the country can furnish, and to that extent the colonies have been the gainers.

We notice too that the 'Mail and Empire' itself has joined in endorsing the government policy. In an editorial on Monday, December 16, 1907, it had to say:

The men who came to Canada qualified to take their places among our producers are, generally speaking, prosperous, and would not exchange their present position for the one they left to come here. Immigrants are doing well as farmers. Capable farm labourers and willing and adaptable general labourers have saved enough money to tide themselves over the short period of dullness. No anxiety need be felt on account of the industrious, fit and saving immigrant.

If the Immigration Department has to some extent been taken by surprise, both by the continuance of the flow of immigration and by the somewhat slackening demand for employment, I submit that it is only in company with all the leaders of thought throughout the country on this question. If we have erred, so has every one else. So that there may be no mistake about what the policy of the government is in regard to immigration, I quote from a pamphlet issued in 1907, reprinted from a former issue :

In this it is set out that the classes wanted in Canada are tenant farmers, farm labourers, general labourers and navvies. The classes not wanted are clerks, draftsmen, telegraphists, shop assistants, professional men, schoolmasters and teachers, civil engineers and architects, surveyors.

In a more recent pamphlet the following appears :—

The immigration efforts of the Canadian government are confined to securing for Canada farmers, farm labourers, railway construction men and female domestic servants. Those seeking occupation other than the above specified are advised to secure absolute assurances of employment before they leave home, as the government cannot assist them in securing employment.

Here is another :—

Important to farmers. Farmers, farm labourers, railway construction men and female

domestic servants are the only people whom the Canadian Immigration Department advises to come to Canada. All others should get definite assurance of employment in Canada before leaving home, and have money enough to support them for a time in case of disappointment.

I have placed before the House, Mr. Speaker, at some length, the policy, the administration, and the results achieved by the Immigration Department. I have done so because, in the first place, immigration is one of the most important interests under the direction of our government. We cannot expect that the electorate will shut their eyes to the policy of the government on immigration, or its lack of policy. What we ask is that we be judged on our policy as it is and not as it is misrepresented. We ask to be judged on our policy and on our administration, which we believe to be effective. We ask to be judged by the results, which we believe to be beyond expectation and to which is largely due the great advance this country has made in the past few years. A few years ago Canada was pretty much in the position of a farmer who owned a comfortable farm, but who had a growing family whom he expected to leave the farm and look elsewhere for fields of activity. As a prudent man he thought it well to buy new land on which his boys could settle. It was a similar idea which caused the Canadian people to acquire the Northwest. They acquired it in the hope and expectation of becoming, through its possession, a great nation on this continent. It is more than half a century since that policy was first taken up by Canadian statesmen. For a long time it lay dormant. It was first taken up by the statesmen of old Canada. Immediately after confederation the project was pushed to completion. The new farm was bought, the price was paid for it, vast expenditures were made for the maintenance of law and order in the new territories, vast sums were spent in the construction of railways, in the payment of Indian claims and in many other ways, but the country looked with confidence to a profitable return on its investment. It was expected that these new possessions would cause the exodus of Canadians to the United States, which had gone on so many years, to cease, and that our own people would build up a greater Canada between the lakes and the Rocky Mountains. But for one reason or another, the expected did not take place. I think myself that was chiefly due to the fact that our hon. friends opposite, who were then in control, failed to appreciate, the necessity of bringing in people to fill these vacant lands. They had the country, they knew it was a good country, they knew they had spent money to develop and govern it, but they did not realize that without people there were no country. Therefore instead of the new farm furnishing a field for the employment of Canadian labour and capital and furnishing homes for the sons of Canada, it was a drag, financially and otherwise, upon the old homestead. Eastern Canada for years looked upon western Canada as a load to be carried and not a profitable asset. But when the administration changed the policy changed. The new government appreciated the fact that people were necessary to make the country, that if there was to be wealth produced in the west, there must be people there to produce it, and they set about getting the people. Their first attempt was to bring back from the States those hundreds of thousands, of native born Canadians who had up to then found their homes in the great republic. The Liberal administration entered upon a vigorous campaign in that connection. It was slow work at first and difficult. This government then directed its energies to England and the continent and endeavoured to induce from these countries a stream of immigration of the classes of people who would make homes on our prairies and make productive the lands that had lain fallow so long. At last success began to smile on their efforts. Our Canadians began to come back, others came with them, people came from Europe and the British Isles, the country began to be cultivated, production increased and so did wealth, trade and prosperity. And as the prairies in the west became productive so did the country in the east progress. Our friends opposite try to depreciate that policy, but I think the country will agree that what we did was done for the best, that what we did had good results, and that our policy was far better than the do nothing policy which characterized the administration of our hon. friends opposite. One of the strongest factors in the progress Canada has made in the past few years has been the immigration policy of this government. That policy has not been the same from the beginning. It has had to be changed according to circumstances to meet the different cases as they arose. At one time it would have been madness to have induced people to come from Europe to the eastern provinces of Canada. Previous to 1896 it would have been an insane proposition to bring out British immigrants to Ontario or Quebec. There was not room in these provinces for the people who were there. Skilled labour was then leaving Canada so fast that our neighbours enacted an alien labour law to protect themselves. We had placed a million people in the United States in the preceding years. This government has followed an active and energetic immigration policy for the past eleven years. It has been phenomenally successful. But, in these eleven years, notwithstanding that

success, in drawing people from all quarters of the earth, it has not been able to replace the native-born Canadians who were lost to this country before this policy was entered upon. It has not been able to bring into Canada a million people; our friends on the other side were able to send a million Canadians out. We ask the country to judge between their policy and ours.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). I always had a very clear opinion of the Manufacturers' Association, and the quotations made by the minister have shown me that this association is exactly what I thought it was. I am convinced that the present immigration situation in our cities is the result of the work of the Manufacturers' Association. It is all very well to say that skilled mechanics are needed in different cities throughout Canada, but the present condition of the labour market should convince anybody that skilled mechanics are not needed in our cities. Let me give a few instances of how skilled labour has been treated. During last summer the Manufacturers' Association, through the famous Leopold, so well known in this House, sent circulars broadcast throughout England, making representations that skilled labour was needed in Canada. Let me cite the facts concerning some of these. It was stated that in the city of Montreal, fifty bricklayers were wanted. As a matter of fact, there were about two hundred and fifty bricklayers walking the streets of Montreal at that time. This circular held out to the bricklayers of England these inviting terms: You will earn 55 cents per hour, which will make your wages for the year about $1,400; you will have to pay only about $200 for your board; and, allowing $200 more for clothing and pocket money, you will have $1,000 left for your year's work; and if you are in Canada for ten years you can come back to England a rich man with $10,000. Is it possible for any one of common sense to believe that you can lay brick here at this time of the year, or when you have bad weather? Can any one of common sense believe that a bricklayer can earn $1,400 a year? In the same way, not very long ago, circulars were sent out stating that twenty carpenters were needed in Montreal. And at this particular time, four or five hundred carpenters were walking the streets of that city. The circular said: You will be paid from 25 cents to 33 1-3 cents per hour and you will be assured of work for a year or more. A number of carpenters reached Montreal. They were offered 19 cents per hour. They had no money and no friends, and finally they had to accept the 19 cents rather than starve. Something had been said here about the cotton mills. Well, just about the time the Manufacturers' Association was trying to induce textile workers from England to come to Canada, the textile workers in the different factories in this country were asking for an increase in wages, that is they were asking for a living wage. But the Manufacturers' Association were anxious to have people to replace these workers at a worse starvation wage than those working for them had been receiving.

Now, last September, and that is not very long ago—in the city of Winnipeg I went down a certain street where the work of digging a sewer was in progress. Out of fifty men working in that sewer, thirty-one were skilled mechanics—among them being four printers, four plumbers, two watchmakers, two metal polishers and eight stonemasons. Does any one suppose that if these skilled mechanics could get employment in their several trades, they would take a job as labourers in digging a sewer? And still, the Manufacturers' Association plainly stated that they were short of skilled mechanics. What the Manufacturers' Association wants—and we know it very well—is to have five or six men knocking at the door of every job that offers in this country. They are looking to their own interests, and they are going to protect their own interests regardless of the interests of other people and of the country. Last September, the Trades and Labour Congress held its session in Winnipeg. We declared against the immigration into Canada of skilled mechanics. And is it not a fact that about the same time the Manufacturers' Association sat in convention in Toronto and protested against the attitude taken by the Trades Congress? As these misrepresentations have been made, especially through the famous Leopold, what were we to do? The labour people of this country, on November 29th last, sent a man to England to represent to the people there the condition of the labour market of this country, and that man is there at our own expense and will be there for five or six months. We are going to fight Leopold on his own ground. Formerly, he had it all his own way. Of course, we used to send cablegrams telling the conditions of the labour market. But he had men on the job—and he has plenty of men for the Manufacturers' Association is a powerful organization financially and otherwise—and he would send these men to different meetings to tell the people that the labour men of Canada simply wanted to keep the work for themselves, and were not willing that Englishmen should come to Canada to earn their daily bread. I hope that this will be stopped through the efforts of the man who was sent by the organized people in Canada.

I may also mention the case of the moulders. I am sorry that I did not know that this question was coming up to-day, as I have letters and documents which I wished to read in the House, but if members are anxious to have them, I shall afford them means, before the close of the session, to see all the documents I have in my posses-

sion. Recently moulders were again asked to come to Canada through the Manufacturers' Association. It was stated that a few moulders were wanted in Toronto, a few here and a few there. When they were asking for moulders for Toronto 300 were walking the streets of that city. It was the Gurney Company that was asking for them. Why? Because they had been fighting labour for a number of years past with the help of the Manufacturers' Association.

I was more than pleased to hear the minister read these letters and make these quotations from government circulars, &c., because the other day when the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) spoke on the immigration question I did not believe that he was sincere; but now I know that he was not sincere. To show what the Manufacturers' Association are liable to do—I am not stating that the firm to whom I am about to refer are members of the association, but they might be for all I know—only last month, in a little city not far from Montreal, a certain manufacturing concern attempted to force their employees to take shares in the company, saying: Either take a share or leave our employ. Is it a fact that the Manufacturers' Association will go so far as to compel girls of fourteen or fifteen to take a share in a company or be without work for the balance of the winter? I really believe that that association is liable to do anything. I am one of those who are willing to give credit to that association for any good they do, but I am also willing to fight them when they do wrong. The question of immigration is a capital question for organized labour, especially the immigration of skilled mechanics. You have never heard organized labour in this country state that they were against farm immigration or against immigration; what we are opposed to is the immigration of skilled mechanics because we have to suffer, financially or otherwise, on account of the skilled immigration that we have coming to this country, and that has to be supported in the winter. It is all very well to call a labour society a charitable organization, but at the same time it is no more than fair that the Manufacturers' Association should bear the burden imposed by that immigration as well as we do. I hope and trust that the government will be able in a short time to stop the misrepresentation that has taken place in England, and this would be one means to that end. I know that the government last session obtained the passage in England of a law concerning such misrepresentation, but it is so easy for the Manufacturers' Association, especially with the famous Leopold as their agent in England, to evade that law and bring into this country as many immigrants as they choose, in order, as I said before, to have as many men as possible rapping at the door for a job, to lower the conditions of labour, and to lower the wages. If they lower the wages, the manufacturers themselves will be, if not the first, at any rate the second to suffer.

If this country has been prosperous for a good many years past, I am quite sure it is not due to the Manufacturers' Association, but to somebody else. I am not going to give the credit to that association for the prosperity of this country, because they have tried to fight the best element, probably, that we have in this country.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Speaker, in one way I was sorry that the minister read these letters, because they show that the Manufacturers' Association has had too much influence over him in this matter, as it had over other gentlemen with reference to the trade policy of this government. The Manufacturers' Association or the protectionists of this country seem to have had altogether too much influence on the government, that is if they wished to carry out the policy on which they got into power, free trade as they have it in England. The minister quoted a great deal of material which I thought he would not have quoted had it been from his own political friends. It used to be the pride of this government that they bonused only farmers, farm labourers and domestic servants, and I was opposed even to that. I am one of those who have stood up in this House from the beginning and opposed bonuses to any kind of immigration to this country. We have a striking example in the United States. The federal government has never given a bonus for any immigrant to come to the United States. Some years ago they found out that their prisons, alms houses and charitable institutions were filled. They investigated to ascertain the reasons and found that a large number of those in these institutions were foreigners and immigrants. They appointed a commission to go to the old country, and this commission found that in several of the old countries it was the custom of the governments to take the worst criminals out of their gaols and prisons, pay their passage to the United States and so get rid of them. I am afraid that we have gone too far in extending the bonus system to others than farmers and farm labourers. The minister said that it extended only to these people in Great Britain. That is a mistake. I have here a circular, which I shall read, as to the countries in addition to Great Britain on immigrants from which, other than farmers and farm labourers, bonuses are paid. There are booking agents in France, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Norway, and these people are allowed to get a bonus on farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stable-

men, railway service men, navvies, miners, and domestic servants. How much further need it go to cover the whole outfit? It seems to me that even mechanics might work in under that system, and I for one wish to protest in the strongest possible manner against this extension of the bonus to immigrants other than farmers and farm labourers, and if I had my way I would even cut them down. We have an illustration of the result of this. I have clippings from the newspapers in the various cities of this country showing that these people who came out to work on our railways—and on whom I presume this government paid bonuses—are now in destitute circumstances. In Toronto they have been huddled up in houses with neither furniture nor bedclothes, nor fire. The authorities of the city have applied to the local government, and they were going to apply to the Dominion government, to the municipal council, and to all charitable people who had any labour to do, that they go on and do it now, that these people might be given employment so as to keep them from suffering. I understand that a deputation waited on this government to ask that something be done, that railways and public works be pressed forward now during this inclement weather, so that these people may be able to get something to do and thus earn their living.

Then, I find, that, in his speech before dinner, the hon. minister claimed that they were the people who had started immigration work in the United States. I know, of my own personal knowledge, that that is not true. I know two men, and I know them very well, who were the first immigration agents to the United States. One was Capt. Holmes and the other gentleman was a Mr. Webster. I had a personal acquaintance with both of them and Mr. Holmes was the man who planned out the policy which this government have, I presume, extended. They have not extended it for nothing to the people of this country. The amount of money they have paid out for agents, subagents and for people who have abused their positions is something very wonderful. Then, we have had the question of Mr. Preston up this afternoon. Mr. Preston is a gentleman whom I have known since 1882. I first met him in the town of Port Hope when he was running a newspaper. The next year, I believe, he became organizer for the Liberal party in the province of Ontario and I have a distinct recollection of meeting him on one occasion in the riding of Lennox, in the by-election in 1892, when I was a candidate. He did not quite succeed, but he came mighty near leaving me at home. Mr. Preston was the gentleman who introduced into this country the Doukhobors. That is a class of people that I have always contended we did not want in this country. I take the ground that we do not want a class who will not conform to the laws and usages of our people, and I think it was a great mistake when the government made concessions to these people. They claim now that they have letters from the Minister of the Interior to the effect that they would be permitted to live in villages and get their lands just the same. Now, there are some things which are interesting with respect to these Doukhobors. There are some members of this House who are not very well satisfied, I believe, with the presence of the Doukhobors in the parts of the country in which they live. I know that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was a very different man from what he is now, when he was a private member, in so far as immigration is concerned. I recollect that there was no freer lance in this House than the Minister of the Interior. But, I want to read an extract or two from a letter dated December 15, 1906, and addressed to the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister, Ottawa. Here is what a member of this House says about these Doukhobors :

> There are several ways of dealing with the question. I would suggest, and I think it is in harmony with the minister's idea, that these people should be given a fair chance to become Canadian citizens and cultivate their individual quarter-sections. If it were an American settler and he refused to do this his land would be cancelled without further consideration. Then why should the Doukhobors be placed upon a higher level than the Americans?

Then he goes on to say :

> There is one thing which stands out more prominently than others and which is producing a crisis at the present time, it is the fact that a British subject or an English speaking American looks on and sees the fact demonstrated that the Doukhobor is receiving much better treatment at the hands of the government than he can hope for or expect and that this treatment is in violation of the Homestead Act and is in favour of foreigners who are not favourable to our government nor our mode of life.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> (Sgd.) E. L. CASH.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the present member ?

Mr. U. WILSON. I cannot say whether it is the present member or not, but that is what I suppose. We know the trouble that the government has had from the beginning with the Doukhobors. We know of their immoral practices ; I mean by that their view of matrimony—their loose ideas of matrimony. Their leader in the old country wrote to them that a Doukhobor must not put away his wife and marry another because he would be punished for bigamy, but he should be allowed to put away his wife and take another without marrying her. I think it is a standing disgrace to allow people to live in our country in that way without being punished, and if

we have not a law to punish them we should make one. These people are huddled together in villages. The government decided to take their lands away from them, but not until they were pressed on every side, and I think the House will agree with me in saying that these are not the kind of settlers that we want in this country.

Then, we have that celebrated North Atlantic Trading Company contract that we have heard so much about on so many occasions. I think that is the most unbusinesslike contract that I have ever seen during my lifetime. I think that perhaps I was the first member of the opposition who saw it and when I reported to my chief the nature of the contract he was astonished, and he could hardly believe that I had taken correct notes from the contract. The government actually made a contract which was all one-sided under which the company only had to spend $15,000 and under which they were entitled to receive $5 a head for every man, woman and child that came to this country, the only condition being that the immigrant was of the farming class or in domestic service. That was not all. The company did not have to report to the government the number they brought over. That was not part of their business. Every person who came to this country from the countries that were covered by their contract the government had to pay $5 for, and they had to report who they were and the number of them to the company. Nobody can dispute that. That is part of the contract. On the other hand, the government did take certain precautions. They put a clause in the contract which I think was right, that the company should not violate the laws of any country in which they operated. They covered that by operating from one country to another, using the mails, &c. The government tried to shield the men who were violating the laws of these countries, a fact which must have been known to them, because they could not possibly be ignorant of it, and their ostensible reason for undertaking to shield them and for refusing to give the names of the members of the company was that some of them said that if their identity were disclosed they would commit suicide. I have been in public life, one way and another, for a good many years, but I have never had anything to do with a contract that was not open to the fullest investigation. A man has no business in public life whose contracts will not bear the strictest investigation. This contract, as a matter of course, was concocted by this celebrated Mr. Preston, contrary to the wishes of Lord Strathcona. The High Commissioner opposed it and he did not want to have anything to do with it until he got the opinion of Mr. Ross, a lawyer in London.

Mr. Ross reported against it because he did not see how they could possibly conduct the business specified in that contract without violating the laws of these other countries. Lord Strathcona opposed it, and although Mr. Preston tried to lay the blame on Lord Strathcona and tried to make out that he endorsed it, we had the letters of Lord Strathcona before the Public Accounts Committee in 1906 in which he repudiates having had anything to do with it. Lord Stathcona's statement is : that he opposed Mr. Preston's views, but Mr. Smart came over, and Lord Strathcona, and Mr. Preston and Mr. Smart went over the draft contract ; they were to meet again and discuss the matter and finally settle it, but Mr. Smart had to leave in a hurry one day and he took the papers with him and Lord Strathcona never saw them after that. Lord Strathcona stated that he found the department here was so anxious to make the contract that he did not feel he ought to interfere. Well, we know something of the history of the matter after that—Mr. Smart who was Deputy Minister of the Interior, a position that any man might be glad to get ; a permanent position worth $4,000 a year ; he resigned that position to become the representative of the North Atlantic Trading Company in this country. Does that look as though the contract had been managed in the interest of this country, or does it not look rather like a job put up by these gentlemen to get a profitable contract in the profits of which they were to participate. We all know what Mr. Jury stated about Mr. Preston, and I am afraid I will have to repeat it notwithstanding the high character which the Prime Minister gave Mr. Preston a session or two ago when the right hon. gentleman said that Mr. Preston had been before the two committees and had come out of the ordeal unscathed, and pure, and white, and clean. But you remember that Mr. Jury, who was a servant of this government said, that the opinion of the shipping people in Liverpool was that Mr. Preston had an interest in that contract. Some one said to Mr. Jury in the committee : Don't you remember that Mr. Preston denied that, and Mr. Jury answered : I don't care for that, I don't believe it. That is the opinion of one of these officials about the other, and yet they are both still in the employment of this government. Is that as it ought to be. Although these two men had known each other for years in Canada before they went to the old country, and although they worked together there, yet they have so poor an opinion of each other that one man said the other was so disreputable that he would not believe him upon oath.

Let us look for a moment at the amount of money that has been spent on the North Atlantic Trading Company, and it is a great deal. When men make large fortunes, if they do it honestly, it is not objectionable, but when men get hold of a government that is willing to be bled it is a very easy

matter to make money. A year or two ago I moved for a return as to the payments that were made to that company, and I have the figures here. I may say that the Minister of the Interior, the other day, in reply to a question gave exactly the same figures. Previous to the date of this return the government had paid them $306,011.22, and since then they have been paid $61,234.83, or a total of $367,245.85. Now, the bulk of that money has been paid within the last three years. According to my figuring, during the years 1903-4, 1904-5, 1905-6 they have been paid $284,546.58 if the figures are correct, and during the same period this company has paid out $84,428.61. According to these figures that would give them a profit in three years of over $200,000. I think there may be a mistake in that of $20,000 or $24,000 and as to that I am not sure, but in a large amount like this we can afford to be generous and if a company with an investment of $84,000 can in three years make $181,000 I think it is considerable. But we have been told by the Minister of the Interior and by other members of the government that this is a good contract. That was not the opinion of Lord Strathcono, who stated in a letter which I think he wrote to the Prime Minister: that he was of the opinion that under the old system we got just as many immigrants as we did under the new, and that if the old system had continued the country would have been saved a lot of this trouble and expense. As a matter of course we all know that when this contract began to be discussed in the House, the Auditor General became curious and he refused to pay the money to the company, and the government had to send a responsible clerk from the Interior Department to Amsterdam to get the information, and of course he reported that these people had paid out all the money they had agreed to pay and even more, and so the government paid the balance due them. But these people are not yet satisfied. We have had three or four reasons given as to why this contract was abandoned. The other day the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) said it was abandoned because we did not get good enough immigrants; the Minister of the Interior said it was because we did not get sufficient immigrants, but the North Atlantic Trading Company says it was abandoned because the Minister of the Interior was a new man in the office; that his deputy was a new man, that Mr Preston was in London too far away to be consulted; that Mr. Scott had never taken any interest in it, and that the opposition in parliament had pushed the matter so hard that the government got scared and notwithstanding their moral obligation to recognize their own agreement they gave notice to rescind it. But that is not all. The North Atlantic Trading Company claims that they spent a very great deal of money in advertising, in getting things in shape to conduct the business during the ten years the contract was to run, and that they have sustained serious loss through the government giving notice to cancel the contract. I have a great deal of information here that I might quote with reference to the stringency in the money market which has caused such great trouble to the poor people who have been brought to Canada, I fear under false representations. But, Sir, this government is not at all satisfied with anything like ordinary evidence: the Manufacturers' Association has had altogether too much influence over them. The government sent to the old country last year thirty-five special agents to advocate the interests of Canada and bring in more immigrants, and I saw by our local paper last week that the brother of the Minister of Justice had started on his way to engage in similar work. I do not know whether that is true or not, but that is the report from the village in which he lives. Now, Sir, we spent in salaries for these special agents last year $8,751.86 and we spent in expenses $11,541.11, making a total for salaries and expenses of $20,292.97.

There was a very great difference in the cost of these men. The cheapest man was paid for a month's expenses $56.30, while the most expensive man for three months and a quarter of expenses was paid $766.42. This is equivalent to $235.80 a month for the one man as against $56.30 a month for the other man, a difference of $179.50 a month. There must be some aristocratic gentlemen among those sent out, and some ordinary men who are able to live on ordinary fare. We used to be better satisfied with farmers and farm labourers than we are now. The bonuses are now extended to farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, railway service men, navvies and miners. I think that is carrying it altogether too far. The government has changed its opinion wonderfully in regard to the value of immigrants from Great Britain and Ireland. They used to pay them 7s. 6d.; now they give them a pound They used to give a pound for immigrants from the continent; now they give 10s. They used to give a pound for a farmer and every one of his family, and for a farm labourer and every one of his family, even to infants in arms. The government has changed that policy. Now an immigrant has to be a year old before he gets anything, and up to eighteen years of age he gets only five shillings. I think this is a change for the better; but I see no reason why we should give a bonus at all, especially for immigrants from the continent, from which we get a good many undesirables, and we shall get a good many more if we continue as we are going. In the

United States, with all the care exercised, and it is believed that they are much more careful than we are, they get a large number of undesirables. The percentage of foreigners in their gaols and charitable institutions and asylums is very much larger than that of the native born; and I think you will find that the same is the case here, and is likely to be more so if we continue to bring in people without the proper safeguards. I do not think we are likely to get good people by giving bonuses, and I will tell you why. A man who wants to come to the country is a man who has made his mind up, and he will come; but a man who does not know and is not particular where he goes will be got hold of by some smooth steamship agent and will be brought out by him. The agents are not interested as to whether the people they bring out are good or bad; what they want is their pound. Since I have been interested in this question, the point I have always made has been this: if we cannot get quantity and quality, we ought to be very particular to get quality. I would rather have a few and have them good than have a great many to become paupers. We hold out inducements to all kinds of people that there is plenty of work at high wages, and they come. But, Mr. Speaker, I expect that there will be another opportunity to discuss this question before the session is over, when I hope I shall be very much better prepared than I am at the present time; because I had not much idea this morning that I was going to have anything to say in this debate. I trust that the government will cease to take the advice of the Manufacturers' Association, and that if they are going to give bonuses at all they will confine them as before to farmers and farm labourers. There was a time when people had to pay a head tax to come into this country. To-day people pay $4 a head to get into the United States, and it does not seem to stop them. I hope the government will reconsider their policy. If my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior were as free to-day as he used to be in the old days when he sometimes came to my relief when I was getting the worst of it, I am sure he would take a different view. He used to say that he did not know what change was coming, but he welcomed any change because he knew that things could not be worse.

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

Excise—Salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, &c., to provide for increases depending upon the result of excise examinations, $417,122.56.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The increase in the total vote is $35,995. The increase in the excise salaries over last year, $5,495, is entirely due to the fact that every official of the department who is entitled to receive a statutory increase in his salary, is to receive it.

To provide for extra duty at large distilleries and other factories, $9,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is an increase in this vote of $500, which is due to the increased business at the large distilleries. The general increase is due to the statutory increases, and the increase of business. For instance there is an increase in the amount required for stamps, $15,000, and that is due absolutely to increase of business.

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume the hon. gentleman is making a great deal more whisky than formerly. Is it on that ground we are called upon to rejoice in the prosperity of the country?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is one of the evidences.

Mr. HENDERSON. That the people are able to drink more whisky. I congratulate the minister on his contribution to the prosperity of the country?

Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., excise, $85,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The increase of $10,000 is due to the increase of business.

Mr. LENNOX. We should have some items showing how that increase is made up.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is due to the establishment of new factories, and the extra travelling caused thereby. The excise revenue collected during the five months ending August 31, 1907, exceeded that received during the same five months of 1906 by $660,000, showing the enormous increase in the business of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. That does not answer my question. This is said to be for increased travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c. Can the minister give us the increase on each item? What is the increase in rent for instance?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is simply an estimate of what we think will be required, and I cannot say positively whether it will all be expended or not. My officials think it a fair estimate.

Mr. LENNOX. Even with this government we have always in the past been able, after pressure, to get the figures by which they arrive at the increased amount. This is not a mere guess, I presume, but an estimate arrived at from actual calculation and the result of certain figures set down and added up. The minister should have that information.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The officials of the department estimate that $10,000 additional will be required, based upon the cost to the

department of the travelling expenses of officials and the additional rent and fuel required. The travelling expenses have yet to be incurred, and we cannot say exactly where or to whom they will be paid but we know that an additional amount will be required.

Mr. LENNOX. The more we talk about this, the more the government seem to be in the dark. The minister does not give us any additional information. He says it is an estimate for travelling expenses which have not been incurred, for fuel not burnt and for rent of buildings not occupied. How many new buildings is he going to open and where are they to be placed? How much of the addition is for rent and how much for fuel? Are the travelling expenses due to the opening up of new offices or to more frequent journeys? It is perfectly idle to tell us that this is an estimate or a mere guess.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We spent $77,000 last year, and the increased business will require this additional money. It cannot be expected that we shall do increased business on the same expenditure. It seems to me quite clear that, with the growing business more officials are needed, and, therefore, an additional vote.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister did not answer the question put to him. Are more distilleries to be in operation next year than this year, making the appointments of new officers necessary? Have rents gone up? Is the cost of travelling higher than it was? These are data that ought to be available.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. One new distillery was opened in New Westminster last year. I am not aware of others to be opened. But in the new provinces and in British Columbia, and also in New Ontario, a number of bonded warehouses are being opened. This is especially true of Alberta and Saskatchewan. In some cases also, increased rents have to be paid, as, for instance, in Montreal and in Edmonton. The proposed increase is a small sum. We require enough to carry on the business of the department, and the increase is due solely to the reasons I have stated.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What was the increased expenditure last year over the year before under this vote?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It was $8,300.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Has the minister made an estimate of the probable increase of output of distilleries next year as compared with the current year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I can give the figures for nine months of the current year as compared with last year. The grand total of spirits manufactured last year was 6,743,243 gallons, and for the nine months of the current year 5,561,389 gallons.

Mr. SPROULE. At that ratio, there will be an increase to between seven and eight million gallons this year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. With a new distillery running in the west, that is probable.

Mr. SPROULE. It speaks well for the success of temperance sentiment in the party, and the reduction of liquor selling through local option.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Our export trade in that line is increasing, I think.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister said he required enough money to carry him through the year. I understand that last year he expended $77,000 under this head although the vote was only $75,000. Will the minister explain where he got that other $2,000 and how he justifies spending money without parliamentary authority?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We expended at the rate of $77,000 for the twelve months. The expenditure was actually for nine months, and our over-expenditure under this head was $19.75 for the nine months.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there any superannuation among preventive officers during the past year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco, $70,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The increase is $15,000. This is due to the increase of business and the necessity for holding a stock of stamps sufficient for the demand. The duty collected on tobacco for the five months ending August 31, 1907, exceeded that during the same months of 1906 by $251,748.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the minister able to tell us what was the total amount of duty on tobacco for the nine months ending March 31st, last?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The total duty collected on cigars was $901,200, and on tobacco $4,062,098—that is the total excise duty collected on tobacco during the last fiscal year. The duty on raw leaf was $1,198,122. That is the excise duty on imported raw leaf.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to find out how much of the duty on tobacco during the nine months was owing to the legislation of 1897? I want to know what the increased duty on tobacco was?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I could give that information later, but it will have to be figured out; the deputy informs me he can ar-

rive at the information, and it will be sent to my hon. friend.

To pay collectors of customs for duty collected, $7,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is an increase of $1,000 practically for the same cause. Customs officers who do excise work get a commission for collecting the excise revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. What commission?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Five per cent up to $3,000 collected, and after that it is graded. This is found in the department to be a very economical method, as in many places where the collections are small it would be exceedingly costly to have officials collecting excise and doing nothing else. We pay 5 per cent up to $3,000 collections, and above that it is graded, but $250 is the limit paid.

Provisional allowance of $100 each to officers whose salaries from any government source do not exceed $1,000 each, $5,000.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to know from the minister if it is the intention of the government to grant increases of salaries to the Montreal excise officers? They have been complaining for the last three years that they are receiving very low salaries. I understand that the Montreal custom house officers and employees have been given a fair and substantial increase of salary during the last year, and I think it would be but fair that the same substantial increase of salary should be given to the employees of the Montreal excise office. The higher officials of the Inland Revenue Department in Montreal are getting fair salaries, but the ordinary employees are not in receipt of sufficient salaries to enable them to live properly. Quite a number of them in Montreal are not getting more than $550 to $600 apiece. Under the present circumstances, due consideration being given to the increased cost of living, no man can live decently in or around Montreal on the paltry sum of $500 or $600 a year. I understand that most of the officers in the Inland Revenue Department in Montreal appeared before the Civil Service Commission, and that they were given some promise that they would receive an increase of salary. This seems to be the proper time to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to ask this House to vote some proper and substantial increase of salary to the officers and employees of the Inland Revenue Department at Montreal.

Mr. M. MARTIN. I endorse all that my colleague (Mr. Gervais) has said with reference to the salaries of the Inland Revenue officials of the city of Montreal, but I would ask, in addition, if it is the intention of the government to increase the number of officers there. I have myself suffered from this cause; for two days I could not get goods from my bonded warehouse because the officer in charge of my factory had sixteen factories to supervise daily. As to the salaries, I have nothing to add to what the hon. member for St. James Division (Mr. Gervais) has said, he has said all that is necessary under the circumstances. Our officers in Montreal are certainly not paid sufficiently.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am pleased that the hon. members have called attention to this matter. I can see at once that the salaries of the officials in the Excise Department, not in Montreal alone, but all over the country, are too low, particularly those under $700 or $800 a year. We have in the department in Montreal, Toronto and all the other cities of this country, officials who are receiving only $500, $600 or $700, which I am free to say is, in my opinion, too low altogether. We have been waiting in the Department of Inland Revenue for the report of the Civil Service Commission now about to be presented, and we expect that that report will contain a recommendation not only respecting the Department of Inland Revenue but through all the departments of the government with respect to the underpaid officials of the government, those who are receiving less than, say, $1,000 a year. I am hopeful that with respect to the Inland Revenue Department the commission will so report. I sympathize greatly with that class of officials who receive only $500, $600, or $700 a year, and I would almost say that if the commission do not report in favour of improving the condition of these officials, I will be disposed to come to the House, if not this session, next session, with a proposition to increase their salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. Whether there is an election in the meantime or not?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. I think the House will approve that course. As to the number of officials I do not feel disposed to say that we ought to increase the number in Montreal or in any other city. I would much prefer that we should get the best men we can and pay them adequate salaries. For the information of my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) I might say we have relieved the situation in Montreal by putting on one new official there to-day.

Mr. GERVAIS. Is it not possible for the government to give some increase to some of the worst paid employees in the Inland Revenue Department at Montreal this session ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It would be quite possible, I suppose, under the supplementary votes, to increase the salaries this year, but I do not know whether that will be

done or not. I do not make any distinct promise.

Mr. GERVAIS. I may say to the minister that many inland revenue officers and employees in Montreal have been waiting for years for a little increase in their salaries, and it would be fair that this House of Commons should do them justice now.

Mr. M. MARTIN. I would say to the committee that I am one of the number in Montreal who have suffered from the fact that there is not a sufficient number of inland revenue officers in that city. I wrote to the deputy minister in May last but got no answer. I know an officer who had to come two days to my factory and he had sixteen other factories to visit in Montreal; I could not get goods out of bond. We need more officers in Montreal because those who are now in the service have too much work. Operations in my factory were delayed because there is not a sufficient number of officers to do the work. The incident to which I referred happened last May and the statement which I make is true.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister give us the name of the new official and the salary and a statement of his qualifications for the work?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think his name is Rivet and his salary at the start is $500.

Mr. BLAIN. What is his special qualification for this work?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He is a young man who will be required to pass the civil service examination. He has had no special training in the work.

Mr. SPROULE. He has not passed it?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Not yet. He is on temporarily for six months until he passes.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister if that is quite fair to the large number who have passed the civil service examination?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot say whether it is fair to those who have passed the civil service examination. This man goes on at $500. He will be required to pass the civil service examination at the first opportunity. Otherwise, he cannot be permanently employed and he cannot get any increase in his salary. When officials are needed and they have not already passed, they are informed that if they do not pass at the first opportunity they will be expected to retire from the service. We are trying to follow out that policy and we are succeeding in most cases.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the minister to say that his department were employing men who had special qualifications for the work. Here is a man appointed only to-day without any special qualification whatever, not having passed his civil service examination. Yet the hon. minister comes forward and says that he has appointed him to an office in the city of Montreal commencing to-day. It seems to me it is very unfair to the large number of men who have already passed the civil service examination and are seeking employment from the government. It flavours of political patronage and I have no doubt that if the hon. minister would tell us all he knows about it he would say that on the recommendation of some member of this House this gentleman was appointed to this position. May I ask the hon. minister if he was appointed on the recommendation of some member of this House?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I really do not remember on whose recommendation it was, but I am aware of the fact that the collector of Montreal asked for the appointment of three additional men for his work. A number applied to the collector directly. He examined them and considered what their qualifications were, and of those applying he recommended this one to the department as being the only man who was qualified for the office. As the qualification can only be got by experience we do not expect to get men who have already had experience in the excise department. They can only get that after they come into the service. We could not get them for $500 or $600 a year.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom it is supplied, and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c., $60,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister tell us where he gets his methylated spirits and to whom it is sold?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is an increase in this item of $3,000. The methylated spirits which is sold by the department is made by the department in its warehouse at Ottawa. It is made from grain and wood alcohol. The grain alcohol is purchased from the distilleries of the country, a little coming from all of the distilleries and the wood alcohol which is mixed with it is bought from Gall & Co., of Montreal, under a contract, which, my hon. friend will remember, was made for a period of three years at a rather high figure according to the price of wood alcohol at the present time, which contract, I am glad to say, expires in March next. As the amount of methylated spirits sold is increasing, this increase of $3,000 is to enable the department to purchase the alcohol which is required for making methylated spirits. The department, for a number of years, have made a profit on selling methylated spirits of approximately something like $15,000 a year. We reduced the price a year

ago and in 1907 the profit was about $1,400. For this current year there really will be no profit. There may be a little loss at the price at which we are now selling.

Mr. SPROULE. At what price are you now selling it ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. 65, 70 and 80 cents per gallon.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the establishment that you had near Orillia for the manufacture of wood alcohol and methylated spirits ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is a wood alcohol business.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought you manufactured methylated spirits there ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, that is all mixed here in Ottawa.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. What was the quantity you bought last year from the Gall Company, Limited ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Alchohol, 913 proof gallons at ten cents per gallon ; and 4,263 proof gallons at 25 cents per gallon ; wood naphtha, 3,044 proof gallons, in nine months.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. When does the contract with the Gall Company end ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. March next.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Is it the intention of the government to leave the contract open so that American firms can tender ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think the government will undoubtedly buy in the best market. We have no intention at the present time to do otherwise, but of course we will give preference to the Canadian product.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Is the minister aware that this contract was awarded at $1.39 per gallon and that a quotation was sent in for fifty cents a gallon ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Well, that is so.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. It was sent in through a senator.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. If you look at the departmental papers you will find the Wood Products Company of Buffalo tendered at 50 cents a gallon, delivered in Ottawa free, in bond, if the government wanted it. Can the minister explain why the customs duty is $2.40 on this article when it costs 25 cents to manufacture it in Canada. The Americans take our wood from this country, make the alcohol, and send the alcohol back here for 50 cents a gallon. The Minister of Finance stated in his budget speech last year that it was the intention of the government to try and reduce the price of wood alcohol, and I understand from the statement made by the Minister of Inland Revenue that 90 per cent of grain alcohol is used in the mixture. You get grain alcohol at 20 cents a gallon, that makes 18 cents ; 10 per cent of methylated spirits you can get at 50 cents ; and therefore you could sell the methylated spirits at the nominal figure of 23 cents a gallon. These figures are standard, but I understand there is some kind of relation between the Customs Department and Inland Revenue Department, to prevent American goods competing against certain Canadian manufacturers who I understand have a hold on the Inland Revenue Department. Methylated spirits is the raw material for varnishes and other manufactures, and it is not right to permit these industries to be handicapped by one or two factories who are given such an extraordinary high protective duty. There are other industries which need more protection than this does, and still the government takes this industry under its special care. I would be pleased if the minister would give some information to the House on this important subject.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In 1905 tenders were called for the supply of wood alcohol and four were received. A. D. Gall, Montreal, $1.29 per gallon ; G. P. Magann, Toronto, $1,37 ; Railway Spring & Supply Company of Montreal, $1.40 ; Standard Chemical Company, $1.40. The tender of A. D. Gall being the lowest, was accepted, and the contract was then made for three years for the supply of all the wood alcohol required by the department for making methylated spirits. In consequence of the introduction of denatured alcohol in the United States the price of wood alcohol there fell from 70 cents or 80 cents a gallon to probably 40 cents or 50 cents a gallon. In consequence of the reduction in the price of methylated spirits by the department the price of wood alcohol in Canada was reduced by the manufacturers to the general public, and although we have been paying under our contract, $1.29 for wood alcohol, the public have been buying from the same manufacturers I have no doubt at a much less price. I do not know what the market price is at present, but I would not be surprised to be informed that it was not worth more than 60 or 70 cents a gallon.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. The government buys it at $1.10 for the Marine Department.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. When my hon. friend (Mr. Robitaille) says that a manufacturing firm has a hold upon one of the departments of this government, I am afraid he went a little too far. There is no manufacturing concern in Canada that I know of that has any influence or hold upon the Inland Revenue Department. This contract was

made in 1905 and we are living up to it rigidly ; buying all the wood alcohol from that company that we require for that purpose and we intend continuing that until March next. In the meantime the fact that we have had to pay $1.29 per gallon for wood alcohol has prevented the department from decreasing the price of methylated spirits or denatured alcohol as it would wish to. After March next when we are paying a less price for this denatured substance than we are paying now, we can decrease to a relative extent the price we are now charging for methylated spirits. I do not know whether my hon. friend is figuring as to what the denatured alcohol might be sold for is correct or not ; I did not hear everything he said. But having made a very close calculation this year I say now that it is absolutely impossible to put upon the market in Canada at the present price of ethyl alcohol, a denatured spirit at anything like the price my hon. friend mentions which I think was 23 cents per gallon. It is absolutely impossible to do it. We pay 25 cents per gallon for grain alcohol to-day to the distillers, and that is the very lowest price with the exception of very small quantities we are getting from a distillery in Montreal in connection with a sugar refinery where we get a very small quantity at 10 cents a gallon, but this particular alcohol is, shall I say, the refuse of the distillery—not the refuse of the distillery, but it is a low grade of alcohol containing impurities which make it all the better for the purpose of the denatured alcohol. It is utterly impossible when we pay 25 cents a proof gallon and then sell the methylated spirits 65 per cent over proof which would bring the price of that grain alcohol to us itself at 41¼ cents at a strength of 165 ; it is utterly impossible that this grain alcohol could be purchased in Canada for less than 25 cents per proof gallon to sell in Canada at the price named by my hon. friend. Where you have to buy grain alcohol at even one-half the price we are paying now it cannot be done, however desirable it may be to do it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister know anything about the price of denatured alcohol in the United States or in Germany ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot give my hon. friend the figures now. Before the session is over we may have some question as to denatured alcohol. As you will remember one of my hon. friends on the other side made a speech on this question last session. The United States Congress passed a law at the beginning of this year liberating alcohol from bonded warehouses, and permitting it to be denatured and freely sold. Up to the present time the department is without any information from Washington as to the success of that experiment. We have written to Washington for all the data we could obtain as to the success of the United States government in attempting to put on the market a cheap denatured alcohol. We have a vast amount of information from Germany on the question, and I shall be glad to take it up later in the session. We are trying to cheapen methylated spirits, but from my study of the question I am quite positive that unless the farmers of this country can grow potatoes at ten cents a bushel or less, we cannot produce denatured alcohol cheaply enough to compete with gasoline or coal oil as a fuel or as an illuminant. But perhaps we can take up the question at a later stage in the session.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 18, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

THE DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following motion for the purpose of correcting a clerical error in a motion which was passed by this House on the 3rd December, 1907, in so far as it affects the committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates:

That the resolution adopted by this House on the 3rd December, instant, granting the several select standing committees certain powers be rescinded in so far as it relates to the committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House, and that on the Library of Parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand the motion. What is the meaning of it?

Mr. GERVAIS. For the last two years the committee appointed to supervise the official report of this House has been included among the select standing committees of the House. For more than thirty years previous that committee has been entrusted with the supervision of the official report and things incidental thereto. We want the privileges of our committee not to be interfered with. This year, the following resolution was passed by this House:

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

According to the working of this resolution, any power which the committee for the supervision of the official report ever had has been taken away, and we can do nothing unless the House of Commons, by special order, refers something to us to be done by us or amend that motion passed through error. I think under the circumstances the motion of December 3 is a clerical error, and the object of my motion is to have such error corrected, so that our committee can go on with its work.

Motion agreed to.

FROZEN WHEAT.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a question of urgent public importance, namely, frozen grain that is now being shipped from Manitoba and Western Canada to Ontario and the eastern provinces.

Leave being granted.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I well understand that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is devoting a good deal of attention to the question of the distribution of foul seed in different parts of Canada, this is a matter that requires special attention on the part of the minister and of the government. The shortage of the crop this year in some parts of eastern Canada, particularly in the northern parts of the province of Ontario, is causing a great deal of anxiety to the farmers and the country generally, resulting in the importation from the province of Manitoba and the Northwest provinces of considerable quantities of frozen wheat for fodder purposes. I have a letter from one of my own constituents, which I will take the liberty of reading:

Elmbank, December 16, 1907.

Sir,—What does the Seed Act say in regard to wheat from Manitoba? I have seen some frozen wheat from Manitoba which is full of foul seed. Does the Seed Act stop grain coming in without being properly cleaned? If not, it should. Our country is overrun with wild seed without bringing them in. I think parliament should compel all grain to be cleaned.

(Sgd.) GEO. BROCKLEBANK.

This is but one letter of several which I have received from my own county; and the House should bear in mind that in the county which I have the honour to represent the crops have been very good this year; indeed, it was among the best in the country for good crops. Farmers in many other counties of Ontario will no doubt be importing larger quantities of this grain. It may be said that wheat comes from the west to eastern Canada every year. That is true, but that wheat is used for grinding into flour. The wheat to which I refer is used only for feeding cattle and other farm stock. If it be a fact that in the grain which is being brought from western Canada to the eastern provinces there is a large quantity of foul seed, the matter is of sufficient importance to call for the special attention of the minister and for such regulations as will prevent such seed becoming an evil to the farmers of eastern Canada. I do not wish to enlarge on the subject. I merely wish to draw the attention of the hon. minister to the fact as a note of warning. I do not need to say anything as to the condition of agriculture in western Canada. I am aware that there is on the statute-book of Manitoba a first class Noxious Seed Act, which is pretty well enforced by the government of that province. When we bear in mind that this is a poorer class of grain which is coming in from the Northwest, we will realize the importance of the government taking some measure to see that the people of the eastern provinces, who are importing this grain for feed purposes, do not import a large quantity of foul seed. I would like the hon. minister to give special attention to this and see that some regulation is adopted which will give protection and keep out the foul seeds to which I have referred.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I have much pleasure in seconding my hon. friend's resolution. We suffer a great deal in the province of Quebec from foul seeds, and any importation of that article ought to be prevented as far as possible. My hon. friend has done good service in calling the attention of the government to this important matter.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I appreciate fully the danger of the importation of foul seeds into the better agricultural parts of the Dominion. My hon. friend has alluded to the Act of this parliament, which was passed at my own instance not long ago, for the purpose of controlling the sale of seed to be used by the farmers in sowing their crops. But that Act applies entirely to seed grain and does not apply to grain used for feeding purposes. Section four provides that the Act shall not apply to any persons growing or selling seeds for the purpose of feed. We know that frosted grain is being brought from the west for feeding purposes to Ontario and Quebec this year. This grain is sold at a low rate and is not good for milling purposes and evidently is not fit to be used for seed. It is quite true that the grain usually brought from the west to Ontario is used for milling purposes and made into flour and the foul seeds in it are separated and generally destroyed at the mill or else ground up and sold at a cheap rate for feeding purposes. But this frosted wheat, which is being brought from the Northwest, will be ground for food, and I

venture to say that a very large proportion of any foul seeds in it will be destroyed in the process of grinding. Occasionally this wheat may be fed whole but that is not the most economical way. The better farmers will grind it in most cases, although in some cases it may be fed whole to hogs. We have no statute that I know of which can in any way control the danger my hon. friend mentions. How best to deal with that danger is a question open for discussion. I have not yet seen a very clear way to prevent the sale of foul seed for feeding purposes. To do so would probably add so much to the expense of the feed that the farmers would feel themselves aggrieved, although it would probably be in their own interest in the future that the bad seed should be taken out and destroyed. My hon. friend has done a good purpose in drawing attention to the point as no doubt his remarks will be reported and spread throughout the country and perhaps induce those who are purchasing this seed to see that it is ground to such an extent that the foul seeds will be destroyed. I am not prepared to say anything regarding the extent of the evil. True in the west there is a good deal of foul seed grown, but that occurs also in the east, and is a danger to the farmers who buy feed for use on their own farms unless they take precautions, which it is not very difficult to take, but which still involve some trouble. These precautions, I regret to say, are not always taken by the farmers. We have no Act dealing with this matter, and it would be difficult to frame an Act and put it through this session even if we could find out the true solution.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 42) intituled an Act respecting Insurance. He said: A year ago a Commission, which was appointed to inquire into insurance matters, presented to the government and parliament, in connection with their report, a draft Bill for a revision of the Insurance Act. The measure was one of such importance that we did not deem it advisable to proceed with it immediately. We preferred that it should lay on the table for consideration at another session. In the interim we have been enabled to give the subject further consideration, and with the assistance of insurance experts of large experience, recognized ability and unquestioned impartiality, we have prepared a Bill which I have now the honour to present to the House. The Bill is necessarily somewhat complicated and technical in its character. Much of it can be best understood by insurance experts or those who have the assistance of experts. For the present therefore I need not burden my speech by many remarks dealing with the details of the Bill. It will serve the purposes of the House better if I call attention at this stage to what may be regarded as the most important features of the measure.

The Bill presented by the Commission dealt with life insurance only. In the Bill now submitted the whole question of insurance is dealt with, but the amendments are chiefly in connection with life insurance.

Mr. FIELDING. I will do that, so far on some recommendation of the commission or is it a consolidation of all the Acts relating to insurance?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a consolidation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my hon. friend be good enough to explain to what extent he has followed out the recommendations of the commission?

Mr. FIELDING. I will do that, so far as important matters are concerned. There are many details with which the House would not care to be burdened at this time.

The Bill deals with insurance generally. The Commission's Bill dealt with life insurance particularly. The amendments in this Bill are almost entirely confined to the life branch of the business. In the course of the investigation, it was complained that the powers of the government, through the Minister of Finance, were not as broad as was desirable. In the Bill which I now submit we are enlarging these powers. It was the opinion of good authorities that the Minister could only withdraw or suspend an insurance company's license under very exceptional circumstances. Under this Bill it is proposed that for any violation of the provisions of the Insurance Act the Minister of Finance may withdraw a license which has already been issued, or he may refuse to renew a license at the expiry of the term for which it was issued, or he may suspend a license for a period, as the circumstances may seem to require. We also give the superintendent of insurance somewhat wider power. He is to have the powers of a deputy minister in respect of insurance matters, and also to have special power enabling him to visit the offices of the American companies which are situated most conveniently to us, and to make inspections at the head offices of the companies when he may deem it desirable to do so. He is also to receive power to make special audits where such seem to be necessary and to appoint valuators to value the property of a company wherever he thinks that such further valuation may be desirable.

Under the present law, foreign companies are empowered to deposit a portion of their moneys in Canada in the hands of trustees who are private individuals. We have thought it well to provide that, wherever a vacancy should occur in the existing

boards, the place should be filled, not by a private individual, but by a trust company, incorporated either by the parliament of Canada or by one of the provinces of the Dominion, subject to the approval of the Minister of Finance. And, hereafter, all such trust funds are to be placed in the hands of incorporated trust companies and not in the hands of private individuals as at present. That, as I have said, will only apply as vacancies occur among the existing trustees, because we do not wish to disturb trustees now in office.

A question very much discussed in the insurance field is that of deferred dividend policies. It was claimed, in the investigation which took place in the United States, that the existence of large funds arising from deferred dividend accumulations which were not distributed was a cause of much abuse. The Commission proposed to abolish all such policies and to provide for an annual distribution of the surplus. We realize that the object which the Commission had in view is a good one, but we are inclined to think that provision for the compulsory annual distribution of the surplus is rather undesirable, and we propose that it shall be a compliance with the law if the company divides that surplus once in three years. Some companies already provide for the annual distribution of surplus, and, of course, they are still free to do so. But, in any case, they must distribute their surplus at least once in three years. The Commission recommends that these surplus funds, arising out of deferred dividend policies, be treated as liabilities of the company. To this the company have strenuously objected. We propose to accept the recommendation of the Commission, with a qualification. These funds, we propose, shall be treated, to a certain extent, as a liability of the company, and shown in its report accordingly. But, in the case of depreciation of securities held by the company, which would involve a loss, that depreciation may be charged against the surplus fund, and, in that way, the balance will appear as a liability of the company. The argument for this is, that where there is depreciation of securities which is very considerable—as occurs for example at the present time—to treat the whole sum as a liability, and, at the same time, charge the company with this depreciation of securities, might place the company in a position of apparent insolvency. The Commission, recognizing the abuse which had been created, in other countries more than in ours, thought it would be proper to treat that entirely as a liability. We propose to treat it as a liability, but with the qualification to which I have referred.

A question that has been very much discussed is the question of the expenses of new and renewal business respectively. This is one of the most difficult problems. The Insurance Commission recommended that the expense of new business be shown separately from the expense of old business. That is a very desirable result, but we realize that the companies may occasionally find some difficulty in making a distinction in the proportion of expenses which should be charged to the old business and the proportion which should be charged to the new business. However, feeling that the object is a good one—though realizing that the working of the clause is not free from difficulty—we have allowed the clause recommended by the Commission to stand in the Bill.

The question of salaries and commissions is one which has been very much discussed in regard to insurance companies generally. We propose that the officials at the head office of the companies shall not be permitted to receive commissions in any shape or form. They shall be entitled to receive whatever salaries are properly attached to their offices, but not any commissions on the business done. This is a recommendation of the Commission, and we concur in it. The agents, of course, may be paid by way of commission, but officials at the head office must be paid by salary and not by commission——

Mr. LENNOX. Is there a limit to the salary an official may receive ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am coming to that in a moment if my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) will permit me. It is proposed that no salary of $5,000 or upwards shall be paid without being specifically voted by the board of directors. This is a recommendation of the Commission and we concur in it. Without this provision it might be possible for a general manager, by his own act, to make a contract for the payment of a larger salary, or it might be done by a finance committee or some authority less than a board of directors. The Commission recommends that no salary agreement be made for more than three years. The object there, we think, is a good one, but we incline to think that a three year limit may be too short. We propose that a salary agreement may be made for a period not exceeding five years. The payment of excessive salaries and commissions was one of the subjects much complained of in the United States. We think that the provisions to which I have referred will, to a large extent, operate against any such abuse in Canada. And, as a further protection, we provide that, in the case of all salaries and commissions amounting to more than $4,000 per annum, a list of such salaries and the persons to whom they are paid must be set forth in the returns of the company and published in the report of the superintendent of insurance.

Mr. FOSTER. Salaries and commissions, each by itself, or the two combined ?

Mr. FIELDING. The two combined—the income any man is to receive in one form or other. The person receiving over $4,000 shall have his name returned and published. We think that publicity is the

only reasonable guard we can place against further abuse in that direction.

With regard to rebates or special favours, the Commission have recommended that these be forbidden. The Bill of the Commission proposed that in every such case of granting a rebate, a penalty of $1,000 should be imposed upon the director or manager of a company the agent of which has granted a rebate. It seems to us on consideration that that is perhaps too severe on the director, and it does not take account of the agent who gave the rebate or of the policy-holder who received it. What we propose is that the clause as respects the fine of $1,000 to be imposed on the director or manager, shall still apply, provided that the offence is committed with his knowledge. Without that knowledge, it does not seem to us it would be reasonable to impose a penalty on a director or manager ; but in the case of a director or manager who knowingly permits this offence, we provide a penalty of $1,000; and that the agent who gives the rebate and the policy-holder who receives it, shall be subject to a fine of $100, in each case to be covered by any person who takes action.

The Commission made a recommendation respecting pension funds which we are not able to agree with. They recommend that all pension funds be forbidden. It seems to us, in view of the operations of all large corporations which find it necessary to make some provision for the future of their officers in order to secure the services of the best men, that the recommendation of the Commission in that respect is rather severe. We propose to permit the establishment of pension funds, provided that in every case they are authorized by the general annual meeting, or a special general meeting of all persons who are qualified to vote in the affairs of the company. But it must not be done by arrangement with the manager or directors alone ; if such fund be established it must be done with the consent and approval of the whole body of persons, whether shareholders or policyholders, who may be entitled to vote.

The Commission made a recommendation with respect to the method of voting by policyholders, which was taken from the recent New York law. Hon. gentlemen may remember the difficulty, confusion and expense which arose in the United States from the administration of that section. It is rather complicating to conduct an election by mail, to have machinery whereby a ticket is nominated, and rival tickets are put into the field, and people are invited to vote for them by sending in ballots. I do not think any abuse has occurred in Canada which makes that recommendation a matter of urgency, and inasmuch as it is of doubtful expediency, in the light of experience in the States, and inasmuch as it has undoubtedly given rise to much difficulty, to much confusion and expense, we think that for the present we cannot recommend that to the House, and so we have dropped that clause out of the Bill. However, in regard to voting we think we can do something which may guard against abuse. We understand that it is the practice of president and directors to have proxies from their policyholders extending over a number of years. A man signs a proxy and forgets all about it, and for years the president or director, or some other official, holds that proxy and votes upon it. We think this system of voting by long standing proxies should be abolished, and that no proxy should be good unless it is executed within two months of the meeting at which it is to be used. This is rather an important change, and will, I think, serve a very good purpose. A case has been brought to my notice recently where special conditions were made against the public interest. This general clause will, we believe, prevent any abuse of proxy voting.

The Commission recommended what are known as standard policies. The object there is a very desirable one indeed ; but the conclusion we have reached, under the advice of the Department of Insurance, is not to demand standard policies, but that certain standard provisions must be of necessity inserted in every policy. If in addition to that the company wishes to insert other provisions, then the company must submit its forms of policy to the superintendent of insurance and get his approval. I think the attempt to arrange for a standard policy is surrounded by difficulties. But if we create standard provisions, which must be inserted in every policy, and then permit a company to add other provisions in any other form, upon submitting such form to the superintendent of insurance, the objects the Commission had in view will be accomplished.

With regard to fraternal insurance we make some important provisions. Experience shows that the fraternal insurance organizations, started always in good faith, very often by men with little knowledge of the principles of insurance, do not flourish for a long time. For a little while they are able to give the cheap insurance which they are established to give ; but as the years roll on and deaths occur frequently, it is discovered that the rates of premium in the form of assessments are not sufficient to pay the death losses in full. The experience of some of these companies has been such that the directors, recognizing the weakness of their position, have been glad to adopt other conditions. There is in existence what is known as the National Fraternal Congress' Table of mortality, which is employed by actuaries as a fair basis for that class of business. In the case of business of that character already existing, we do not disturb it. Companies having policies of that character outstanding may carry them, but we require that they should keep the accounts of such business entirely separate from those of the new

business which they may do. The new business must be carried on according to this standard to which I have referred, the National Fraternal Congress' Table of Mortality; and as respects the old business, the company should be allowed to work it out as best they can. But they must not take premiums derived from the new business to pay losses or other expenses arising from the old.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How do you separate the two classes of business? Is that done on a head basis, or a percentage basis?

Mr. FIELDING. We have no special provision in the Bill touching that point, we should have to work it out in practice.

Mr. FOSTER. But the two funds would be absolutely kept apart?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. The idea is that if the old fund is weak and cannot carry the policyholders, you cannot help it; but they must not take the money of new members to meet the claims of the old policyholders.

Another condition which we propose to insert with regard to companies doing more than one line of business is desirable. What is proposed is that, without interfering with that right, they will have to have a separate policy form for each line of business and not combine the two or more classes.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the minister mean by a line of business?

Mr. FIELDING. For example, it has occurred in the case of life and accident policies that a general policy is issued. We do not forbid companies doing this business, because they are within their chartered and licensed rights, but we say they should issue separate forms for each line of business, instead of one form governing both. There is a clause permitting private underwriting. There is little of that done now, but it has been done in the past, and not satisfactorily. With regard to deposits to be made with the Receiver General, we provide that any company may make its deposits in the form of Imperial or Dominion securities, either direct securities, or securities bearing Imperial or Dominion guarantee. Any company which is a foreign company may deposit the national securities of the country in which it is incorporated. That would apply, I would say, to an American company, and we will interpret that to mean either the national securities of the United States or the securities of one of the states of the union.

Mr. EMMERSON. Are Provincial securities permissible?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, Canadian securities would include Provincial securities. Then other securities may be deposited subject to the approval of the treasury board. Deposits of trustees in Canada may be in any of the securities in which a Canadian company is allowed to invest.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any supervising or discriminating authority as to national securities? You might have widely divergent national securities, most of them good, but some of them worthless.

Mr. FIELDING. In the case of investments provision is made for the very point which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) raises and, possibly, if it is not broad enough to apply to every case, we may well consider that, but I will deal with that in regard to investments. Probably the investment clause is one of the most important and the one in regard to which there would be the most interest. The Insurance Act, as it now stands, authorizes investment in a class of public securities such as Imperial Dominion, Provincial and so on. As to these there will be no question. They are legitimate forms of investment. We continue the provision respecting that class of securities enlarging it to this extent—

Mr. FOSTER. What class?

Mr. FIELDING. Public securities of the nature of Imperial, Dominion or Provincial securities of a character as to which there is hardly any question. We continue the right to invest in that class of securities and we broaden it a little. We propose that the guaranteed security, whether Imperial, Dominion or Provincial, should stand on the same footing as a security direct. Under section 49 of the existing Insurance Act, subsection (b), provision is made for investment by insurance companies in a large class of securities. I think I had better read it for the benefit of such hon. members of the House as are not familiar with the Insurance Act. I shall read from the existing law, not from the Commission's Bill. It says that any life insurance company may invest in:

(b) The stock of any chartered bank in Canada, or the debentures, bonds, stocks or other securities of any building society, loan or investment company, trust company, water works company, water power company, gas company, navigation company, street railway company (by whatever power the railway is operated), electric light or power company, heat and light company, rolling stock company, bridge construction company, harbour trust company or commission, telegraph, cable or telephone company, dock company, fire insurance company, or the debentures or bonds of any steam railway company, which has earned and paid regular dividends upon its ordinary preferred or guaranteed stocks for the two years next preceding the purchase of such bonds or debentures, if such society, commission or company is incorporated in Canada.

It will be observed here, Sir, that authority is given to invest in the stock of any chartered bank or in the debentures, bonds

or stocks of a large range of companies which are specified by classes.

Mr. BERGERON. It will be shorter to mention where they cannot invest.

Mr. FIELDING. I have something like the thought of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) in my mind now which I am going to suggest for the consideration of the House. The Commission recommended that that clause remain, with the qualification that the power to invest in the stocks of all classes of companies should be abolished except with respect to the stocks of chartered banks. The Commission recommended that insurance companies be permitted to invest in the stocks of the chartered banks but not in the stocks of the other classes of corporations therein mentioned.

Mr. BERGERON. Is not that the proposed law that you are now reading ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am pointing out wherein the Commissioner's report differs from the existing law and from what we propose. Under the law as it now stands insurance companies are permitted to invest in either the stocks or bonds of the classes of corporations mentioned. The Commission recommended the same thing with this qualification that they struck out all stocks, excepting bank stocks. While our chartered bank stocks are undoubtedly of the highest class, still they carry with them a special burden in the shape of a double liability, and there may be room for some question whether they should receive that distinct preference which is suggested by the Commission. However, the manner in which we propose to deal with the matter is somewhat broader. We propose to strike out all that list or class of companies which the existing law particularly mentions and endeavour to reach a basis in a different way. We propose to take as a test of the character or class of the stock its earning power. We propose that if a company has been established for a sufficient time and has earned its dividends, that fact shall be taken as establishing its grade and as an indication of the character and standing of the stock.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Whether foreign or otherwise.

Mr. FIELDING. In some respects. If a company is doing business abroad it will have the right to invest in securities issued in the country in which it is doing business, within certain limits to which attention will be drawn later. A Canadian company doing business only in Canada would have to limit itself to the securities of companies in Canada, but a Canadian company doing business in a foreign country would have the power to make investment within moderate limitations in the securities of the country in which it was doing business. The method which we have adopted as the basis is this : We say that the bonds of any company incorporated in Canada, or where the insurance company is doing business, must have been outstanding for at least five years, must be secured by real estate and other assets of a market value of at least 25 per cent in excess of the bonds, and there must have been no default on these bonds for a period of five years. Next, we authorize investment in debentures provided they have been outstanding for seven years without default. Next, we provide for investment in the preferred stock of such companies if it has earned dividends of 4 per cent for at least seven years. Finally we say that a company may invest in the common stock of any such company if it has earned dividends of not less than 5 per cent for a period of ten years. To summarize, then, we say that bonds which have been outstanding five years without default, debentures which have been outstanding seven years without default, preferred stock which has paid dividends of at least 4 per cent for seven years, and common stock which has paid dividends of five per cent for at least ten years shall be available for investment. All these seem to us to be evidence that the companies, as respects these particular classes of stocks, are of good and substantial standing and that their securities may properly be invested in. I think, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read the new clause and let me say that the new clauses in the Bill have been printed in italics so that hon. gentlemen will readily have their attention drawn to them. The section is as follows :

60. Any life insurance company which derives its corporate powers, or any of them, from an Act of the parliament of Canada, or which is within the legislative power of the parliament of Canada, may invest its funds, or any portion thereof, in the purchase of:—

The debentures, bonds, stocks or other securities of or guaranteed by the government of the Dominion of Canada; or of or guaranteed by the government of any province of Canada; or of or guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom, or of any colony or dependency thereof; or of or guaranteed by the government of any foreign country, or state forming a portion of such foreign country, wherein the company carries on or is about to carry on business, provided the Treasury Board has signified its approval of such securities; or of any municipal or school corporation in Canada, or elsewhere where the company is carrying on business.

That refers to the question asked by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to the securities of a foreign country. It will be observed that with regard

to the Imperial securities, and the Dominion securities, and the provincial securities, they may be purchased as of right without any question, but with regard to allowing them to invest in the securities of any foreign country, or of a state forming a part of such country, we require that it shall be subject to the approval of the Treasury Board. To illustrate, we would undoubtedly accept without question the securities of the United States government; we would without doubt accept the securities of the great state of New York, or Massachusetts. But there may be some state—I do not mention any names—there might be a state in the union which had so mismanaged its affairs that its securities were not in favour and we would be free to refuse them. There might even be some of the minor republics which have a national existence and which while good enough in their own way but the bonds of which are not regarded by us as the highest class of security. We therefore reserve to the Treasury Board the power to refuse or to accept these foreign securities, whereas in the case of any of the Imperial, or Dominion, or provincial securities, the right of investment is without question. Then, Sir, subsection B reads:

The bonds of any company incorporated in Canada or elsewhere where the company is carrying on business, which bonds have been issued and outstanding for a period of at least five years prior to the time of purchase and which are secured by a mortgage to trustees or otherwise upon the real estate and other assets of such company and which real estate and other assets are of a market value of at least 25 per cent in excess of the amount of the bonds so secured thereon, provided default shall not have been made in any regular interest payment upon such bonds within said period of five years; or

The debentures or other evidences of indebtedness, not secured by mortgage, of any such company, which debentures or other evidences of indebtedness have been issued and outstanding for a priod of at least seven years prior to the time of purchase, provided default shall not have been made in any regular interest payment upon such debentures or other evidences of indebtedness, within said period of seven years prior to the time of purchase; or

The preferred stocks of any such company upon which regular dividends of at least four per cent have been paid for the seven years next preceding the purchase of such stocks; or

The common stocks of any such company upon which regular dividends of at least five per cent have been paid for the ten years next preceding the purchase of such stocks.

Now then, attached to that is a provision of some importance, namely, that while the companies may invest in the stock, bonds or other securities of any of the corporations to which I have referred if they have the length of standing and the evidence of good faith in regard to the payment of interest and so on, this limitation shall apply:

Provided that not more than twenty per cent of the total issue of such bonds, debentures or stocks, respectively, of any such company shall be purchased by any such life insurance company.

That is to say, the life insurance company cannot create a subsidiary company. It may in a bona fide way invest in one-fifth of the stock or one-fifth of the bonds, or one-fifth of the debentures, or one-fifth of any class of security of a corporation which has the standing required by the proposed legislation, but it cannot under the guise of another corporation invest a very large sum and practically control the separate corporation; it cannot have more than one-fifth interest in any class of the securities issued by any other corporation.

Then, provision is made for investment in ground rents or mortgages on real estate in Canada or elsewhere, where the company is carrying on business provided the amount loaned on such mortgage shall not exceed 60 per cent of the value of the real estate covered by such mortgage. Then there are provisions regarding investment in life or endowment policies the same as before.

So far for the investments.

Now, with regard to the power of the company to lend its money; the provision we propose is:

Any such life insurance company may lend its funds or any portion thereof on the security of,—

(a) Any of the bonds, debentures, stocks or other securities mentioned in the preceding subsection; or

(b) Real estate or leasehold for a term or terms of years or other estate or interest therein in Canada or elsewhere where the company is carrying on business: provided, however, that no such loans shall exceed sixty per cent of the value of the real estate or interest therein which forms scurity for such loan.

I have said that the power of investing in foreign securities is subject to limitation; that limitation applies both to investments and to loans. Subsection 3 of section 60 reads:

The total amount invested in or loaned upon securities other than Canadian securities by any such company shall not exceed by more than twenty per cent the reserve or re-insurance value of its policies other than Canadian policies, calculated upon the basis of valuation adopted by such companies.

The provision of the existing law is that they may not invest outside a sum more than 10 per cent in excess of that reserve, and we propose to make the figure 20 per cent.

That, Sir, deals with all the questions regarding investment and loans. The only question remaining is with regard to the manner in which this Act shall be brought into operation. It would be manifestly unfair if we were to require the Canadian

companies to hastily dispose of any securities which they may have acquired and which do not happen to fall within the category we propose to lay down in the new Bill. It is therefore expedient that a reasonable time be allowed to the companies to dispossess themselves of any securities which they now hold and which do not come within this classification. We propose to allow the company in any case five years in which it may dispose of any such securities which it now holds; and if at the expiration of five years any particular cause can be shown—where the matter is in progress and has not been brought to a conclusion—the Governor in Council may increase the period by making it six years instead of five.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister give consideration to another phase of that, as to whether it would or would not be advisable to leave that matter as regards past investments entirely in the hands of the company. I wanted to ask whether the minister in drafting this clause had thought of that?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; we thought that if we required them to dispossess themselves of these securities within a short time it would be manifestly unjust, but we thought that if the time were made liberal the companies would not object to it. At all events that is the way the Bill is now drafted. We have drafted this Bill as the result of the best judgment we could bring to bear upon an exceedingly difficult question; we have had the benefit of the assistance and experience of reliable officers of the Insurance Department. Our view has been to recognize the fact that the Commission in its report and Bill, have made many valuable suggestions, and these we have been glad to accept and include in the Bill now submitted to the House. In a number of other cases, after further consideration, we thought their proposed measures were too drastic and we have either dropped their proposals or we have made changes of the nature to which I have already referred. I think I can say that every effort has been directed to the production of a reasonable and sensible Bill. I am not unmindful of the fact that in a measure so complicated as this must necessarily be, and where there are undoubtedy conflicting interests involved, we may not hope that this Bill will please every one. I quite anticipate that I shall find myself within two lines of criticism. On the one hand there will be protests—intimation of which has been given to me already in certain quarters—that we should have adhered rigidly to the provisions of the Bill submitted by the Commission a year ago and not have made any concessions to what are regarded as the views of the companies. On the other hand, I am afraid that I cannot congratulate myself that the insurance companies are going to be willing to accept the provisions of this Bill unreservedly. But I would hope that between the two extremes there is a happy medium which the House will be able to reach. That has been our effort at all events. I thought it well to bring down the Bill on the eve of our Christmas vacation, in order that hon. gentlemen might have an early opportunity of considering it, and it is my purpose, shortly after the holiday recess, to move the second reading, not for the purpose of provoking a discussion on the Bill then, but in order that it may be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, so that the companies and others who desire to be heard on the subject will have an ample opportunity to do so. Probably the House will reserve its own judgment until after that hearing takes place.

Mr. BARR. I would suggest that copies of the Bill be sent to the members during the holidays.

Mr. FIELDING. Copies of the Bill have been sent to the distribution office, and will be distributed immediately.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WIRES AND WATER MAINS ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 43) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to facilitate the crossing of railroads by telephone and telegraph wires and water mains. Those who have had anything to do with carrying telephones or telegraph wires or water mains across railways have experienced great difficulty in accomplishing their object without going before the Board of Railway Commissioners, with the result that much time has been wasted. Another great objection to the law as it stands at present is that it imposes an enormous amount of unnecessary work on the Railway Commission. I find by the return I moved for a few days ago that during the last two and a half years some fifteen hundred cases have been sent to that board, and in every one of these cases the commission has granted the permission desired, proving beyond a doubt that there was no reason in any of these cases why the permission should not have been granted by the railway companies without putting the parties to the trouble of going before the Railway Commission. The difficulty and expense of going before the Railway Commission is not by any means small, particularly to those with small telephone lines. These are very numerous in every part of the Dominion of Canada. I speak more particularly of the province of Ontario, where telephone lines

are being established everywhere. Business men, doctors and others find it to their advantage to run out telephone lines to accommodate their customers and increase their business. A small telephone corporation wishing to carry its line across a railroad does not anticipate the opposition which it usually encounters from the railway company; so it goes ahead and puts up its poles, and when it comes to the railway, it asks permission of the agent to cross the track. Then it is told that if it pays $5 for each crossing it will be allowed to string its wires, but if it will not do so, it will have to go to the Railway Commission. In my county there is one little line that crosses a railway four times and for this the railway company demanded $20. The telephone company went before the commission. It happened that the Railway Commissioners at that time were on their holidays, to which being a hard worked body, they were justly entitled, and the result was that nothing was done, and that small corporation was held up for six weeks until the Railway Commission met. After the commission met, objections were raised by the railway company, notwithstanding the fact that they had been willing to allow the telephone corporation to cross their tracks by paying $5 for each crossing, and the case was held over for three weeks longer. When the board met, they gave the permission, as they have done in every case. As telephones and telegraphs are increasing throughout the country, the demands on the Railway Commission will correspondingly increase. To my mind this is entirely unnecessary, and my Bill provides that parties desiring to string wires across railways may do so on giving notice to the agent of the railway company in the locality, and if the railway company do not take action and notify the board within ten days thereafter, the parties can go on and string their wires according to the rules and regulations laid down by the Railway Commission. Water mains occupy a little different position. The Bill provides that if a party or corporation desires to carry a water main across a railway, they must not only give ten days notice, but must pay an engineer not to exceed $3 a day. I think the Bill is in the interest of the public at large. I will explain its provisions more fully when I move the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Labour for 1906-7.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I beg to lay on the table of the House copies of two letters from the Deputy Minister of Justice to the Controller of the Northwest Mounted Police with reference to the observance of the Sunday law in the Yukon Territory. These letters were referred to in an answer which I gave on Thursday last to a question put by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I promised to have them brought down.

QUESTIONS.

ROYAL PROVINCIAL COMMISSION *RE* BELGIAN SYNDICATE.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked:

Does section 33 of chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes of Canada apply to the Honourable Judges of the Superior court of the province of Quebec, Sir François Langelier, acting chief justice, and Charbonneau, puisne judge, at present employed by the provincial government of that province to inquire, as members of a Royal Provincial Commission, into certain accusations brought against that government and regarding the administration of that government in certain transactions with a Belgian syndicate, the object of which inquiry is to make a report, without judgment, to the government of the province of Quebec?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I take the question to be whether the judges named in it are or are not within the prohibition of the section of the statute referred to. Answering it in that view, I have to say: The question whether or not any legislative enactment applies to some given set of circumstances, or whether such circumstances do, or do not, fall within the meaning of such enactment—is one in regard to which every one must form his opinion for himself, but I have no objection to expressing my own opinion that where a judge undertakes any work of judicial character under Royal Commission issued to him, such work thereupon becomes a part of his judicial duties within the meaning of that phrase as used in the section of the statue referred to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, QUEBEC.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked:

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware that the number of judges in the province of Quebec is not sufficient for the administration of justice?
2. If so, does the government intend appointing more judges?
3. Has the Minister of Justice received any complaints in this regard, especially from the bar of the city of Quebec?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH Minister of Justice):

1. No.
2. The government has no power to make such appointments until the necessary legislation in that behalf has been passed.
3. Representations on the subject have been made on behalf of the bar of the district.

GOVERNMENT LANDS, ALBERTA.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. How many acres of odd numbered sections in the province of Alberta are there still in the hands of the government?
2. How many acres of even numbered sections in the province of Alberta are there still in the hands of the government?
3. How many acres of coal lands is it estimated the government has possession of in the province of Alberta?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Estimated at 56,000,000 acres.
2. Estimated at 62,000,000 acres.
3. From information at present available an estimate cannot be given of the area of coal lands in the province of Alberta in the possession of the government. Coal has been discovered in many parts of the province, but in the large majority of cases the development of these several discoveries has not yet been sufficient upon which to base an estimate as to the extent of the coal measures. In addition to this more than one half of the province lies north of Edmonton, and as no great demand for coal in this northern part of the province has yet arisen, very little prospecting has been carried on. New discoveries of coal in the southern portion of the province are still being made, and while it is known that the coal measures of the province are of very great extent, no estimate has been attempted as to the number of acres of such lands in the possession of the crown.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS FOR NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to appoint agents to encourage immigration to the province of New Brunswick from Great Britain and Ireland or any portion of continental Europe?
2. If so, who have been named for such appointments, and at what remuneration?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The subject of appointing agents to encourage immigration to the province of New Brunswick from Great Britain and Ireland is under consideration.

FREIGHT ON STEAMERS BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. What was the total quantity of freight carried on the winter steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the past two seasons, 1905-6 and 1906-7?
2. What amount of freight was delayed in transit for those two seasons?
3. What is the freight rate on the different classes of goods carried?
4. What was the amount received for freight during the two seasons?
5. What was the amount received for passengers and number carried?
6. How many days did the steamers fail to cross in each of those years?
7. What was the amount of damages paid to shippers for delay of goods in transit

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Better let that stand as notice of motion for a return.

84TH ST. HYACINTHE REGIMENT.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount of pay due the 84th St. Hyacinthe Regiment by the government on account of its annual drill exercises?
2. When was the account or statement of amount so due to the said 84th Regiment sent to the government?
3. Why has the amount so due not been paid?
4. When will said amount be paid?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1 and 2. Not known, as pay sheets have not yet been received at headquarters.

3. The delay is due to the fact that the regiment has not carried out musketry practice and accounts have not been adjusted as to 'efficiency pay.'

4. As soon as the amount due for 'efficiency' pay has been ascertained ; in the meantime $1,500 has been advanced on account.

FRENCH TREATY AND GERMAN SURTAX.

Mr. AMES asked :

How will the coming into force of the new French Treaty affect Canada's position in respect to the surtax upon goods imported from Germany?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It will have no effect upon such surtax.

FRENCH TREATY—PREFERENTIAL INTERMEDIATE AND FRENCH MINIMUM TARIFF.

Mr. AMES asked :

What are the countries designated by the words contained in Article VIII. of the new French Treaty, viz.: (a) 'or from a port of a territory enjoying the preferential or intermediate tariff;' and (b) 'or from a port or country enjoying the French minimum tariff'?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

(a) No country at present enjoys the benefit of the intermediate tariff.

The countries to which the preferential tariff applies are contained in the customs tariff of 1907.

(b) The countries enjoying the French minimum tariff are :

Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canary Islands Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, Ottoman Empire (including Turkey in

Asia), Ecuador, Switzerland, Spain, Venezuela, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg (Grand Dutchy of), Morocco, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Tripoli (Regency of), Paraguay, Persia, Spanish Possessions on the coast of Morocco, Argentine Republic, Dominican Republic, Roumania, Russia, Servia, Sweden and Norway, Uruguay.

Those enjoying the French minimum tariff on certain articles only are:

Danish West Indies, Brazil, Congo Free State, Costa Rica, Hayti, Zanzibar, Corea, Straits Settlements, Federated Malay States, Ethiopia, Hong-Kong Colony, Republic of Liberia, Muscat, Siam, English Protectorates—East Africa, Centre Africa, Uganda, United States of America, Seychelles Islands, India, British and Allied Native States, (Travancore, Cochin, Sochin, Janjira, Cambay, Cutch, Baroda, Jungahad, Navnagar, Bhavnagar, Parbander, Morvi, Jafrabad), Island of Ceylon, Republic of Honduras, Jamaica, Netherland Colonies Nicaragua, Canada, China, Porto Rico, Salvador.

This information has necesarily to be obtained from other sources and I would not like to guarantee it too exactly.

FRENCH TREATY—FAVOURED NATION TREATMENT.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. So soon as the French treaty of 1907 shall have been brought into force, what other foreign powers, by reason of a treaty with Great Britain, will become entitled to like advantages with respect of their commerce with Canada?

2. Will the reduced customs rate upon imports from Canada to such other foreign countries, and upon exports from Canada to such other foreign countries, be dependent upon conformity to direct shipment conditions such as are described in Article VIII, of the new French treaty?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. This portion of the question will be answered with question No. 17.

2. The advantages to France of any tariff reductions under the convention are contingent upon the direct shipment conditions of Aricle VIII. thereof.

Advantages of the treaty reductions on imports into Canada from any other country by virtue of favoured nation provisions would similarly be contingent upon the like conditions, as such countries could claim no greater privileges than are granted to France.

With regard to the exports from Canada to the favoured nation countries, Canada is entitled in such countries to the best treatment that is accorded to any country. The French treaty does not affect that situation.

FRENCH TREATY—IMPORTS VIA UNITED STATES.

Mr. AMES asked:

Would goods, coming from France to Canada via a United States port, put on a through bill of lading, and vice versa, be excluded from the benefit of the reduced tariff under Article VIII, of the French Treaty?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

France would not have the right to claim the reduced rates provided in the convention on goods sent into Canada via United States port unless Canada should extend to the United States the benefit of the intermediate tariff.

The treaty of 1893 provided that Canadian goods should not receive the benefit of the reduced rates of duties unless sent by direct shipment from Canada to France. This rule is continued in the new treaty.

FAVOURED NATION TREATMENT.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What conventions or agreements respecting the commercial relations between Canada and other countries, exclusive of Great Britain or the British possessions, are at present in force?

2. When were these several agreements concluded?

3. Who were, in each instance, the plenipotentiaries authorized to represent Canada in the negotiations?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1, 2, 3. The only countries entitled to favoured nation treatment by reason of treaties which have been approved by the parliament of Canada are France, by the treaty of 6th February, 1893, and Japan, by the treaty of 31st January, 1906. Other countries entitled to favoured nation treatment in Canada have become so entitled by virtue of old treaties between those countries and the government of the United Kingdom. These treaties vary in their terms, and difficulties sometimes arise in determining whether in every case they are now applicable to Canada. As to several of the countries, there are debatable questions which are now the subject of consideration. The following countries, however, are unquestionably entitled to favoured nation treatment and will therefore receive the benefit of the concessions to be granted to France:—

Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Columbia, Denmark, Japan, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Venezuela.

As to some other countries a further statement may be necessary at a later date.

PAY OF 62ND ST. JOHN FUSILIERS.

Mr. DANIEL asked:

1. Have the 62nd St. John Fusiliers received their pay since last August? If not, why not?

2. Had they completed their drill and been duly inspected in August last?

3. Are any other corps of the active militia in the same position with regard to pay as

the 62nd St. John Fusiliers? If so, what corps?

4. If not already paid, when will the 62nd St. John Fusiliers receive their pay for their last annual drill?

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

1. Cheque was forwarded on December 13, and has been since paid.
2. Yes.
3. Yes; nearly all city corps.
4. Covered by reply to question No. 1.

GAME PRESERVE—BUFFALO FROM MONTANA.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked:

1. What is the area of park in townships 53 and 54, ranges 19 and 20, west of the fourth meridian, set aside for a game preserve?
2. Is the game preserve fenced? If so, was it constructed by contract or otherwise?
3. If tenders were called for, who tendered, and what was amount of each tender?
4. What duty has F. A. Walker, M.P.P. for Victoria, Alberta, performed in connection with the park, or the herd of buffalo, and what pay has he received?
5. How many buffalo did the government purchase?
6. What did they cost in Montana, and how much was paid in freight?
7. How many buffalo are now in the game preserve, how many are at large, and are they in good condition?
8. Who is game warden, what is his salary, and does he reside on the game preserve?
9. Were tenders called for hay? If so, how much per ton was paid for it?
10. What is the total cost of the buffalo to date?
11. Is the park under Dominion or provincial control?
12. Has the provincial government of Alberta paid for fencing the park?
13. Did Mr. Hackett, Dominion government naturalist, report on the condition of the buffalo?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Sixteen square miles.
2. Yes; by contract.
3. Tenders were called for and the following were received:—

For contract A, clearing lines for roadway—

Geo. A. Cranston, Fort Saskatchewan	$ 700.00
Wm. A. D. Lees, Fort Saskatchewan	1,200.00

For contract B, furnishing and setting posts—

Wm. A. D. Lees, Fort Saskatchewan	7,000.00

For contract C, wire fencing and gates—

Wm. A. D. Lees, Fort Saskatchewan	6,800.00
Locked Wire Fence Co., Ltd., London, Ont.	9,300.00
McGregor Banwell Fence Co., Ltd., Walkerville, Ont.	9,355.10
J. M. Chisholm, Winnipeg, Man.	14,732.00

Besides the above, Messrs. Ross & Ross, of Winnipeg, tendered for the whole work at $20,341.00.

4. Mr. F. A. Walker, M.L.A., superintended the unloading of buffalo at Lamont and their transference into the park. He has received no pay.
5. The whole herd, which according to a recent estimate, will number about 650.
6. Two hundred dollars per head and forty-five dollars per head per expenses of corralling, loading, transportation, etc.
7. There are 395 buffalo in the park. One of them was reported to be at large. They are in good condition.
8. E. Simmons, salary $1,500 per annum. He stays on the reserve.
9. Yes; $9.90 and $10.40.
10. $100,450 as follows:—Purchase price of 410 head at $200, $82,000; expenses of corralling, loading, transportation, etc., on 410 head at $45, $18,450.
11. Under Dominion control.
12. No.
13. No.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—MURRAY HARBOUR AND TIGNISH SECTIONS.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. What is the freight and passenger earnings of the Belfast and Murray Harbour section of the Prince Edward Island Railway for the year ending March 31, 1907, and the same information respecting the Souris and Tignish sections of the same road?
2. What is the working expenses of each of those three sections for the same period?
3. If the freight and passenger traffic on the Murray Harbour section is as favourable as the Tignish and Souris sections, why is the former discriminated against by giving only one train a day?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The accounts of the Prince Edward Island Railway both for the expenditure and the earnings are kept as a whole and not for separate parts of the line. No separate account is kept for the Murray Harbour branch or Tignish sections, and therefore it is impossible to give the information asked for.
2. Answered by number one.
3. Answered by number one.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Before you leave the order of questions, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement bearing on the French treaty. I intimated to the House that I would probably bring down some papers with relation to this matter before the holidays. I had hoped that they would be ready to-day or to-morrow. I find, however, that there will be delay in bringing them down as

they are somewhat difficult to prepare owing to the mass of figures. Should I not be able to bring them down to-day, they will be left in the distribution office, and I would suggest that hon. members who desire to see them in the holidays should leave directions so that the papers may be forwarded. I expect to have them down before the end of the week, and they will be sent direct to the distribution office.

TIMBER BERTHS.

On the order :

For a return showing, in respect of timber berths Nos. 1220 to 1226, 1238 and 1272, all bonuses, rentals or dues paid to date by the lessees or other assigns to the government, together with a copy of all applications, correspondence, reports, advertisements, tenders, leases, transfers or memoranda of any description in connection therewith, and the production of the original applications and tenders.—Mr. Lake.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Stand.

Mr. LAKE. The minister has twice asked this to stand without stating any reason. It is of importance that the documents referred to in this resolution should be brought down as early as possible. The motion was put on the paper on December 2nd. Might I ask the minister if he is not ready to have it moved now?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LAKE. If the delay is deemed necessary merely because of the form of the resolution, that might be arranged for, with the permission of the House, if the minister will allow the motion to go on. Am I right in supposing that it is the production of the original documents in this particular case which is the difficulty in the minister's mind?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. I consider the production of these original documents of great importance, but still I would be willing to allow the concluding words of the resolution calling for the original documents to be struck out for the present, but with the understanding that a resolution would be moved later asking for the original documents covered by this and the two next succeeding motions. As to these original documents, I may say that application was made to the minister by a member of this House for permission to examine them, and it was at his own suggestion, in refusing that application, that these words were included in this resolution. With the permission of the House, I would move that this resolution be passed striking out the final words 'and the production of the original applications and tenders.'

Motion as amended agreed to.

On the order.

For a return showing, in respect of timber berths Nos. 1048, 1049, 1122 and 1168, all bonuses, rentals or dues paid to date by the lessees or other assigns to the government, together with a copy of all applications, correspondence, reports, advertisements, tenders, leases, transfers and memoranda of any description in connection therewith, and the production of the original applications and tenders.—Mr. Boyce.

Mr. BOYCE. Perhaps the minister (Mr. Oliver) would have no objection to this order also being moved, with same amendment as that proposed in the other.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection if the motion is amended as suggested.

Motion as amended agreed to.

On the order :

For a return showing, in respect of timber berths Nos. 1031, 1118, 1119, 1097 and 1098, all bonuses, rentals or dues paid to date by the lessees or other assigns to the government, together with a copy of all applications, correspondence, reports, advertisements, tenders, leases, transfers or memoranda of any description in connection therewith, and the production of the original applications and tenders.—Mr. White.

Mr. WHITE. If I might be permitted to move this motion with the same amendment, I would do so.

Motion as amended agreed to.

CRUISE OF THE 'NEPTUNE' IN HUDSON BAY.

On the order :

For a copy of the report of superintendent J. D. Moodie, on service in Hudson bay for steamer 'Neptune' in 1903-4.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I may observe that we have that report already in the Sessional Papers, No. 28 of 1905.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

BRANCH RAILWAY P.E.I.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN moved :

For copy of all surveys, correspondence, petitions, agreements, reports, memoranda and any other information respecting the construction of a branch railway to Stanley Bridge and New London, P.E.I.

Hon. GEO. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The report of the Marine Department of April 30, 1906, covers all that information. It is fyled in the Sessional Papers of the House of Commons, No. 122, 1906.

Motion dropped.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

On the order :

For a return showing: 1. In respect of each category mentioned in schedule A of the new French treaty (Canadian products enjoying the benefit of the minimum tariff when going into France), (a) the general and the minimum French tariff expressed in terms equivalent to those employed in the Canadian customs tariff, together with the calculated percentage reduction of the latter on the former; (b) the value of the exports to France and her colonies in each class of goods enumerated in said schedule A for the last five years, and the yearly average value covering the same period.

2. In respect of each category mentioned in schedules B and C (French products enjoying (b) the benefit of the intermediate tariff, or (c) of a special tariff when coming into Canada), (a) the general and the intermediate rate under the Canadian tariff, upon each class, together with the calculated percentage reduction of the latter on the former; (b) the value of the imports, from France and her colonies to Canada in respect of each class of goods enumerated in schedules B and C for the last five years, and the yearly average value covering the same period.

3. List of items, if any, in schedules B and C upon which there is a *surtaxe d'entrepôt*, and the rate of said tax reduced to familiar Canadian terms.

4. A statement, in category, of Canada's export and import trade, for the twelve months ending June 30, 1907, with those countries, to which, under the most-favoured-nation arrangement, the privileges of the new French treaty will require to be also granted.—Mr. Ames.

Mr. AMES. I understood from the minister to-day that it was his intention, during the recess to lay a return on the table of the House, and send copies of the same to the members, which would contain a considerable part of the information mentioned here. If what I have asked for here is to be covered by what the minister intends to send us, there is no necessity for me keeping this motion on the paper, and I am willing to withdraw it, with the understanding that the minister will give consideration to what is asked for in this resolution when he brings down the information he has promised.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Every new request for information to be included in these papers delays the completion of the papers. We have not had time to give much attention to this particular motion. I think it includes a good many things that we are not in a position to produce at all. We can produce any information we have in the departments, but we cannot always produce information which has to be obtained from abroad. If the hon. gentleman will allow the motion to stand in the interim, I will endeavour to meet his wishes.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. PATERSON. With regard to clause 4 of the hon. gentleman's motion, if he will make it for nine months, ending March 31, 1907, instead of twelve months, ending June 30, I could give him that information at once. Otherwise it will take some time to get the information he asks for.

Mr. AMES. Then I ask leave to amend the fourth clause, and ask for a statement ending March 31, 1907.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the information to be brought down will cover at least some portion of this clause. Then, if the hon. gentleman feels it necessary to ask for something further we will consider it.

Mr. AMES. I will suggest that the Minister of Customs send his information to the Finance Minister.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of the report of the Honourable Justice James Henry Madden, appointed by order in council May 15, 1907, to investigate and report upon the matter of arrears for rentals on certain leases at Dunnville, Welland canal feeder.—Mr. Lalor.

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, contracts, papers and reports in connection with the employment of certain experts to prepare a system of accounting and book-keeping in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing, in respect of timber berths Nos. 1050, 1265, 1267, 1274 and 1275, all bonuses, rentals or dues paid to date by the lessees or other assigns to the government, together with a copy of all applications, correspondence, reports, advertisements, tenders, lessees, transfers or memoranda of any description in connection therewith—Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of all papers, representations, memorials and correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of Manitoba *re* the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Schaffner.

For a return showing the number of post offices receiving daily, tri-weekly, semi-weekly, and weekly mails, in each county of the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the total postal revenue and expenditure in each of said counties.—Mr. Crocket.

For a return showing, in respect of all timber berths at present under license or authorized to be licensed within the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories, (a) number or designation of each berth; (b) number of licenses for 1907-8; (c) area of berth in square miles; (d) name and address of present license holder; (e) name and address of original applicant, with date of his application; (f) date of issue from Ottawa of advertisement; (g) date fixed therein for opening tenders; (h) name and address of successful tenderer; (i) amount of bonus paid; (j) date when definite selection of blocks was completed and the returns of the survey filed with the Department of the Interior at Ottawa; (k) amount of dues col-

lected during the year ending April 30, 1907, in respect of each berth for ground rent, stumpage royalty, and the cost of fire guardian, &c., also the amounts, if any, unpaid and overdue at the termination of said year; (l) whether license was issued according to order in council of April 14, 1903, or of July 23, 1906; (m) in case of berths upon which during the year 1906-7 no timber was cut, whether notification has been served on license holder to operate a saw-mill, and the date of such notice.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

For a return showing what sums have been voted or expended for the dredging of the river bottom between Charlemagne and Terrebonne; since when the dredging has been going on there; what sums have been voted or expended for wharfs at Terrebonne and at St. François de Sales; and who obtained the contracts.—Mr Bergeron.

For a return showing what sums have been expended or voted for the dredging of the Rivière à Graisse at Rigaud; to whom the contracts were given; and what sums have been voted or paid out for dredging Dorion bay, Vaudreuil station.—Mr. Bergeron.

For a return showing what changes, if any, have been made in the National Transcontinental Railway Commission's engineering staff during the current calendar year.—Mr. Macdonell.

For a return showing the total amount paid by this government each year, during the past five years towards mail subsidies to steamships; the names of the countries served, the names of steamers and contractors, and the steamship subventions,—Mr. Armstrong.

For a return showing what sums of money were paid by the government during the years 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, for advertising printing, or for any other purpose, or any other account whatever, to the 'Sault Express,' a newspaper published at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, or to any person, firm or company for, or in respect of, any work done by said newspaper for the government or any department thereof; for what purposes such moneys were paid, and by what departments, respectively.—Mr. Boyce.

1. For a return showing what contracts for dredging in the St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia River, Port Arthur Harbour, Fort William Harbour, Thunder Bay and Mission River, have been let during the years 1905, 1906 and 1907.

2. The work in each case let by tender, who the tenderers were in each case, the amount of each tender, and to whom the contracts were awarded respectively.

3. The nature and extent of the work in each case, and at what prices it was let.

4. What bonds were taken to secure the due performance of the work and the securities in each case.

5. If such security was furnished by deposit of marked cheques, whose cheque in each case was deposited, the amounts and on what banks given.

6. All such cheques still held by the government.—Mr. Boyce.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ontario) moved:

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, documents and papers, during the present year, relating to the immigration of Japanese into Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in connection with this motion which stands in my name. The subject has been before the country for some three or four months. It has been before the House during the three weeks of the present session and up to the present time we have had very little information indeed from the government in regard to their attitude with respect to this question. We have from the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a great deal of discussion of some other matters that perhaps were not as relative to the debate upon the address as this is; for example, a discussion of the Halifax platform, as it is called, or the policy of the Conservative party, as set forth in a speech which I delivered at Halifax on the 20th day of August last. The discussion of that policy did not seem to be very relevant to a debate upon the speech from the Throne, but I have very great satisfaction indeed in realizing that the Prime Minister thought it better to devote attention to my speech than to the speech of His Excellency; and I may say to the right hon. gentlemen that before the session closes I venture to think that he will get all the discussion desirable with respect to the various planks of that platform which occupied to so great an extent his remarks upon that occasion.

The attitude of the government in regard to this question is as little known to the people and parliament of this country as it was when this session opened. It does seem a remarkable circumstance that when the subject was presented two days ago to this House, when five hon. members from British Columbia made speeches in regard to it—exhaustive speeches, interesting and some of them instructive,—not one single member of this government saw fit to say one single word in connection with that great question or in connection with the subject of the resolution which was proposed by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith). It was either a gallery play, arranged beforehand, or else these gentlemen must consider that the government treated them and the motion with the utmost possible contempt, because I observed that from time to time there was a pause when one of these gentlemen would take his seat, evidently in the expectation that some member of the government would feel himself constrained to give some information to the House with regard to the attitude of the government. Yet, although

these five gentlemen arose, and, one after the other delivered important speeches upon a great subject, that subject was regarded of such trifling importance by the government, that, as I have already said, not one single word was uttered in regard to it. Well, that is a matter that has to be settled between the government and these hon. gentlemen, and afterwards, I suppose, between these hon. gentlemen and their constituents.

I may be permitted, however, on this occasion, to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister what was the nature of the assurances which were alluded to in the debate, not imparted to this parliament but imparted to the members from the province of British Columbia. It seems to me a rather new phase of constitutional government that when a great treaty like this comes up for discussion in parliament there is information afforded by the government to their own followers, or to certain representatives from one province, but which is not afforded to this House, and I venture to think that it is high time that the government should give to parliament as a whole and to the country as well the information that is said by one of the hon. gentlemen who spoke, the day before yesterday, to have been received by the members from British Columbia from the government on that occasion.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I think he refers to myself. I did make a statement to the effect that assurances were given inside the House and outside the House, but I did not say that these assurances were confined to the members of British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That removes it, I suppose, this one step farther that the information was given to the caucus, was given to all the members on the other side of the House and was denied to us.

Mr. DUNCAS ROSS. No, if the hon. gentleman will allow me, I think the information was given possibly to the hon. leader of the opposition and was given some two years or one year before the treaty was ratified in a reply by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to a question from the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be a very plausible explanation if the hon. gentleman had not spoken of information given outside the House. I am aware that any information given inside this House is free to all, but I distinctly asked the question across the floor of the House and I got a very plain and distinct answer, and if it meant anything it meant that information had been afforded to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House which had not been afforded to parliament as a whole.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me again, because I do not want him to misunderstand me. Surely information imparted by the representatives of the Japanese government to this government is not information given inside this House but information given outside of this House. He has no seat on the floor of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, seriously expects the House to believe that that is what he desired us to understand by the answer which he gave to me across the floor of the House. Well, we would like to hear from the right hon. the Prime Minister in regard to that. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not object to as to what he has just stated and that he will allow us to say that we accept his assurances—not his assurances but his suggestions—in a parliamentary sense and exactly as he expects us to receive them. Now, there was one circumstance in connection with this subject, which, I think, has not been adverted to in this House at all, and that is the attitude of the party of which the right hon. gentleman is leader, as expressed in a recent convention in the province of British Columbia.

The right hon. gentleman has been very earnest in his deprecation of any appeals to passion or prejudice, but when asked to make good his statement that there had been on the part of any member of the Conservative party such an appeal, he came down in the final analysis to this statement: 'that because, the Chinese were a peace loving people, and had not a great army and a great navy, they might, in effect, be treated with contempt and indifference, but because Japan has a great army and a great navy and is a great power she must be treated in an entirely different way. I venture to think that is the fair inference from the statement the right hon. gentleman made to this House. He has been good enough to attack those who have suggested that his government should make good to parliament and to the people of Canada the assurance upon which that treaty was ratified or else it was in a position and is to-day in a position to ask for the abrogation of that treaty. The attitude of the right hon. gentleman seems remarkable in one who at all times has announced himself to be a great lover of peace. The right hon. gentleman over and over has proclaimed himself as the great apostle of peace, but now he declares that the Chinese nation which has been practising and preaching the doctrine of peace for a thousand years should be treated with a contempt and an indifference, to use his own words, which he would not venture to extend to a great military power like Japan. If I have misunderstood the right hon. gentleman let him make his position clear on that point, but what I have said seems to be the only meaning

which one can gather from the remarks he has vouchsafed to this House and to the country in reference to this question. The right hon. gentleman has declared it an unworthy suggestion that this treaty might be abrogated. If the understanding upon which it is supposed to have been made does not hold good, is the suggestion improper? In that connection I would say to the right hon. gentleman that he and his Minister of Finance as well, have seen fit to reproach me that the Halifax platform so called has not commended itself to certain members of the Conservative party. I would tell the Minister of Finance were he here, and I will say it in his absence that when he refers to the action of the Conservative club of Winnipeg, he might have remembered that at a banquet attended by 600 people which they tendered me in that city, the very last words they uttered were that I might be absolutely sure that the city of Winnipeg will send a good Conservative member to the House of Commons at the next election. And at the very next meeting of that association, a unanimous resolution of confidence in and approval of the platform which had been announced in Halifax was passed and forwarded to me. I think therefore that the right hon. gentleman and his friend the Minister of Finance might very well have occupied themselves with matters of graver public concern than to talk gossip of this kind.

But I have something a little more cogent than that for the digestion of my right hon. gentleman. The Liberals of British Columbia met on the 18th of November last to lay down the platform of the Liberal party in the province of British Columbia, and article 6 of that platform reads:

> That as the opinion of British Columbia generally is against the immigration of orientals and as the Liberal party of the Dominion has successfully excluded the Chinese, the party should adopt an immediate policy which will accomplish the same object against all orientals. And that in the opinion of this convention the Natal Act which has been effective in restriction of oriental immigration in other British countries, should be passed as a federal enactment, and any existing treaty which prevents the passage of the Natal Act should be abrogated at the earliest possible date.

Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will inform us to what extent his party in British Columbia and the policy of that party as laid down by the convention demand his sympathy or his reproach. And before he endeavours to set the houses of other people in order it would be well indeed that he should give a little attention to the policy of the Liberal Association in British Columbia, and inform the House and the country whether they are speaking with his knowledge or approval, and whether he is prepared to utter the words of reproach in respect to them which he has seen fit to utter against very much milder utterances by public men on the same question. I would like to say to the right hon. gentleman and to his Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that it is perhaps not too wise to go into the question of appeals to passion and prejudice, because some interesting illustrations might be given if need be. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was prompt to exercise his usual tactics when he was on the other side of the water this year. An interview with him, published in the Montreal 'Star' over the signature of their correspondent Windermere contains this interesting paragraph:

> What, Mr. Brodeur asks, can Mr. Borden mean when he declares the Conservatives will keep British Columbia for the great pioneer races, British and Canadian. Are not the French the pioneers in Canada; are they to be excluded by Mr. Borden's new national policy?

You can see the appeal and the intent of that language of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These are words which I trust will command the disapproval of the Prime Minister when he comes to speak in this parliament, although he has not been unwilling apparently to take full advantage of such appeals. I would refer him notably to the utterances of that organ in the city of Quebec, 'Le Soleil,' the direction of which was handed back to him by senator Choquette after the Prime Minister had seen fit to interfere in the municipal politics of the city of Quebec. When the right hon. gentleman was challenged with the control of that paper he said he did not control it, but up to the present time he has never seen fit to explain how it was that the direction of that paper could be handed back to him if it were not absolutely under his control every day of the week and every week of the year. Well, I want to tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that if he had waited a little to see the true report of what I said in British Columbia he would have found there was nothing to alarm him and nothing on account of which he could offer any such reproach to me as he did. What I said in British Columbia was this—and I am willing to repeat it here to-day—I said that above all commercial considerations, above all material considerations, above all considerations of trade and commerce there was one consideration which should be kept supreme, and that was that the great province of British Columbia must at all times in the future be inhabited and dominataed by the same great pioneering races which have peopled and developed the eastern provinces of this country. I intended to include in that not only men who come to us from the British Islands, but men of the great French race, which I cheerfully acknowledge to have been the first pioneer race of Canada. I intended to include also

men of German descent, who not only in my own native province of Nova Scotia, but also in the province of Ontario, have been among the most worthy pioneers of this country. So there was no need of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries attempting to raise this old cry, which has been repeated by 'Le Soleil' and 'Le Canada' day after day and week after week until I am tired of following and contradicting their utterances in regard to myself, which in every case of that character are absolutely unfounded and based on nothing except the imagination of the men who wrote the articles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us come to consider what the position of the government is in this regard. The right hon. gentleman was warned in 1900 by a man whom he has seen fit since to elevate to the judicial bench of British Columbia; I refer to Mr. Morrison, then a member of this House, from that province. I will not read the whole of the language which Mr. Morrison uttered on that occasion with respect to the undesirable character of Japanese immigration; I would not care to do so at the present time. He went very far indeed; he used language very strong and very cogent; but I may be permitted to quote just two or three lines to show that the Prime Minister at that time had the most ample warning with regard to this question, and disregarded that warning, and disregarded it knowingly. Mr. Morrison said:

In referring to the Japanese I may say that the objection economically to their existence in British Columbia and in Canada is even greater than the objection to the Chinamen. They are, as far as opposition with white labour is concerned, infinitely more objectionable than the Chinamen. They meet the white man at a greater number of points of competition. They live just as objectionably as the Chinese.

Then he went on to use stronger language than any that I have quoted, and a little further he declared, basing his statement upon quotations from British Columbia papers:

Japanese are still pouring in here. The steamer 'Riojun Maru' brought 800, and the big liner 'Goodwin,' 1,100. The steamer 'Milos' brought eighty more, and the 'Braemer,' at the end of this week will bring more than 700.

What was the attitude of Mr. Morrison at that time? He desired to amend the Immigration Act by adding to it provisions which were essentially the same as those which were to be found in the Natal Act on this subject. The Prime Minister declined to accede to Mr. Morrison's request He asked that the amendment should be withdrawn, and it was withdrawn, and he used on that occasion language to which I have already drawn attention both in this House and before this session opened; language in which he declared that the matter was already in a sufficiently satisfactory condition, that the Japanese had taken the matter into their own hands, that they permitted no emigration from their country into Canada, especially of the labouring class, and that therefore the amendment proposed by Mr. Morrison was entirely unnecessary and entirely undesirable. The right hon. gentleman was warned again in 1903 by his commission, which said exactly the same thing as Mr. Morrison, which declared that, as far as competition with white labour was concerned, the Japanese were more dangerous than the Chinese, and that some satisfactory solution of their proposed immigration should be brought about. The government were warned by myself in 1903, when I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, on his return from Japan, as to what effect the closer relations between Canada and Japan might have on immigration, and what effect the immigration might have on the status of labouring men in British Columbia, and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture made reply in language which I have already quoted, and to which I shall take the opportunity of referring again. He said:

The government there, in accordance with negotiations with our government, issued orders, I think about two years ago, that for the future no permit should be given to the Japanese except the classes I have mentioned, to come to Canada, and that has been strictly maintained to the present time. I had the assurance of the government there, personally and in writing, that this policy would be maintained.

Well, from that time up to the present, notwithstanding all the discussion in this country on this question, the government has not seen fit to lay on the Table of the House the written assurance which the Minister of Agriculture obtained from the government of Japan. Not only that, but the Prime Minister has not seen fit to allude to it in his reply to one of the labour organizations of the country which called upon him to take steps for the abrogation of that treaty; because, in replying to the Trades and Labour Congress in the month of September last, the right hon. gentleman used this language:

I have given due consideration to your request that immediate steps be taken to terminate the treaty with Japan. I would observe that this treaty, when brought into existence some fifteen years ago, did not apply to Canada, and that some two years ago, in view of affording Canadian producers with an opportunity of taking their share of the growing Japanese trade, the Canadian government became a party to this treaty, and that it was unanimously ratified by the Canadian parliament.

The treaty has proved of great advantage, and our trade with Japan under it has considerably increased. You base your appeal for the denunciation of the treaty on the alle-

gation that a crisis has arisen in British Columbia by reason of the unprecedented influx of Japanese. Whilst it is true that most regrettable incidents have lately occurred in Vancouver, which have been rendered public, there seems reason to doubt that the cause was the influx of Japanese, as I am in possession of a telegram from the mayor of Vancouver, which has been rendered public, which expressly avers that the disturbances were directed against Asiatics, generally, rather than against Japanese. Under such circumstances any precipitate action might be regrettable, and before committing themselves to such a course the government think that they should carefully inquire into the causes which in the recent past have caused a greater influx to our shores than previously of oriental people.

Not one single word in that answer with reference to the assurances that had been extended to this government by the government of Japan. These assurances, or some of them, have been in writing. The Minister of Agriculture obviously does not allude to those which have been alluded to by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross), but to those which were given to him in Japan during his visit there. I understood the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo to refer to distinct assurances which were gven at Ottawa by the Consul General of Japan, now resident in this city. So in respect of neither one nor the other of these assurances have we had from the government up to the present time any information.

Now, it seems to me that we are entitled to some statement from the government as to their position in this matter. My. hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) spoke upon the subject in September last. As reported in the Victoria 'Colonist,' he said this :

> Provincial Acts aimed at their exclusion, have been disallowed by Ottawa at the request of the Imperial government, and it is utterly useless, except as an appeal to demagogy to continue to enact such legislation.

My hon. friend does not seem to have given this question much study or he would have found over and over again in the records of this parliament evidence contradictory of what he said. He would have found that during the session of 1905 the answer of his government, delivered twice, was as follows :—

> These Acts have been disallowed for the reason that they were ultra vires and not in accord with Dominion policy.

There was not a word about imperial policy. I remember well a discussion, in which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the then Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick) participated. The attitude of the government then was distinct. The disallowal was not based upon imperial policy but altogether on Dominion policy. In the "Hansard' of 1905, pages 6475 and 189, the answer of the government is given twice in the terms I have just now quoted. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) does not seem to be very well acquainted with the history of this subject upon which he undertook to enlighten the people of British Columbia.

Further than that there are the well known despatches of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, despatches which were quoted by the Hon. David Mills, then Minister of Justice. These despatches wer sent on the 23rd March, 1899, and the 20th July, 1898, and both are to be found in the records of parliament. I shall read one and the second is exactly similar. This is a despatch from the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, to His Excellency the Governor General :

> Downing St., July 20, 1898.
>
> I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatches of numbers and dates noted in the margin, in which you forwarded copies of various communications received by you from the Japanese consul for Canada respecting the anti-Japanese legislation recently passed by the legislature of British Columbia. I shall be glad if you will lose no time in transmitting in accordance with the request contained in my telegram of June 18, copies of the Acts to which M. Shimizu takes exception, together with the observation of your ministers thereon.
>
> In the meantime I have to request that you will impress upon your ministers that restrictive legislation of the type of which the legislation in question appears to be, is extremely repugnant to the sentiments of the people and government of Japan, and you should not fail to impress upon them the importance, if there is any real prospect of a large influx of Japanese labourers into Canada, of dealing with it by legislation of the Dominion parliament on the lines of the accompanying Natal Act, which is likely to be generally adopted in Australia.

The telegram of 23rd March, 1899, repeats in exactly similar language the decision contained in the despatch I have just read. So that my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue does not seem to be very well acquainted with the history of this question.

The position of this government, when it asked parliament to ratify this treaty, was as follows. The First Minister stated in 1900 that there was an understanding with Japan by which the emigration from that country into Canada should be so restricted that it could not possibly occasion any difficulty or inconvenience. Dealing with the question of Chinese immigration in 1903, he took the same ground, and his Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) during the same year expressly assured the House that there was a written understanding between this government and the government of Japan upon which this country could rely and under

which no emigration of any account would go from Japan to Canada. In 1907, when this treaty came up for ratification, the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took exactly the same position. That was accepted by the House as a substitute for the control of immigration which is provided for by the treaty between the United States and Japan, but which is not provided for by the treaty between Canada and Japan.

The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) brought to the attention of the House a couple of days ago the article of the American treaty to which I have just referred. So far as the right to enter, travel and reside is concerned, that treaty is in practicaly the same words as the treaty negotiated between the United Kingdom and Japan and to which this country has become a party by the treaty of 1906. But the United States treaty contains this saving clause :

> It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding articles do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of labourers, police and public security, which are in force or which may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries.

We have not got that in our treaty. Perhaps is might have been more prudent to have it, but it would not have been necessary if the assurances conveyed to the House by the First Minister and his colleagues had proved effective. They have not proved effective. 10,000 Japanese have come into British Columbia within a little over a year. The white population of that province is not a large one, and in the face of this enormous influx, the government has been utterly helpless. It has not even referred to these assurances, when questioned by the great labour interests of the country. It has simply made reply that the subject should not be dealt with in a precipitate manner and that some further inquiries should be made. But if these assurances were effective, as the Prime Minister led us to believe they would be, they should have been put forward in the first instance, the House should have been informed of them as soon as parliament assembled, and the government should have stated definitely then, exactly what those assurances were, in what language they were couched, and should have given reasonable explanation to the House as to the causes of the disregard of those assurances. The question seems to be at present an economic one. The standards of life of labouring men in Canada are entirely different from those of the labourer in China and Japan. That has been dealt with fully by the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia, and if I were to repeat the language which some of these gentlemen have used, my right hon. friend would be the first to rise and accuse me of appealing to passion and prejudice. I shall not repeat their language but simply say that the question is an economical one. They are different standards of life. We cannot change, and we do not seek to change, those good standards of life which prevail among the labouring men of Canada. If we desired any change at all, it should be in the direction of improving these standards and with those even as they are at present, it is absolutely impossible for white labour in British Columbia to compete with the labour from China and Japan.

I do not believe that it is possible for white labour, under present conditions to stand that competition in the province of British Columbia. But, though this is, at present, merely an economic question, it may develop into a more serious question. And it is for that reason that I think we should have the policy of the government announced to parliament in clear and unmistakable terms. We should know what is the exact object of the mission of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to Japan. We should know with what success that mission has been attended. We should know whether or not the newspaper reports that that mission has practically come to a conclusion are correct, and we would particularly like to know whether or not the despatch in to-day's newspapers is correct stating, that no change will be made in the treaty, and no written assurance given, but that the oral assurance already given, will be repeated. Is that the whole outcome of the mission of the Postmaster General to Japan? If so, it does not seem to me that it improves the situation to any great extent. We have had oral assurance, we have had written assurance twice repeated and, if, as an outcome of the Postmaster General's mission to Japan, we have simply the oral assurance repeated, I do not see how the situation is materially improved. For these reasons, I thought it desirable to say a few words on this subject, in the hope that the Prime Minister might be induced to break his silence on this question, to treat the question as a serious one, and to give the House and the country some intimation of the policy of the government in regard to it.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden), if I correctly interpret it, deprived of its warmth, and of the rhetorical flourishes with which it was embellished, is simply a request to have an authoritative statement of the position of the government on this question. It seems to me that he cannot be in doubt as to the position of the government in the matter. It never was the intention to keep himself, or anybody else, in doubt as to that policy, and

I have always been under the impression that that policy has been expressed so that it could be understood by anybody who would set his mind to the understanding of it. But, if, notwithstanding the efforts made, the hon. gentleman is still in doubt, he is quite entitled to have a full answer and that I will endeavour to give him.

I preface what I have to say with the remark that the question is one of very great moment, and one that ought to be treated with as much calmness as possible. I may say at once, in answer to the observation which my hon. friend made with regard to the treatment of Japanese immigration and Chinese immigration into this country, that, for many years past—in fact, ever since we assumed office—we have always made a clear distinction between Chinese immigration and Japanese immigration. For good or ill—I believe for good and not for ill—we have taken the position that Japanese immigration and Chinese immigration could not be treated in the same manner. I know that, so far as British Columbia is concerned, opinion is the same with regard to the two, and that the feeling is not sympathetic for either. But I have taken the position more than once on the floor of this House, and in the presence of my hon. friends from British Columbia, that we could not apply to Japanese immigration the same treatment that we have applied to Chinese immigration. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is aware of that. He knows the circumstances and has referred to them. He referred to them for one purpose alone, and not so as to cover all the ground. In 1900, Mr. Morrison, then a member of this House, spoke upon this question. My hon. friend is aware that I told him on that occasion that we had reason to suppose—we were not much informed upon the question, being new in office—that there were differences in the two classes of immigration, that coming from China and that coming from Japan, and that it would be our duty to inquire before adopting a policy with respect to them. We told him we intended to investigate the question. We did have the question investigated by a commission which reported to this House. Our action has been based upon the report of that commission. The commission reported that the people of British Columbia were hostile to both classes of immigration, but suggested that a different treatment might be introduced with regard to the Chinese and the Japanese. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) tried to make a little point between the government and their supporters by stating that information had been imparted to the members from British Columbia which had been withheld from the members of the House generally. My hon. friend's memory is singularly at fault on that point Had he referred to the speech delivered in this House only two days ago by my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) he would have found that that hon. gentleman stated that the action which was adopted by the government was based upon the report of the commission which investigated this question. I think I am not referring to a past debate in quoting this speech, as this is practically the same debate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) said:

> But I find in this report something very important, of which this House and the government ought to be reminded, and that is that during the sittings of that commission, the Japanese consul in Vancouver voluntarily proposed to the commission to use his influence in favour of the regulation of the Japanese influx into British Columbia. The commissioners reported that as the Japanese authorities had voluntarily consented to regulate the immigration of their people into Canada, it was important that this should be understood as a settlement of the question at any rate for that present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was referring to the statement by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) which he will find at p. 774 of 'Hansard.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had not the pleasure of hearing that speech, having been called away. But I heard the speech of my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) and, speaking under correction, I do not think there was any difference in this respect between that speech and the speech of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo. As I have stated, the basis of our operation was the report of the commission, to which I shall allude at greater length later on. My hon. friend stated that our action with regard to Chinese immigration and Japanese immigration was based upon the fact that China was a comparatively weak country, while Japan had a big fleet. That was not my statement but was the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman stated that we had a different way of treating Chinese immigration and Japanese immigration because China had no fleet while Japan had a big fleet, and that this was immoral. This was given by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) as the basis for our action. But I do not wish to be bound by the language of the hon. member for North Toronto. I think that if I interpret my own words, they will be better understood than if I leave them to be interpreted by that hon. gentleman. The basis of our treatment of Japan and China in this matter is not the condition of these nations as to naval strength, but the circumstances in which these nations stand at the present time. The report of the commission of investigation, as regards Chinese immigration, was as follows:—

> In reference to the representations made by the people and legislature of British Columbia, wherein it is alleged:

That the province is flooded with an undesirable class of people, non-assimilative and most detrimental to the wage-earning classes of the people of the province, and that this extensive immigration of orientals is also a menace to the health of the community; that there is probability of a great disturbance to the economic conditions in the province and of grave injury being caused to the working classes by the large influx of labourers from China, as the standard of living of the masses of the people in that country differs so widely from the standard prevailing in the province, thus enabling them to work for a much less wage; that it is in the interests of the empire that the Pacific province of the Dominion should be occupied by a large and thoroughly British population rather than by one in which the number of aliens would form a large proportion:

We find that these representations are substantially true and urgently call for a remedy.

We also find that the increase of the capitation tax from $50 to $100 is ineffective and inadequate. Your commissioners are of opinion that the further immigration of Chinese labourers into Canada ought to be prohibited.

That the most desirable and effective means of attaining this end is by treaty supported by suitable legislation; that in the meantime and until this can be obtained, the capitation tax should be raised to $500.

The only point upon which your commissioners could not agree is the date when the capitation tax of $500 ought to come into effect.

Therefore upon this report, we brought in a Bill in 1903, imposing a capitation tax of $500. Now what was the report of the commissioners with regard to Japanese immigration? Did they also suggest that we should impose a capitation tax upon Japanese immigrants, that we should treat them exactly as we treated the Chinese? Nothing of the kind. They had a different treatment to suggest for the Japanese, and that is to be found in these words of the report:

Your commissioners fully appreciate the action taken by the government of Japan on August 2, 1900, whereby the governors of the prefectures of Japan were instructed to prohibit entirely for the time being the emigration of Japanese labourers for the Dominion of Canada. It is stated in a pamphlet purporting to be published by the Japanese consul at Vancouver: 'The principal reason for the measure thus taken was to avoid any friction that might occur by allowing them to come into British Columbia where their immigration was not desired by a certain element of that province,' and that 'the government of Japan wholly stopped the issuance of passports to any intending emigrants for Canada since the 1st of August last, 1900, and still continues to do so, under a provision of the Immigration Protection Law.' (Law No. 70, 1896.)

The course adopted by the Japanese government, if we may without presumption be permitted to say so, is most opportune, eliminating all cause of friction and irritation between Canada and Japan, and so favouring a freer trade and intercourse between the countries than could otherwise obtain.

Nothing further is needed to settle this most difficult question upon a firm basis than some assurance that the action already taken by the government of Japan will not be revoked.

Your commissioners desire to express their earnest hope that in the continuance of this friendly policy, legislation on this subject, by the Canadian government may be rendered unnecessary. Should, however, a change of policy be adopted, in this regard by the Japanese government whereby Japanese labourers may again be permitted to emigrate to Canada, the welfare of the province of British Columbia imperatively demands that effective measures be adopted to take the place of the inhibition now imposed by the Japanese government.

Your commissioners recommend that, in the event, an Act be passed by the Dominion government on the lines of what is known as the Natal Act, made sufficiently stringent and effective to accomplish the desired result.

Therefore, upon the advise of the commissioners to whom we entrusted the examination of the whole subject, we did not apply the same law to Japanese immigration, and for the reasons there stated by the commissioners, that the Japanese government themselves had undertaken to restrict the immigration of their people to Canada, and especially to the province of British Columbia. The commissioners went on to say that if this arrangement proved satisfactory it would not be necessary to take any other step; but if it did not prove effective, then they would advise the government to pass the Natal Act, which is, as every body knows, simply the imposition of an education test upon certain immigrants coming from Asia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the right hon. gentleman understand that while this treaty remains in its present form it is competent for us to pass such an Act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is simply begging the question, because I have already said to the hon. gentleman that we have an understanding with the Japanese government. But I will come to that point presently. I have no hesitation however to say that under the treaty we have now, we could not pass the Natal Act, it would be contrary to the treaty. But I have also to observe to my hon. friend that we ratified the treaty on the assurance that the restrictions then existing would be continued.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have you any objections to producing these?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated two or three days ago, in answer to a motion moved by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that as soon as Mr. Lemieux came back, whether he was successful in his mission or not, the whole correspondence would be brought down. The hon. gentleman, I am sorry to say, is not

as patient in this respect as he might be. We will have all the information in proper time.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should we not have had this information when we were ratifying the treaty with Japan ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We were ratifying the treaty on an understanding that we had with Japan. But let me go on and complete my answer to my hon. friend. The leader of the opposition asks what is the attitude of the government upon this question ? As I said a moment ago, in 1903 we refused to apply to Japanese immigration the same restriction that we applied to Chinese immigration, for the reason stated by the commissioners whom we had instructed to investigate the matter, namely, that the Japanese government had undertaken to restrain their own people, not because we wanted Canada to be flooded by Japanese immigrants in spite of public opinion in British Columbia, but simply because the Japanese government themselves, out of friendship for the Canadian people, out of friendship for the British people, out of friendship for the King of England, who was their ally, they had themselves undertaken to impose restrictions upon immigration to Canada in order to maintain the good relations then existing between the two populations. Well, the years 1904, 1905 and 1906 passed on. There was no Japanese immigration of any consequence into British Columbia. The understanding which we had was respected. But something occurred in the meantime. We had an exposition in Tokio, a very successful exposition, and the merchants of Canada asked us to have the treaty which existed between Great Britain and Japan apply to Canada. That request came from both sides of this House, and from the whole country. When we took measures to have that treaty with Great Britain applied to Canada, the matter was referred to the Canadian parliament, and not a word of dissent was expressed. I knew very well that we would have the same difficulty that we had before, I knew very well that the question of immigration must arise ; so we had correspondence with the Japanese authorities on the subject and we had from them reasonable assurances that the restrictions which had been placed upon the immigration of their people by the Japanese government, would be continued. The matter went on until this season. This season, all of a sudden, there was an influx of Japanese immigrants to British Columbia, some 8,000 were landed there during the summer. That was contrary to our understanding, I say this without any hesitation. Then what was to be done ? Were we to assume at once—and this is the reproach that I made some time ago to the leader of the opposition—were we to assume at once that the Japanese authorities had gone back on their understanding ? We would not take that position, but we acted, I think, in a reasonable manner. Finding that the understanding we had with the Japanese authorities was not as we conceived it to be, we did not jump at a conclusion, we did not send notice to at once put an end to the treaty and we did not use any threatening language. We adopted the very simple and very ordinary method of sending a commissioner to Tokio in order to obtain a proper explanation as to what had taken place, what the reason was for what had taken place, and how a recurrence could be prevented. Does anybody blame the government for taking that attitude ? Was that not the proper and legitimate attitude to take ? Before coming to any conclusion, before denouncing the treaty or taking any rash action, was it not better that we should go to Tokio to confer with a friendly government, a government which we have reason to believe, is friendly which, at all events, is the ally of our Sovereign ? Was it not better to go there and say, why is it that this understanding we have with you has not been respected ? There is more than one way in which an understanding can be violated. It can be violated wilfully. We refuse, in the absence of further information, to believe that it has been violated wilfully. It can be evaded by designing people. I believe that that is what took place. At all events our commissioner has gone there to try to obtain information and upon the result of his mission must depend the decision as to the action we shall take. The treaty might have to be denounced if it were shown that the Japanese authorities had been wilfully and systematically violating it. I refuse to believe that such is the case, but if such were the case there would be no other course open to us than to denounce the treaty. If it had only been evaded, if certain designing parties had taken means to get around and surprise the good faith of the Japanese authorities then that is a matter which can surely be rectified, and when it is rectified we will continue to get the benefit of the treaty and the benefit of the restriction which we have had up to the present time. I ask my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), since he has taken some interest in this matter, if he does not know as well as I do that the people of British Columbia are averse to having any Asiatic immigration in the country. I regret this position of the people there. I regret that this should be the public opinion, but it is public opinion, I know, and therefore we must pay respect to it. But, if such be public opinion, is it not infinitely better, in view of the relations which we have with Japan, in view of the fact that Japan is the ally of the King of England, and in view of the fact that we want to have trade relations with the empire of Japan, that the restriction which we desire to have imposed should be imposed,

not by enactment of this parliament, but that it should be brought about by the voluntary action of the Japanese themselves ? Who can doubt that ? My hon. friend himself will admit it and that is the reason that we have our commissioner at Tokio. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me a moment ago if we are to believe certain rumours of newspapers. Well, Sir, I have only to say that my hon. friend should not be too hasty in crediting newspaper rumours. The modern journalist is a very enterprising man, he wants to have a paragraph for his paper and he will publish anything that comes in his way without taking the trouble to confirm it or to see see whether it is absolutely accurate or not. The journalist who has published this, I may say to my hon. friend, has more information than the government, and I think the government has all the information that it is possible to have upon this question at this moment What will be the success of the mission of Mr. Lemieux is something that I am not prepared to say because I do not think that any conclusion has been reached as yet. I have reason to believe, and I hope that Mr. Lemieux's effort will be crowned with success, and that he will come back with a satisfactory solution of this difficulty. But, it is a matter which is absolutely in abeyance, as to which there is absolutely no information and as to which there cannot be any information until Mr. Lemieux has concluded his mission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Any information as to the probable date of his return ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I expect that Mr. Lemieux will sail probably not later than the 3rd of January next.

Mr. FOSTER. Direct ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER Direct, of course. Why should it not be direct ?

Mr. FOSTER. The newspapers have led us astray again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is too old a bird to be caught by that chaff, I am sure. He ought to have more experience than that.

Mr. FOSTER. I always used to believe the St. John 'Sun.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, if the hon. gentleman will believe the St John 'Globe' it would be better.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the 'Globe' now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At the present time it is impossible to say whether the conclusion has been satisfactory or not. I am not able to give any information, but I venture to express the hope and the strong hope that it will be. Now, I think that I have made the position of the government very clear. I have only this other word to say. We have had some correspondence upon the subject. The other day we had a motion on the paper, moved by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), to have this correspondence laid on the table. I said then that there was no objection but that I must warn my hon. friend that we could not bring down this correspondence until the completion of the mission of Mr Lemieux. Mr. Lemieux will be here certainly about the 15th of January, and as soon as he comes back it must be our duty to give the House all the information that we have on the subject. In the meantime let me recapitulate our position. We have made a difference between Chinese and Japanese immigration. We appointed a commission in order to be advised upon the subject. We were advised by our commissioners that we should bring in legislation to restrict Chinese immigration. We brought in legislation. We were advised by our commissioners not to bring in such legislation as far as Japanese immigration was concerned. We relied upon the information which had been given to us and upon the assurances which had been given us by the Japanese authorities that they would restrict immigration and we acted upon that suggestion. We were advised further by them that so long as these restrictions were maintained by the Japanese authorities no legislation was advisable. We have acted upon the faith of these assurances which were repeated to us, but when we found that these assurances had not been absolutely carried out, when we found that in spite of these assurances a large contingent of Japanese had come into the country who were obnoxious to the people of British Columbia, we sent a commissioner to Japan in order to ascertain the exact position of affairs. We are awaiting the report of that commissioner before any action is taken, and at the present time I think the position of the government upon this matter is as clear as it is possible to make it, and I do not intend that there should be any ambiguity about it.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before this motion is disposed of, I would like to add an observation or two to what has been already stated in support of it. I take it from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the mission of the commissioner who represents us at present in Japan is not terminated, that he is still there, liable to receive instructions from this government and that his proceedings have not yet come to an end. I think that is important, in view, particularly of the despatch which most of us no doubt saw in the press this morning, that his mission had come to an end, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that for my own part, if it has come to an end, it does not in the least degree surprise me. As I understand that cable message the Japanese government have informed Mr. Lemieux that they intend placing some restriction upon immi-

gration without in any way bindng themselves to do it, without giving him a diplomatic note to that effect and without in any way giving up the very important privilege which they secured by the convention of 1906. That result which should surprise nobody because it seems to me that that country, having obtained from Canada a very important concession indeed, could not be expected, under the conditions laid down in the treaty, to give up that concession.

It has occurred to me that since the opening of this session we could have approached this question differently, and that we could have strengthened the hands of our envoy to Japan by permitting him to make known to the government of Japan what is the unanimous feeling of this country with regard to that particular clause of the treaty which has taken him on such a distant mission. There is a precedent to be found in other countries for adopting a resolution indicating the feeling of this House on the subject, and I believe that a unanimous expression of opinion from this House would have enabled Mr. Lemieux, as it has enabled diplomats in other instances, to bring pressure to bear upon the government of Japan by showing that public opinion here was unanimous against that most regretful surrender of our rights which this government conceded to Japan in 1906. I would have upheld a resolution in that sense ; not a resolution such as has been proposed, a wishy-washy milk-and-water resolution merely saying that we must adopt a policy looking to restriction. I would have favoured a resolution affirming the principle, that in the case of no nation will we give up the all important principle to us that we must retain our absolute control over immigration. As was hinted at by the question put a moment ago by the leader of the opposition and which the Prime Minister has found it impossible to answer, we have undoubtedly by that clause completely abandoned our control with respect to immigration coming from Japan. As I understand it we have abandoned and surrendered, so far as Japan is concerned, these measures which it has been found absolutely necessary in the interests of Canada to embody in our general immigration laws. We cannot now exclude Japanese coming to this country who would be stopped under these immigration laws for the causes enumerated in these laws. We have abandoned that control, and I believe that had we made known to the government of Japan that there was a unanimous opinion in this House and throughout the country that such control had been abandoned injudiciously and contrary to the manifest and unanimous wish of our people, it would have strengthened Mr. Lemieux and enabled him to arrive at some other conclusion than that at which he appears to have arrived, judging by the terms of the despatch received this morning.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the treaty prevented the operation of our ordinary immigration laws as against Japanese ?

Mr MONK. Certainly. That is what I understand from the terms of the treaty, and if my hon. friend will take the trouble to read the first article of that treaty he will find that the Japanese are the only subjects of any foreign nation which send immigrants to this country, who under the terms of that article are placed, so far as their right to enter this country is concerned, upon the same footing exactly as Canadian subjects themselves.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I was referring to the general regulations of the immigration laws, and I want to inform my hon. friend that Japanese subjects coming to this country have been deported repeatedly for general reasons which apply to any other class of immigrants under our immigration regulations.

Mr. MONK. I must tell my hon. friend immediately that I cannot find in our treaty with Japan any such reservation as there is in the treaty between the United States and Japan. If my right hon. friend, or some one on his behalf, had taken the trouble at the time we entered into this very serious agreement, to look at a somewhat similar treaty entered into a short time before between the United States and Japan, he would have found an immense difference between the two. In the treaty of 1894 between Japan and the United States there is to be found a special reservation, which we have not copied into our treaty in any way, reserving to the United States government the right to control absolutely by immigration laws the right of Japanese to enter the United States, the same as with reference to any other people. I say, Sir, that a resolution passed in the sense I have indicated—whatever may be Mr. Lemieux's position with respect to the Japanese government—would have given strength to the representations he was making. But in order to have such a resolution we would have to have in the game (which evidently was prepared by the government as to the discussion which has taken place in this House) a little more diplomacy than we have hitherto found among gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches. Have we really in this government any diplomats ? Can we find among these gentlemen on the treasury benches ; I will not say the village Hampden of Grey's Elegy, but any man of

the type of Lord Palmerston, or Cavour, or Bismark, or to come down a little nearer to our own country, can we find among these gentlemen any man who has the foresight shown by Macdonald or George Etienne Cartier in the building up of this country. For my part I see no such diplomats among the gentlemen who sit before me to-day. My right hon. friend has a sunny smile I admit, and in his own country that sunny smile is very often effective, but in his relations with other countries it has been of no assistance to him. I well remember in 1896 that I very nearly lost my election because we were told in the county of Jacques Cartier that if the Liberal party came to power we would have for the first time since confederation a real live Minister of Agriculture who with one stroke of the pen would obtain for our agricultural interests untold advantages in the American market Has anything come of that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs says 'yes.' I would like him to point out, in the balance of nearly $100,000,000 a year against us in our trade with the United States what has been achieved by this government in the direction then foretold. We had a very costly commission to the United States ; we had several of our best qualified men on that mission, but how did it end ? All the questions to be solved were left in abeyance except one which was chosen for pre-eminence, and the House and the country knows that with respect to that question we were foiled from the beginning, and in the end lost an important part of our territory. And when we denounced our treaties with Belgium and Germany—and that stroke of policy has been the boast of my right hon. friend and his colleagues more than once —when we denounced our treaties with Belgium and Germany, what became of it ? From the absolute want of foresight and prudence and care in negotiation on the part of this government, we have had the doors of that important country, Germany, practically closed against us by a surtax, and we are deprived of an immense commerce, which goes to benefit our neighbours to the south. We gave preferential treatment to Great Britain, and twice, in the most definite manner, my right hon. friend and the hon. Minister of Finance have tried to obtain something for us by way of compensation. Have they succeeded ? They have failed. And as a last instance of want of that diplomatic foresight which must be acquired by these gentlemen if we are not to fall into greater mishaps, we have this fatal clause in the convention made with Japan, of which we have not seen the end, and which could easily have been avoided if our hon. friends had only brought to the consideration of that treaty a little of that prudence and foresight which Americans displayed the other day when they treated with the empire of Japan on the subject of immigration. On more than one occasion, and again to-day, my right hon. friend has endeavoured to shield the indefensible position of his government by invoking the amicable and friendly relations which exist between Great Britain and Japan. Let me point out that this question, in reality a small and limited question, of the uncontrolled rate of immigration into this country of orientals has nothing to do in any shape or form with the conditions of amity and alliance which exist between the British empire and Japan. They are not for a single moment to be considered together. Who knows what are the definite stipulations and guarantees between Great Britain and Japan? Nobody knows even what that treaty is. It is a political treaty. It lies hidden in the chancelleries of both countries, under the care of men who would rather surrender their lives than make known what the conditions of that alliance are. It concerns interests infinitely vaster and infinitely different from those which we have been discussing here to-day. It is entirely foreign to the immigration question of British Columbia or even of Canada. It has been brought about by menaces to our empire in the east, by growth and discernment on the part of Japan, and by other causes which have brought those two powerful nations together. But that is a very different consideration from the question of commercial arrangements, and it would be futile and childish to suppose that our dealing with this question interferes in the slightest degree with the important treaty of alliance, whatever the terms of that treaty may be, which exists between Great Britain and Japan. Indeed, Sir, the conditions of the commercial convention concluded in 1904 between Great Britain and Japan are so totally and entirely distinct that they are not to be considered in any way with that alliance, upon which, if we are to believe hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House, our arrangements regarding immigration to a certain extent depend. They are totally different, and it is unfair in the highest degree to endeavour to throw the responsibility for this particular convention upon the British government. Indeed, Sir, it is sufficient to take cognizance of the commercial treaty concluded between England and Japan in 1904 to see that with rare prudence and foresight Great Britain excluded Canada and all the important British dependencies from the operation of that treaty. In other words, at that time, when England was concluding commercial arrangements with Japan, she was giving us,

in the freest and most independent manner, the right to make our own convention concerning our relations, commercial or otherwise, with Japan; so that the responsibility for the convention of 1906 rests entirely upon my right hon. friend and his government, and upon nobody else. It is, moreover, a commercial arrangement.

Let us for a moment open the books which contain commercial treaties. In all those treaties special clauses are inserted reserving to the parties the right of denouncing them. There is not a commercial treaty which is not liable to be denounced. One would suppose that when a man speaks in this House of the denunciation of this particular little convention of 1906, he is to a certain extent placing in peril the political relations of the empire of Japan and the British empire. I invite the consideration of the House to the inanity of such an observation as that; there is nothing in it. The United States and other countries conclude commercial treaties every day; they denounce them, and the treaties come to an end; they are not put into operation at all. The American Republic had a treaty of commerce with France in 1898. A little misunderstanding arose, and it has not been put into operation; the relations of the two countries remain as they were. When Great Britain denounced the commercial treaties with Germany and Belgium, did that denunciation interfere in any way with our relations? Not at all; our relations continued excellent. The terms of the commercial arrangement were revised and re-concluded, and the great mistake we made was in not providing for our commerce with both of those countries at the time Great Britain was treating diplomatically with them. I mention these facts, because it seems to me that there is in the public mind the idea that anybody who wishes to get rid of this obnoxious surrender which this government most improvidently made in 1906 puts in peril in some way the relations of the British empire with Japan. I venture to say that if to-morrow this purely commercial arrangement were denounced, the reasons for it would be obvious to the Japanese government and would no doubt lead in a short time to the conclusion of new arrangements without the slightest friction or the slightest difficulty arising between the two countries.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of denouncing the treaty?

Mr. MONK. I will come to my hon. friend's question in a moment. My hon. friend took occasion to explain his views here the other day, and this leads me to remark that although we are peacefully discussing this question here, it did not look so peaceful at one time. I can remember a few weeks ago when two gentlemen from the province of British Columbia came to Montreal, and I think one of them was my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You do me too much honour.

Mr. MONK. They were the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) and the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher). If those gentlemen interpreted rightly the feelings which animated them, I can only compare them to two whirlwinds from the way they spoke when interviewed by our papers in Montreal.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but I think that neither in Montreal nor Ottawa nor elsewhere did my hon. friend find any statement to any newspaper from me regarding that matter.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend stood by his colleague and spoke in no measured terms. He said that we were going to have a renewal of the Boston bay difficulty.

Mr. GALLIHER. May I be allowed to set the hon. gentleman perfectly right? It always gives me considerable pleasure to stand by and listen and not express myself unless I feel like it.

Mr. MONK. I should have thought that as my hon. friend and the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) are arcades ambo, and my hon. friend expressed no dissent from this menace of civil war, he endorsed the language used by his comrade in arms. On the principle that 'qui ne dit mot consent,' I should say they were both on the same platform, and they were equal, both of them, to the 20,000 Cornish men who wanted to know the reason why. I perceive, however, that these two gentlemen have modified their views since, and to-day they are more peacefully inclined. But with reference to the question: What is the use of making long speeches and passing resolutions, if we passed a hundred resolutions, they will be of no avail? Well, there is no use our proposing to adopt a policy to regulate the coming of the orientals to our country, when we ignore the real cure for the evil. The only cure is to remove the obstacle which lies in our way and which will prevent us, until we do remove it, from carrying out any policy of restriction. Why were not references made by these gentlemen opposite to that point? It can only be, as was pointed out by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), because there is a kind of entente cordiale between the government and my hon. friends from British Columbia. To me the conduct of my hon. friends is as good as a play. If the Japanese in this country, who are very intelligent, saw that play as I see it, what opinion could they have of this parliament and

of its manner of asserting its rights ? There is no doubt in my mind that the general opinion of this country is that we committed a grievous mistake when we abandoned, as we did in that carelessly made treaty, the right to control immigration to this country, from whatever country it comes. Is there a man in this House who will rise and say that we were right when we abandoned that control? Is there any one who will say that we should allow any nation, white or yellow, Japanese or European, free and uncontrolled access into this new country which we are building up ? There will not be found a man who will uphold such an idea even with qualification. My hon. friends asked me if I would denounce the treaty. They set traps in order to be able to say afterwards : You want to denounce the treaty. Well, I take this position : I say that after having exhausted diplomatic means, after having sought to make the Japanese people understand that we committed a mistake, that we did not interpret properly the feelings of our own people,—after having done all this and failed, what then have we to fall back upon ? Why, we should fall back upon our right ; a right is embodied in the treaty. You will find it in every one of these small commercial arrangements the right to put the treaty at an end on six months' notice. Would I hesitate ? Not for one moment. Having exhausted all diplomatic methods, I would see that the feeling of this country was respected, and would proceed to have embodied in a new treaty such a provision as the Americans have in their arrangements with Japan, and which has worked perfectly well.

My right hon. friend says we ought to wait for the papers before discussing this question. What papers ? On the 24th April, 1906, my right hon. friend spoke as follows :

> I beg to lay on the table the treaty with Japan and all the papers connected therewith.

But now when we are face to face with the results of the treaty and when we are seeking information, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), gives us practically the reply which was given by the clerk on the circumlocution office to the man in Dickens. When asked when the case of Jarndyce and Jarndyce would go on, he said, you must not say you want to know, you know, for you will not know. That treaty was a mistake. I find, on reference to 'Hansard' that it came to us from the Senate, and I am within the judgment of hon. members when I say that we do not, as a rule, follow as carefully perhaps as we should the Bills which come to us from that House. Whether the reason be that we have too much confidence in that House or do not expect anything harmful to come from it, that is the invariable custom. I remember well the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) spoke on that occasion. Otherwise I frankly confess I would not remember having been in the House so quickly did the measure pass through. I remember my hon. friend's remarks on that subject, and I regret to learn, that his frank exposé of the situation and his warning given in most unmistakable terms, but to which the government paid no heed, has brought him, not the gratitude of the government, but the loss of the nomination for his constituency in his own province. I hope that is not true, but if it be, it only shows to what depths sometimes politics bring us in this country. I am not inclined to think that the denunciation of this treaty is a matter of such grave importance. The government made an indefensible mistake. If the measures taken to retrieve the mistake should fail, it will be necessary for us as Canadians to stand on our rights. It may become necessary for us to say to the Japanese government that for reasons, which no doubt with their intelligence they will understand, it has become necessary for us to put an end to the treaty.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). No exception can be taken if hon. gentlemen opposite wish now to discuss the Japanese treaty I might, however, remind them that it is the rule in the British parliament, which is the model of our parliament, not to try to make party political capital out of our relations with foreign countries when negotiations are still going on with those countries. I do not accuse hon. gentlemen opposite of trying to do that now. I would not accuse my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) of doing that, but I fear very much that the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite will take this question up and make party warfare over it. The result will be to give the impression abroad that this question is being made a subject of party warfare in Canada. That certainly should not be the case. It is a question in which Canada is greatly interested—I am frank to say, it is a question in which the empire is interested. We have adhered to the treaty between the King of Great Britain and the Dominions beyond the Seas with the empire of Japan. We did so with the thorough approval, I think, not only of the people of Canada but of the government of Great Britain, because the adherence to that treaty meant improving the cordial and friendly relations between the British empire and the Japanese empire, an object held close at heart by all true people belonging to the British empire. We did this, also, with the full concurrence of the parliament of Canada. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr Monk) confesses that his own memory was so slightly impressed with the question of the Japanese

treaty a year ago that, except for one speech, that of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) he would not have remembered that the Treaty Bill had passed the House. That appears to have been the state of mind of the whole opposition. I find no criticism of the treaty. The opposition concurred in what was done. I have the report of 'Hansard' of that day's debate. The right hon. leader of the government moved the second reading of the Bill respecting a certain treaty between Canada and Japan, and explained the effect of the Bill. Mr. Borden asked what was the value of a yen. He then went on to say: 'I do not find any mention of grain or flour.' Then, I find some remarks by Mr. Kennedy, and a question by Mr. J. D Reid, as to the wages of white men in British Columbia. And I find no other reference by any other member of the opposition to the question.

Mr. BERGERON. Or by any member from British Columbia ?

Mr. FISHER. Or by any member from British Columbia. Because, the whole parliament of Canada was satisfied with the adherence to the treaty.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will permit me a question, I would like to ask him if he finds that the Prime Minister assured the House that immigration would be limited by Japan to about four hundred or five hundred a year ?

Mr. FISHER. Not on that occasion. If hon. gentlemen opposite thought that important why did they not ask the Prime Minister about it ?

Mr. FOSTER. He was asked and gave the assurance, and it is there before the hon. gentleman's eyes.

Mr. FISHER. Where is the question ?

Mr. LENNOX At the head of page 1551.

At the present time the Japanese government do not allow immigration from their own provinces with the exception of a very few from each province. I think it is not more than four or five from each province.

Mr. FISHER. That is right, but that was not in answer to a question from the opposition. There was no demand from the opposition——

Mr. FOSTER. That was after Mr. Kennedy had made his objections to the treaty. The point having been raised by Mr. Kennedy, it was not necessary for any one else to raise it.

Mr. FISHER. It was evident that the opposition did not ask it anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is not making this a party question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) have any objection to giving to the House the written assurance that he spoke of in 1903 ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not it here. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said the treaty was a mistake. I do not see why the hon. gentleman at the time did not——

Mr. MONK I did not say the treaty was a mistake, but that that article was a mistake, and that I had concurred in its adoption upon the assurance of the Prime Minister.

Mr. FISHER. I took down what I thought were the hon. gentleman's words when he spoke them. Of course, I accept his statement. I understand him to say now that the treaty is not a mistake.

Mr. MONK. I said that the treaty was a mistake inasmuch as it provided no control of the immigration of Japanese into this country.

Mr. FISHER. Then the hon. gentleman says that it is a mistake to that extent. The treaty, as a treaty, may be interpreted in that way, but as explained by the leader of the government, when the treaty passed the House, we had an engagement from the Japanese which had been in existence for some time and which had worked well, in regard to Japanese immigration into Canada. It was expected to be continued, and for good reason, under the treaty. It had worked satisfactorily and well, and there was no reason why it should not continue to work satisfactorily and well. I will not go into that part of the question because my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has dealt with it very fully. But one or two points raised by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier should be referred to. That hon. gentleman compared this treaty with the treaty between Japan and the United States. That treaty was made in 1894, at about the time when the treaty between Great Britain and Japan was made. Japan was then in a very different position from that in which she was in 1906 when Canada adhered to the English treaty. At that time we had every reason to believe that Japan would not accept any conditions in connection with the adherence to that treaty. When she made the treaty with the United States, Japan had not fought the Japanese-Russian war. She was not then in the position, the proud position, which she occupies to-day. At that time Japan was very eager indeed to secure immunity from the interference in affairs within her own territory by European nations and the United States. It is well known that, in these treaties, she demanded no tariff concessions at all commensurate with the tariff concessions she yielded to these countries. Why did not she do so ? Simply because she was eagerly reaching out to acquire that recognition amongst the nations of the world which she had not then secured; she was anxious for that, and for

that alone. She was then ready and willing to submit to conditions which she would not dream of submitting to when we adhered to this treaty. Now, hon. gentlemen have not undertaken to depreciate in any way the value of the treaty to Canada in other respects. I am glad they did not, because I find that hon. gentlemen opposite, on various occasions in this House, have affirmed the value of a treaty of this kind with Japan. The first reference to the matter I can find in the House of Commons, was made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). On May 29, 1905, he called the attention of the government to a letter which had appeared in the Yarmouth 'Telegram,' copied from 'Industrial Canada.' It was a letter written by the 'J. Spencer Turner Co., H. H. Lehman, secretary and treasurer.' This was a New York company, and the letter showed the disadvantages which Canadian cotton manufacturers laboured under in the Japanese market in comparison with American cotton manufacturers. The hon. member drew the attention of the Minister of Finance to the matter, saying:

This is a very important matter for the consideration of the government, if it has not already been dealt with.

The Minister of Finance replied. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) also spoke on the question, rather implying a rebuke to the government because they had not adhered to the treaty. I may say that in the same year, on June 22nd, in a discussion of this question, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) said:

This is one of the most important commercial questions before Canada to-day. The market of Japan, I believe, is the best market we can hope to gain—and a growing market too.

Evidently hon. gentlemen opposite fully appreciated good relations with Japan, and urged adherence to the treaty so as to get the commercial advantages which that treaty gives. I may say incidentally that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when speaking on the address in 1906, spoke at considerable length in regard to Japan, and deliberately censured the government for not having adhered to this treaty earlier. He said:

If there is one reason now why this treaty should be hailed and acclaimed with delight and with applause, as I believe it should be, there were ten reasons ten years ago why it should have been adopted and its provisions taken advantage of by this country, simply because ten years of added benefit over and above what this country can now obtain, would have been obtained by intercourse with that country at a period of time when, probably its demand upon such products as Canada could have afforded, would have been even greater than they will be in the years to come.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. BARKER. Those are commercial benefits.

Mr. FISHER. I am speaking of the commercial benefits. Hon. gentlemen opposite are urging the commercial benefits, as they were then. No doubt it was because they appreciated the commercial advantages, as the government did, as the people of British Columbia themselves appreciated the commercial advantages perhaps more than any persons else in Canada—it was for that reason that the treaty was accepted without any provisions in the treaty itself against immigration from Japan.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman spoke a moment ago of the difficulty of getting Japan to consent to such a stipulation as that which was included in the United States treaty of 1894. Was there any attempt made, and was there a refusal?

Mr. FISHER. We were impressed with the belief that Japan would not adhere to the treaty with any conditions attached to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was any attempt made?

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter I cannot speak about, the Prime Minister can speak about it better than I.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the Prime Minister will tell us.

Mr. FISHER. Now, I have here a copy of the Montreal 'Gazette' of this morning, which I think even the leader of the opposition will acknowledge is a Conservative paper, if it does not always support his policy. I will read an article which appeared in the 'Gazette' this morning in consequence, no doubt, of the remarks made in this House yesterday by the hon. gentleman who spoke on this question. Speaking of those gentlemen it says:

They should have protested last year, when the treaty with Japan was before the Houses for ratification. They had ample warning of what the treaty was. It was pointed out in at least a portion of the press that the arrangement was more than a trade convention, that it was a treaty of friendship, guaranteeing to the people of each country when residing in the other the full rights of natives in all that related to freedom of movement, trade, domicile and protection of the laws. The provisions were as plain as they could be put in the English language. They were reciprocal and mutual, and were in no way limited by the domestic regulations of either country. The treaty was sought by the Canadian government after the matter had been discussed in parliament. The time to have objected to it and to the immigration of Japanese which it provided for was when it was presented to parliament for ratification. Those who did not object then are neither doing themselves nor their country credit by raising an outcry now when the honour of the

government, of parliament and of the nation is concerned in living up to an agreement freely entered upon, with another free nation

That is the opinion of the Montreal 'Gazette.' But the 'Gazette' has overlooked a fact which has clearly been stated on various occasions, and was well known before the treaty was undertaken, before the treaty was brought into this House for ratification, that the government had an arrangement with the Japanese government by which immigration from Japan into Canada would be restricted without any reference to the treaty at all. We had that full knowledge, as parliament had, and with that full knowledge parliament ratified the treaty and consented to adopt it without conditions which were outside of the treaty with Great Britain. What I said to the leader of the opposition a moment ago in regard to the conditions in the United States treaty, was simply an explanation of the difference between the Japan of the date when this treaty was ratified and the Japan of the date when they ratified their treaty with the United States, a totally different condition of affairs, a totally different nation with which to deal. I have reason to believe that the question as it came before us in 1906 was this, Will you adhere to the British treaty without conditions, in view of the arrangement which our government and your government have made or will you not adhere to the British treaty at all? That was a position which I think this government were justified in taking, and they recommended to parliament the adoption of this treaty, and parliament was safe in undertaking to adopt the treaty.

I will not repeat what has already been said so well and a great deal better than I could say it, by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will only allude to it to say that I believe most emphatically that the Japanese government are desirous and have been desirous all through, of adhering to the arrangement that was made about 1902 between the right hon. leader of the government and the Japanese government. I believe they are as desirous of adhering to that arrangement to-day. I believe they are quite willing to carry out that arrangement, but I do know that during the last few months in British Columbia, that arrangement has been evaded or ignored and that people have come in in larger numbers than, under that arrangement, they ought to have done. I am not prepared, knowing something of the Japanese, to believe that the Japanese government had themselves either connived at or instigated, or deliberately allowed an evasion of that arrangement. That is my own personal opinion. The House may take it for what it is worth, but I am fully satisfied in my own mind that the Japanese government will live up to its treaty arrangements. I do not believe that the Japanese desire the denouncement of this treaty any more than we do. I am prepared to say quite frankly—and I speak for myself, I speak for every one in Canada, I speak for the gentlemen of the opposition as well as the gentlemen on this side of the House—that it would be a misfortune to Canada if the Japanese treaty had to be denounced. As was said a few minutes ago by my hon. friend the leader of the government, it may come to the point that such a thing may have to be done, but I would deplore that condition of affairs, I would regret it extremely and I believe it would be to the injury of Canada if that treaty had to be denounced. How can we evade denouncing it? We can evade it by making representations to the Japanese government through the medium of our commissioner in Japan to see whether we cannot secure such an arrangement as will be entirely satisfactory even to the people of British Columbia in regard to Japanese immigration into Canada. I still hold that we can succeed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted newspaper reports as to what is happening in Tokio. They need not rely on these.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is the same paper that the hon. gentleman quoted from —the Montreal 'Gazette.'

Mr. FISHER. It may be but there is this great difference that I was quoting the editorial opinion of the paper. The hon. gentleman was quoting the news reports and they are very different things. I am not basing anything I said upon what the 'Gazette' reported to have occurred somewhere else. I was giving the hon. gentleman the opinion of the 'Gazette' itself. I know that it is not always welcome to the hon. gentleman, as we know that on not infrequent occasions the Montreal 'Gazette' has hauled the hon. gentleman over the coals and told him very clearly that he is not expressing the views of the party. I do not know whether the 'Gazette' is right, that is for him and the 'Gazette' to discuss and not for me. As to their news, it is quite a different thing, and I think the hon. gentleman and his friends had better wait until they have authoritative news before discussing diplomatic questions when the diplomacy is being carried on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman going to give us the written assurance I asked for?

Mr. FISHER. I would ask him to possess his soul in patience. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has undertaken to read us a lesson on history, has been telling us how much better the diplomatic relations of Canada were attended to by Sir John Macdonald and Sir George

Etienne Cartier than they recently have been and he dragged me into the discussion. I do not want to be dragged very much into the discussion, I am not boasting to-day, or in general, I think, a great deal about the results of the policy of the Dominion government in agricultural matters. I leave the facts to speak for themselves, but as the facts have to speak for themselves, I will just give the hon. gentleman one fact which perhaps may be of advantage to him in the discussion of agricultural matters again. He said that in 1896 the electors of his county were told that in consequence of the fact that a prominent farmer was going to be the Minister of Agriculture in the Laurier government, we were going to get great advantages in the market in the United States and he asked : Where are the advantages ? Well, I will just give him one of the advantages. Speaking from memory, about six months after the Laurier government was formed, I entered into negotiations with the Department of Agriculture at Washington. I went down to Washington and I spent a week there. I was told and warned by a prominent agriculturist of the Conservative party that there was no use in my going to Washington on the question of the quarantine of cattle between us and the United States because the Conservative party had been trying for years to remove the quarantine without success and therefore, of course, it was no use for a poor Liberal to try to do it. I went down there and I effected an arrangement by which the quarantine arrangements between Canada and the United States, in so far as our exports of cattle and sheep to the United States were concerned, were done away with, and I did it in less than a week. What was the result ? In the years before—1893, 1894, 1895, 1896—the average value of the cattle that we sent to the United States was about $10,000 a year. I brought the arrangement into force in February, 1897, and in the first half of that fiscal year we exported half a million dollars worth of cattle to the United States ; in the next year we exported $1,250,000 worth ; in the next year we exported $1,250,000 worth ; in the year 1900 we exported $1,500,000 worth, or a total, in three and a half years, of $4,500,000 nearly of value as against $10,000 a year for the four years previous to 1897.

Mr. MONK. All that was due to my hon. friend ?

Mr. FISHER. It was due distinctly to me, because I did what the friends of the hon. gentleman said there was no use of my trying to do, and what one of them told me I need not try to do because his leaders had failed.

Mr. MONK. Did my hon. friend lower the tariff on agricultural products ?

Mr. FISHER. I am not talking about tariffs; I am talking about what I knew I could do, what I tried to do, and did do, and I did not attempt to do things that I knew I could not do.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the question——

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will please not interrupt me. I have only five minutes until six o'clock and I am not going to be interrupted. The hon. gentleman also talked about our policy in connection with the British preference. Now, I want to say to the House that if the hon. gentleman can find anything in the fiscal history of Canada which is more the proud boast of the Liberal party or of the people who are concerned in the trade of Canada than the British preference, I want him to name it. I am proud of the British preference, every Liberal in Canada is proud of the British preference, and I venture to say that in spite of certain leaders of the Conservative party the great mass of the Conservative electors are proud of the British preference. Why am I proud of the British preference ? I am proud of it first of all because it was the master stroke by which we were able to secure the denouncement of the German and Belgian treaties—treaties which throttled Canadian trade and in regard to which the Canadian people were not consulted. Previous to the denouncement of those treaties Sir Charles Tupper and the leaders of the Conservative party had tried for a long period of time to have them denounced and had failed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is getting a little away from the question.

Mr. FISHER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling, but I am only replying to the words of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and if it had not been for his reflection upon our diplomacy, it would not have been necessary for me to have referred to these matters. I was just pointing out that our diplomacy in regard to these things as in regard to the Japanese treaty had been successful. It was an indiscretion no doubt on the part of the member for Jacques Cartier, but not on my part. If I may not discuss the British preference I will only say that the arrangements in connection with the French treaty are an eviednce of the wisdom of the hon. the Prime Minister in his diplomacy with other countries including the mother country, and that they are just on a par with the advantages we have secured commercially in regard to Japan, which are of the utmost importance to our manufacturing industries, and which I believe will be of great benefit to Canada without doing that injury which some people in British Columbia

have feared, but which I am satisfied will not result from that treaty.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would remind the Minister of Agriculture that he has made repeated allusions to a written assurance he has got from the government of Japan, and the Prime Minister has on occasions declared solemnly to this House that he had brought down all the papers with reference to this treaty. This paper was in the hands of one of his ministers years before the right hon. gentleman made that announcement, and I think we have a perfect right to ask that that written assurance that a minister of the Crown has, and which he has quoted in the spirit if not almost in the letter, should be at once laid on the table of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should have this question settled.

Mr. HENDERSON. I rose to call attention to the fact that it was the American government who removed the quarantine and not the Minister of Agriculture of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is as follows:—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion passes, I would ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, if there is any good reason why a document which has been referred to repeatedly by the ministers of the Crown for the purpose of securing a ratification of this treaty, and which has been referred to by the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, should not be laid on the table of the House. I understand that a document of state referred to by a minister of the Crown in debate is bound to be laid upon the table of the House. I should think there is every reason why we should observe that rule in the present case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated a moment ago to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, and I repeat, that as soon as the commission comes back all the papers will be communicated to the House. I think it is a rule of diplomatic relations that when a mission is in progress it is not proper to lay the papers before parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But if the documents were of a confidental nature, they ought not to have been referred to here by a minister of the Crown. If the document were really confidential, well and good. But it was obviously not of a confidential nature because the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture have referred to it as a ground on which they proceeded in asking ratification of the treaty by parliament. Under these circumstances, it is idle to talk of it being a document of a confidential nature. How could a communication of that character be a document of a confidential nature? It is absurd to make such a suggestion in connection with a document of that kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These papers are at present the subject of a commission to the Japanese government, and it would not be proper to bring them down. They will be brought down at the proper time.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another document which has been referred to, and which, if not a state document, is something very much like it. I refer to the letter said to have been written by the consul of Japan in which he made certain undertakings on behalf of his government in line with the statement of the Prime Minister, and the assurance that was given to us by the Minister of Agriculture. That has been used in debate, and the information it contains has been urged before the House. Is there any reason why we should not have that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same reason.

Mr. FOSTER. I consider the reason a very flimsy one.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 8, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that during the adjournment I have received a notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of South Huron owing to the death of the sitting member, Benjamin B. Gunn, Esq.

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

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of Charles B. Major, Esq., for the electoral district of Labelle.

Of Jean Baptiste Thomas Caron, Esq., for the electoral district of Ottawa.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Alberta North Western Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Monk.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—Mr. D. Ross.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

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

That, as the time for receiving petitions for private Bills and the time for presenting private Bills without additional charge have been curtailed through the Christmas adjournment of the House, the said time as fixed by rule 87 and rule 88, subsection 3b and 3c, be extended to Friday, January 24, Friday, February 7, and Friday, March 6, respectively.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). How long an extension is that ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Three weeks, I am informed.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Jean Baptiste Thomas Caron, Esq., member for the electoral district of Ottawa, by Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Robert Stewart.

Charles B. Major, Esq., member for the electoral district of Labelle, by Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

QUESTIONS.

SNAG BOAT ON THE RED RIVER.

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How much has the government expended on the snag boat on the Red river up to date?
2. Has all the work by way of construction and furnishing been let by contract? If not, how much and who had the contracts?
3. On whose recommendation was the boat built?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $32,338.34.
2. The work was done under contract by the Polson Iron Works Company, Limited, of Toronto, for the above amount.
3. Upon the recommendation of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg, the Board of Trade of Selkirk, and the resident engineer of the district.

IMMIGRANTS AT TEULON.

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

How many immigrants have been cared for during the seasons of 1906 and 1907, respectively, in the immigrant building at Teulon?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). 1906, 170 ; 1907, 190.

ALGOMA CENTRAL AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY—SUBSIDIES.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many miles of the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company have been completed, (a) on the main line, (b) on the branch lines, (c) on side tracks?
2. Who made the reports to the government showing such distances to have been built and when?
3. What was the amount of subsidy paid per mile, on what dates, and in what amounts, were the sums paid, and to whom, respectively?
4. Is any further sum claimed to be payable by the government to this company on account of subsidy? If so, what additional amount is claimed, for what mileage, when was it claimed, by whom, and how has the claim dealt with?
5. Were any special subsidies granted or applied for on account of bridges or extra cost of construction? If so, how much was paid for such?

Hon. GEO. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. (a) 69·35 miles main line ; (b) 20·29 miles branch line ; (c) 9·93 miles side tracks.
2. J. S. Wynn, acting manager ; A. H. Chitty, assistant treasurer. Sworn to October, 10, 1907.
3. The total mileage subsidized and under construction is on main line 200 miles, on branch lines 25 miles—total, 225 miles. The subsidy was paid as follows :—

On main line, December 17, 1901.	$240,624 00
On branch line, Feb. 24, 1902....	76,800 00
On main line, June 17, 1902....	63,200 00
On main and branch lines, Oct. 15, 1902..	202,912 00
On main and branch lines, Oct. 4, 1904..	331,378 76
On main and branch lines, April 12, 1905..	10,061 24
Total subsidy paid.. ..	$924,976 00

or $4,111 per mile on the whole mileage stated, the payments having been made on progress estimates covering the whole distance under subsidy.

The above amounts were paid to the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

4. The department is not aware of any other amounts claimed by the company on subsidy account.

5. No special subsidies were granted or applied for on account of bridges or extra cost of construction.

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many miles of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway company have been completed (a) on its main line, (b) on its branches, (c) on side tracks?

2. Who made the reports to the government showing such distances to have been completed, and when?

3. What was the amount of subsidy paid per mile, on what dates, and in what amounts were the sums paid, and to whom, respectively?

4. Were any special subsidies granted or applied for on account of bridges or extra cost of construction? If so, how much was paid for such?

5. Is any further sum claimed to be payable by the government to this company on account of subsidy? If so, what additional amount is claimed, for what mileage or on what account, when was it claimed, by whom, and how has the claim been dealt with?

Hon. GEO. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. (a) Main line 13·53 miles. (b) Branch line 1·54 miles (c) Nil.

2. J. S. Wynn, acting manager, A. H. Chitty, assistant treasurer, sworn to October 10, 1907.

3. $3,200 per mile. January 9, 1903, payment of $32,000 to the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.

4. No special subsides were granted or applied for on account of bridges or extra cost of construction.

5. The company has constructed 12·75 miles, commencing at Sudbury to Little Current and by such construction they claim to have earned the full subsidy of $6,400 per mile or $81,600, of which it received January 23, 1903—$32,000.

SHIPMENT OF FEED WHEAT.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has the government taken any special steps to facilitate the shipment of feed wheat from the prairie provinces to the eastern markets during the present winter, (a) by arranging with the railway companies operating in the west for an adequate supply of cars for all feed wheat offered, (b) by arranging for reasonable freight charges by the all-rail route, or (c) in any other manner?

2. If so, what is the nature of such arrangements?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. Officials of the government had communication with railway officials and urged that all possible facilities be employed for the prompt conveyance of such wheat eastward.

2. The movement of this wheat was one of the objects contemplated by the government's arrangements for advances to such banks as wished to assist in moving the grain.

The markets division of the dairy and cold storage branch learned in November that the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association would have a large quantity of frozen wheat to dispose of and at once advertised the fact throughout Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces with the result that hundreds of inquiries have been received by the association, and it is hoped that considerable direct business will result.

In a letter to the markets division, dated December 6, the secretary of the association stated that they had received assurance from the Canadian Pacific Railway that shipments of feed grain would receive preference on their line over any other class of traffic this winter.

FREIGHT RATES TO THE YUKON.

Mr. THOMPSON—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What report did the Railway Commission make upon the result of their investigation into the White Pass and Yukon Railway freight rates?

2. Did they find that they had control over any part of this line? If so, what part?

3. Did they find that they did not have control over some parts of the line? If so, what parts?

4. Can they control the rate on a through bill of lading?

Hon. GEO. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals).

1. The Board of Railway Commissioners has made no report or order respecting the freight rates charged upon the White Pass and Yukon Railway. The board held a sitting in Dawson for the purpose of hearing the complaints against the rates charged upon this railway ; but the evidence laid before the board to form an opinion whether the rates were higher than were reasonable under the circumstances of the traffic. The board then directed its chief traffic officer to make full inquiries and report upon the subject. The traffic officer investigated the books, accounts, and records of the railway company, and subsequently obtained, by authority of the board, the services of an accountant to assist him in dealing with them ; but, on account of the labour involved and the pressure of work in his department, as well as of his having been obliged to go into a hospital for treatment during the past summer, the traffic officer has not made any report in the matter. The board expects that the report will be ready shortly.

2. The board has not given any decision upon the other questions asked, and does not expect to do so until the report of the traffic officer shall have been received and considered.

3. Answered by number two.

4. Answered by number two.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM asked :

1. Was a test of the all-winter open route of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Nova Scotia, alleged to exist between Georgetown or Souris on the island, and Cape George on the mainland, made last winter? If not, why not?
2. Is it the intention of the government to take steps to ascertain whether such route exists?
3. If so, what means of testing such route is proposed and when will the test be made?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. No. No vessel was available for this work.
2. Yes.
3. Under consideration.

INTERNAL REVENUE OFFICER AT PORT HOPE.

Mr. WARD—by Mr. Sam Hughes—asked :

1. Has an internal revenue officer been appointed at Port Hope to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Richard Howden?
2. If so, who has been appointed, at what salary and upon whose recommendation was the appointment made?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Yes.
2. Harry M. Wood. Salary $600. Recommendation of the Minister of Inland Revenue.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—DISTRICT ENGINEER AT KENORA.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. Who has been appointed to succeed A. F. Heaman, assistant district engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway at Kenora, who resigned recently?
2. If no appointment has been made, who is acting as assistant engineer there?

Hon. GEO. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. A. N. McGillivray.
2. Answered by number one.

GOVERNMENT BOUNTIES.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What is the total amount of bounties paid by the government since 1896, and the amount for each year on each article?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would ask the hon. member to move for a return.

WHARF AT ST. LAURENT, ISLE D'ORLEANS.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What sum of money has been expended during the year 1907 to the present date, on the works for the wharf at St. Laurent, Isle d'Orleans?
2. What is the nature of the work done there?
3. Were these works done by contract given out after tenders were called for, or by day work?
4. How many men were on an average employed daily on these works?
5. How many overseers were there for the said works, and what salary per day was paid to them?
6. What wages per day was paid to the ordinary workmen?
7. Are the said works completed or not, what remains still to be done to the said wharf?

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

1. $10,260.34.
2. Repairing wharf and widening approach thereto.
3. By day labour.
4. Twenty-five.
5. One, at $2.50 per day. An assistant in the office of the resident engineer at Quebec also for a considerable portion of the time was personally superintending the work. He is paid at the rate of $3 per day.
6. $2 for carpenters and $1.50 for labourers.
7. Part of the widening still remains to be done.

THE FRENCH TARIFF AND UNITED STATES EXPORTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What articles of export from the United States have the advantage of the French minimum tariff on entry into France?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Canned meats, table fruits, fresh : lemons, oranges, cedrats and their varieties not mentioned. Mandarin oranges ; common table grapes ; apples and pears : for the table, for cider and perry ; other fruits except hothouse grapes and fruits ; fruits dried or pressed (excluding raisins) ; apples and pears : for the table, for cider and perry ; prunes, other fruits ; common woods, logs : sawed or squared timber, 80 mm. or more in thickness squared or sawed lumber, exceeding 35 mm. and less than 80 mm. in thickness ; wood sawed 35 mm. or less in thickness ; paving blocks, staves, hops, apples and pears crushed or cut and dried, manufactured and prepared pork meats, lard and its compounds.

PURCHASE OF BUFFALO.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Under what parliamentary authority was the expenditure made of $100,000 and over for the purchase of buffalo?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The sum of $100,000 is included in the Appropriation Act of 1907, chapter 3, 6-7 Edward VII, folio 68, under the head-

ing of Miscellaneous, as follows : 'Amount required to pay expenses connected with Park Reservations.' The sum of $75,000 was also obtained on a Governor General's warrant dated 31st August, 1907.

CATARACT POWER COMPANY AND WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Taylor—asked;

1. What quantity of water has the Cataract Power Company the right to divert from the Welland canal at De Cew Falls?
2. How much water is said company now using?
3. Is the amount to be increased?
4. What rental is being paid?
5. When does said right expire?
6. Is the current in the canal so great at present as to interfere with shipping?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. 1,000 cubic feet per second.
2. Less than 600 cubic feet per second.
3. Amount was increased from 700 cubic feet per second to 1,000 cubic feet per second.
4. $30,000 annually, being $30 per cubic foot per annum.
5. December 31, 1923.
6. No.

ENTRIES AT PORT OF SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What quantities of hay, potatoes, and other farm and garden produce were entered for home consumption at the port of Sault Ste. Marie, Canada, during the twelve months from June 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907?
2. What was the value respectively?
3. What duties were paid thereon?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Statement showing the imports entered for consumption at the Port of Sault Ste. Marie, Canada, during the period from 30th June, 1906, to 30th June, 1907, of hay, potatoes, and other farm and garden produce.

Articles.	Unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
Hay	tons.	1,370	13,358	2,740 00
Beans	bush.	108	154	25 80
Pease	"	10	13	1 50
Eggs	doz.	15,960	3,087	478 80
Apples	brls.	69	210	27 60
Berries	lbs.	2,296	299	45 92
Cherries	"	80	13	1 60
Cranberries	bush.	152	439	109 75
Grapes	lbs.	9,330	757	186 60
Peaches	"	28,050	1,436	280 50
Plums	bush.	329	708	177 00
Fruit, green, n.e.s			738	147 60
Cheese	lbs.	7,087	1,436	212 61
Straw	tons.	6	35	12 00
Melons	No.	3,369	531	132 75
Potatoes	bush.	12,290	7,095	2,167 05
Tomatoes, fresh	"	155	484	93 80
Vegetables, fresh			4,177	1,145 95

TRADE WITH JAPAN.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

What has been the total amount of our trade with Japan, both imports and exports, respectively, for each of the last three fiscal years, including the present fiscal year up to this date?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

	Fiscal year 1905.	Fiscal year 1906.	Fiscal year 1907.	Five months July to November 1907.
	$	$	$	$
Total imports	1,914,787	1,662,929	2,037,566	1,102,416
Total exports	510,925	493,952	583,470	260,127
Total	2,425,712	2,156,881	2,621,136	1,362,543

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What months do the figures for 1907 cover ?

Mr. PATERSON. They are given to me as for the fiscal year 1907, That would lead one to suppose that it was for the nine months. But as the five months statement is from July to November. I presume them to be the twelve months of 1907.

GOVERNMENT AID TO MOVEMENT OF GRAIN.

Mr. FOSTER moved for :

Copies of all papers, representations, memorials, and correspondence had with the Minister of Finance or any other member of the government in reference to the proposed action of the government through or in conjunction with the banks, to facilitate in a financial way the movements of grain from the western provinces of Canada.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would ask the hon. gentleman to let this stand. The transaction is one that is now current and is largely of a confidential character, but the whole information will be brought down at a not late day.

Motion allowed to stand.

DISTRICT JUDGE FORBES.

Mr. TAYLOR moved for :

A copy of all correspondence between the Department of Justice, or any department of the government, and Mr. Frederick Fraser Forbes, now a district judge in the province of Saskatchewan, or any other person or persons, in reference to the personal or professional status or character of Mr. Forbes, or his appointment as a judge as above-mentioned, and of all writings and documents of any kind in reference to the foregoing matter.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I have no objection to this motion, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that there is no correspondence whatever on this subject, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be in the other departments.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN TOBACCO PROTECTION—AMENDMENTS TO INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. J. A. DUBEAU (Joliette) (Translation) asked for :

Copies of all documents, petitions, memoranda and correspondence received by the Government since 1904, to this day, regarding the amendments to be made to the Inland Revenue Act for the purpose of encouraging and protecting still more the Canadian tobacco industry.

Mr. Speaker, the motion which I have the honour to present to this House has reference to an industry of considerable importance for the county of Joliette, which I have the honour to represent here, and for other sections of the province of Quebec, but also for all the districts wherein tobacco growing is carried on successfully.

I may be allowed before this item is disposed of to set forth the means whereby, in my humble opinion, the development of that industry may be fostered and greater returns from it ensured to the growers.

In order that the House may form an idea of the importance of that industry, I beg to recall that we have in Canada twenty-six factories handling tobacco of foreign origin and thirty-eight handling home-grown tobacco.

The quantity of tobacco manufactured in these establishments amounts to about thirteen million four hundred and sixty-two thousand three hundred and ninety-pounds 13,462,390.

However, that state of things has not always existed. It is only of late years that our farmers have increased their output and that this industry has made considerable headway, as regards the manufacture of the home-grown leaf.

As a matter of fact, in eighteen hundred and ninety-six (1896), our output of leaf tobacco amounted to about one million five hundred thousand pounds (1,500,000), while it reaches to-day about twelve million pounds.

There were then in the country only ten factories handling the home-grown leaf and twenty-nine factories handling the tobacco of foreign origin. To-day, as I stated at the outset, we have thirty-eight factories handling the home-grown leaf, including those which manufacture mixed tobacco, and twenty-six factories handling imported tobacco.

Honourable members will notice that the number of factories handling imported tobacco is decreasing, while the number of those handling the home-grown leaf is increasing.

In 1896, there were manufactured out of imported leaf, nine million six hundred and nine thousand, seven hundred and ninety-four pounds (9,609,794). According to the report of nineteen hundred and six, the manufacture of tobacco of foreign origin reaches seven million, four hundred and seventy-two thousand seven hundred and twenty-nine pounds (7,472,729), which means a decrease of two million four hundred and seventy-two thousand, seven hundred and twenty-nine pounds (2,472,729).

Now if we look into the statistics relating to the manufacture of Canadian tobacco, we are pleased to find an increase of four million six hundred and seventy-two thousand, one hundred and seventeen pounds (4,622,117), while in 1896 the manufacture of Canadian tobacco barely amounted to four hundred and seventy-four thousand two hundred and five pounds (474,205) in 1905, while

in 1906-07 there were manufactured five million, ninety-six thousand, three hundred and eighty-two pounds (5,096,382) of Canadian tobacco.

I say then, that our farmers have reaped great advantages from that increase in the use of Canadian tobacco. Now, should any one inquire what have been the causes of that increase in the output of Canadian tobacco and of the great progress accomplished in the manufacture of the home-grown leaf, no other reason can be assigned but the means taken by this government as far back as 1896. At that early date, indeed, the Liberal government realizing that the tobacco industry was destined to make great headway in our country and to become one of our most important national industries, did all in their power to protect and encourage it.

A duty of ten cents per pound was enacted on foreign tobacco; besides always with the object of protecting the Canadian tobacco grower, the Minister of Inland Revenue (then the Honourable Mr. Brodeur) induced parliament to pass a Bill which had the gratifying result of destroying at one stroke a trust which threatened to take root in Canada; and in order to encourage furthermore the growers of tobacco in our country, manufacturers were authorized to mix Canadian tobacco with the imported leaf, with the result that the consumption of Canadian tobacco increased considerably, and also the cigar factories opened their doors to the Canadian leaf, whose merits are beginning to be recognized in that industry. Lastly, and still with a view to furthering the interests of tobacco manufacturers and tobacco growers in Canada, the Honourable Mr. Fisher sent two of our fellow citizens to Wisconsin, for the purpose of studying their methods as regards the sowing and planting and drying of tobacco; and later on called here Mr. Charland, tobacco expert, whose thorough knowledge of that industry has already been of great service.

Should such a beneficial policy be adhered to, it will not be long before we have to record magnificent results, our tobacco will find in foreign markets a ready sale, and large returns will be ensured to a thriving agricultural industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we look into the particular cause of the great advance of the Canadian tobacco manufacturing industry since eighteen hundred and ninety-six (1896), we must admit that it is due mainly to a customs enactment whereby the raw material of foreign origin was made to pay a higher rate of duty.

The opponents of that proposal had against its enactment two reasons to urge, both of which were of very doubtful value. Some manufacturers who confined themselves exclusively to the use of the foreign raw material, contended that the Canadian product was not suitable for manufacturing purposes. Others claimed that the raising of the duty would work to the detriment of the consumers. But events have shown, in the first place, that the Canadian product was quite suitable, since the output of tobaccco manufactured from the Canadian leaf has increased in a great proportion (of one thousand per cent, that is, from four hundred thousand pounds to five million pounds). Now, the judge as to this was the consumer himself; and if, as was claimed by certain manufacturers, the Canadian product had been worthless, such a result could not have been obtained.

Then, as regards the price of the manufactured article, I may state that in spite of the increase in the duty, the people have been enabled and are still at liberty to buy tobacco in all shapes at lower prices than those which they had to pay before the Canadian leaf was introduced into the manufacturing industry. The fact is easily explained. Owing to the difference of thirty cents per pound in favour of the products manufactured from the Canadian raw material, the manufacturer is in a position to sell tobacco manufactured from that leaf twenty-five cents per pound cheaper on the average than that manufactured from the raw material of foreign origin.

Some exception has been taken and may still be taken to the use of that tobacco on the ground of quality as compared with the foreign product; but the people, who after all are the sole judge in such matters, have decided in favour of the Canadian product. Of course, if the quality had been wanting, that tobacco would have entirely disppeared from the market, and we should not have witnessed the great increase which we find in its output.

However, we should not forget that customs enactments cannot by themselves make a future for that business, considered either from the industrial or from the agricultural point of view. Some people are prone to think that the growing of tobacco is a very simply thing and requires no special effort. That is a mistake; on the contrary, the growing of tobacco is a very complex form of special farming.

As an article of commerce, tobacco has more of the character of a manufactured than of an agricultural product; and if our growers have been slow in improving their methods, it is because they have never had an opportunity of posting themselves as to varied requirements of the industry which makes use of their product.

True, Canada is not in a position to supply all grades of tobacco; but it can produce a sufficient number of varieties to enable Canadian to rid our markets of the greater part of imported tobacco, whether for smoking or for cigar-making.

The requirements of these two industries vary greatly in character, and if heretofore cigar manufacturers have not given great encouragement to Canadian growers, it is

because our growers have not realized what are the particular needs of that industry and have not taken sufficient pains to turn out the article specially required.

I am aware that steps have been taken to spread the necessary information among tobacco growers, and I wish to thank the Honourable Mr. Fisher for his endeavours in that direction; but I hope that very soon we shall see these efforts become more systematic and thorough.

To my mind, we should, as in other countries, establish, in the midst of the tobacco-growing sections, stations under the management of experts whose duty it would be to spread a knowledge of the proper methods of handling the raw material and turning out a saleable product.

And by the word 'stations,' I do not mean to say that the government should necessarily erect, build up at its cost where experiments would be made, but I think it would act wisely in giving to the chief expert, Mr. Charland, three or four assistants, also experts who, at the very beginning of next season, who would reside in the tobacco-growing districts, where after having chosen a certain number of farms as fields of experimentation, would invite the tobacco growers in the neighbourhood to come and benefit by their experiments.

Under the guidance of these reliable men, the tobacco growers should as a whole, succeed in attaining a fair measure of success.

On the other hand, there is a part of the work which devolves naturally on the government. The regulations concerning the manufacturing of tobacco which, at the time of the tariff revision, in eighteen hundred and ninety-seven (1897) were amended in a practical and efficient way, in order to permit a mixture of the foreign-grown and the Canadian-grown tobaccos still oppose certain difficulties to the full development of the industry, as far as the Canadian product is concerned.

I refer particularly to the granting of special licenses for the manufacture of foreign tobaccos, mixed tobaccos and Canadian tobaccos exclusively, and to the separate marking of these products by means of labels of various colours in each case.

Such a state of things does not appear reasonable to me. The system would seem on the contrary rather calculated to depreciate the Canadian product in the eyes of the public, especially as, in certain parts of the country, there still exists against it prejudices which are entirely without foundation.

The colour of the stamp should not be regarded as a certificate of quality; thus, under the black stamp showing tobacco manufactured from foreign raw material, we meet with goods of a very inferior description, while on the other hand, the green stamp of the Canadian leaf sometimes covers the very best product, capable at least of giving entire satisfaction to any unprejudiced consumer; and this is most amply established by the statistics quoted by me at the beginning of my remarks. Why then should we maintain this system of distinction? For whom and in whose favour? Why should the department of Inland Revenue attempt to judge and classify the product?

The public should be the sole judge of its own taste; but the present system, far from favouring such an idea, leads people into the error of supposing that the foreign product is superior and into paying fifty per cent more for goods proved to be in no respect better than the Canadian article.

In concluding these remarks, I wish to observe that in my opinion the rational method would be so to amend the Inland Revenue Act as to place the manufacture of tobacco under the operation of the same license for each industrial classification, such as the manufacture of cigars, that of tobacco, &c., with a uniform stamp for each.

It seems to me that even from an administrative standpoint, such an arrangement would be useful for the purposes of controlling and collecting the revenue. But even were it otherwise, the latter consideration should not be allowed to counterbalance the great practical advantage which such a change would bring about.

I may add that as far as I am able to judge, new life might be given to this industry and increased confidence imparted to the capital engaged therein—not to mention the encouragement to agriculture—by again increasing the excise duty of foreign tobacco entering as raw material for industrial purposes.

This is a subject which cannot be too carefully studied. It is one of paramount importance and may effect the agricultural, manufacturing and financial interests of this country. I trust, therefore, that the government will lose no time in altering the Inland Revenue Act in the manner I have outlined.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques-Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the motion is carried, I desire to say a few words upon the subject treated by the hon. member for Joliette. This tobacco question is one of great interest to several counties in the province of Quebec, and I congratulate my hon. friend on the effort he has made to bring the matter before the government in the hope of inducing them to apply a prompt remedy to what is, in my opinion, a real grievance in that province. I listened with interest to the statistical data submitted to the House by the hon. member, while much regretting that, in the present state of the question, he has limited his motion to a request for papers; he has thus been led into the academic discussion a question which has passed that stage, being a grievance of which we have long complained in the

province of Quebec and demanded redress by the amendment of the Inland Revenue Act. We know all about the correspondence; my hon. friend from Joliette has perused it as I have. What we want is the remedy. We ask that the repeated representations made to the government be carried into effect. Since the beginning of the session the question has been put in a much more practical form than it was to-day. I requested of the Minister of Inland Revenue to state—and several members supported me—what changes would be made? What was the answer? The Minister of Inland Revenue simply replied:—Under consideration. Well! we have passed that stage, and I hope in the face of the numerous petitions and representations addressed to the Minister of Inland Revenue, we have a right to expect a clear statement of the government's policy, and to know in what they intend to meet the just claims of those who have suffered so long from the present state of things. The development of the tobacco industry, of which my hon. friend from Joliette made such seasonable mention, shows that we can no longer tolerate in our excise law any such invidious distinction as between foreign tobacco and our own, a discrimination to which the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) formerly minister of Inland Revenue, promised several years ago, to put an end. I say that we are deeply interested in this industry, those of us at least in whose constituencies tobacco is cultivated. It is a paying crop, as everybody knows. In those years when tobacco reaches its normal price of from eight to ten cents per pound, as much as one hundred dollars may be got out of every acre under cultivation. In my county, in a good many others of the province of Quebec, and in several of the Ontario counties, some people depend almost entirely upon this crop. Their land is not extensive, they may have some ten acres planted, and when tobacco sells at a reasonable figure, they are enabled to earn their livelihood and maintain their families in comfort. I mention this because it appears to me to be the duty of the government to help farmers of limited means. There should be no delay in redressing the grievances complained of and which cannot be soothed by empty words. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that this motion, to have been effective, should have asked for something more than the mere correspondence, because the latter is already well known to us. We are all aware—and the hon. member for Joliette knows it perhaps still better than I do—that the representations made to the government have been unanimous and all in the same direction. If we would really encourage this branch of agriculture and promote the greater development of the tobacco industry, we must do more than the government has done so far. Justice must be meted out to those who demand uniform stamps of a uniform colour and that the branding of the home product in such a manner as to impede its sale should be stopped. We must do what has been done in the United States to encourage the cultivation of tobacco in several states, in Connecticut, in Virginia and specially in Wisconsin, whose territory stands much further north than the two former. Enormous sacrifices have been made to improve the methods of cultivating, drying and curing tobacco, and most marvellous results have followed. But for all this a little money must be spent. My hon. friend from Joliette has shown us in what direction we should work. He has suggested experimental stations, not very numerous, it is true, but well equipped and under competent directors. In Connecticut $30,000,000 were spent to improve the cultivation of tobacco and secure the results which obtain to-day to the advantage of the people at large. The product is quite different from the tobacco grown before the adoption of new methods. To those states tobacco planting has become an important source of revenue. Belgium and Holland purchase this tobacco for state controlled consumption in those countries. To secure such results the best methods of growing, reaping, curing, packing and shipping must be followed. Some time ago the Canadian government sent a gentleman—I do not remember his name—on a journey to Europe with a few samples of our tobacco. He finally reported to the government, but proceedings had to be taken in this House to obtain communication of it. It has not been printed or distributed. That gentleman, a competent man, stated in his report that our tobacco, even upon the ill-cured, ill-prepared and badly packed samples placed in his hands, had been very favourably received on the continent of Europe. In England, I think it was at Liverpool, a large tobacco manufacturer told him that if this tobacco were properly cured, we might easily sell our entire crop. He was also told, I think, in Belgium and Holland, that the tobacco was good and of good substance, and that if properly cured, prepared and packed it would be easily disposed of. Did we act upon the results of this experimental journey made at the country's expense? I think not. I know that the Minister of Agriculture employed for some time in his department a French expert for the purpose of developing tobacco cultivation. The gentleman was heard before the committee. At that time he had only just begun his work. Have the suggestions made by this Mr. Charland—I think that was his name—been carried out? I do not believe they have, and I am informed that the gentleman has not got beyond experimenting. We require not only an early alteration of the Inland Revenue Act in fairness to our growers and manufacturers of Canadian

tobacco, so that there shall be no difference, from a fiscal point of view, between them and the manufacturers of foreign tobacco, but also the prompt establishment of experimental stations as suggested by my hon. friend from Joliette.

Why should we not incur the yearly expenditure of perhaps $20,000 to secure the service of two or three competent experts from Connecticut, for example, men of tried methods who would direct the experimental stations under government control. The cultivation of the plant is worth it. Those $20,000 would give extraordinary agricultural and commercial results, especially in respect of exportation to Europe. The report now before us justifies this view. The problem to be solved is not only how the plant should be cultivated, but also how it should be prepared for export. I say therefore that considering the profitable nature of the crop and the large number of poor families having but a few acres of land to live on who raise it, the results would be out of all proportion with such a moderate expenditure. Why, Mr. Speaker, we frequently spend twenty-five, thirty, forty and fifty thousand dollars to build wharfs that crumble under the pressure of the first spring tide. We erect public buildings in places where they are not even asked for, for the vain-glorious satisfaction of the representatives of certain ridings. Why not therefore employ a few thousand dollars in developing an industry which must give such immense returns? To sum up my opinion, I say that we should first of all amend the Inland Revenue Act, and I hope that we will hear the Minister of Inland Revenue declare to-day that the changes asked for shall be made in the course of the present session.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago my attention was called to this tobacco question by some of the growers of tobacco in Western Ontario. I made some inquiry into it and I found that they have a substantial grievance not only in regard to any encouragement which the government might give them in the cultivation of tobacco, but, as they stated, the laws in connection with the manufacture of tobacco, under the Inland Revenue Department, are hardly fair to them. I would like the minister to make some kind of an explanation to-day and give an answer to the complaint of the tobacco growers of the west. They say that they cannot continue in the business under the present regulations and certainly it would appear to me that they have a grievance. They represent a large portion of the farming community which has it in its power to develop a very important industry if it can get sufficient encouragement. There is no reason why Canada should not raise the great bulk of her tobacco. The government should take into consideration the grievance of these people and try to do something to ameliorate the conditions that at present exist.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Will my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) be kind enough to tell me to what regulations he alludes—and what are the grievances ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I had the correspondence a while ago and I will try and look it up and send it to the minister. The whole matter was very fully set out in the press. All the tobacco growers gave their experience. I will give the correspondence to the minister.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, as I represent a constituency where they grow really first-class tobacco and out of which Mr. Charlan, the expert of the Department of Agriculture, after visiting that constituency, states that they can make cigars almost equal to the best Havana cigars, I am very glad that my hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Dubeau) has introduced this resolution. I regretted very much that I was unable to follow him, but before the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) replies I wish to say that the tobacco growers in my constituency are not satisfied with the present regulations. They believe that they are handicapped by these regulations. They are anxious that the numerous stamps that are now being used in connection with the Inland Revenue Department should be abolished and that only one stamp should be used for all cigars manufactured in Canada. They are also anxious that the regulations should be so amended as to absolutely abolish the system of rebates on clippings which has been in force under the present regulations for some time back. Tobacco growing is a very important industry, in so far as British Columbia is concerned, it is becoming more important each year, and I hope that the Minister of Inland Revenue, in the legislation which, I understand, he is about to introduce into the House, will so amend the present regulations as to give greater encouragement to tobacco growers.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I was not able to follow my hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Dubeau) and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I want to congratulate my hon. friend from Joliette upon moving the resolution. I am sure that in so far as my remarks are concerned on the tobacco question at the present moment they may appear to be somewhat monotonous to this House. But this is a very important question; it is one that this government should deal with and I regret that they have not dealt with it long ago. This is a question which affects a very large section of the farming community in the western part of Ontario, which I have the

honour to represent. I do not know how the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) intends to amend the existing regulations, if he does intend to amend them, but what I ask is that he shall give the Canadian farmers a chance to grow tobacco in Canada for the Canadian market. One of the largest tobacco growers in Kent told me only last Saturday that he was compelled to sell a magnificent crop of 38,000 pounds at from 3 to 6 cents a pound. I say to the minister and to every man in this House who knows anything about growing tobacco that no farmer can grow tobacco at that price. Canadian farmers can grow tobacco equal to any that can be grown in any part of the United States, but if you want tobacco to be grown in Canada you must give the Canadian farmer proper protection. I care not how it is given to him, but you must give him sufficient encouragement to enable him to establish proper buildings for the curing of tobacco, which is the most important point in connection with the production of Canadian tobacco. If the tobacco is cured under proper conditions we can produce tobacco of a quality sufficiently good to make cigars equal to the best demanded by any ordinary man in Canada. I again congratulate the hon. member for Joliette upon having brought this question up before the House. As I have spoken several times on this question I am sure the minister knows my views in so far as our Canadian farmers are concerned, and I sincerely hope that he will acquiesce in the wish not only of the mover of the resolution, but of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. L. ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). Mr. Speaker, I think it would not be right for me to allow this question to pass without saying a few words in regard to it as it is a question which is of interest in the riding that I have the honour to represent. I think that perhaps the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) did not do tice to the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Dubeau) in stating a few moments ago that the motion was not formulated properly and also in seeking to convey the idea that the motion had been brought in too late in the session. My hon. friend from Joliette asked a question of the government about 2nd of December as to the government's intention regarding this question, and as the answer was of a general nature naturally he made this motion to-day asking for further particulars and calling for the papers and documents. I do not think it was quite right for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to take as a subject of criticism the attitude which the government appear to have taken on this matter. I have been studying this question somewhat in my riding and I find that there are different parties who are curing tobacco and who seem to be doing it pretty successfully because many buyers from Montreal come down and buy preferably the tobacco of some of the growers in my riding as well as of the growers of Joliette and the surrounding parts of the country. I remember that one day I even attempted to enunciate a proposition to the farmers of my own riding and that was the formation of a company which would establish some kind of a curing station to be operated under the supervision of a government expert. The company would pay half the salary of the government expert, the government would pay the difference and they would utilize the services and knowledge of the experts. There would be a series of conferences in the counties in which they would like to cultivate tobacco. As soon as the farmers of these counties had been enlightened as to the best method of sowing and cultivating tobacco, the company would buy in the open market the tobacco in which had been grown and bring it into this special establishment and curing there with the aid of an expert so as to arrive at the best method of producing a superior article in the least expensive way. I was in Montreal during the recess and I had occasion to meet one of the largest cigar manufacturers in Canada. Being interested in this tobacco question he brought it up during the course of our conversation. He gave me a few pointers which, I think, if put into practice, would perhaps remove the present difficulty. It was from a purely business standpoint that this gentleman was speaking. He claimed that in order to induce Canadian manufacturers of cigars to give a preference to Canadian tobacco for filling there should be an advantage given under the excise regulations, and he also asserted that if the government would levy a customs tariff on foreign tobacco the place of which could be taken by Canadian tobacco, reducing slightly the excise duties on Canadian tobacco which could be used for filling, the result would be most beneficial to the Canadian tobacco industry. This gentleman suggested that if both the customs and excise duties were put on an equal footing giving free to the cigar manufacturers their strippings made of Canadian tobacco granting them thereby an inducement, it might be satisfactory for the present, and he further stated to me that if a sympathetic feeling were created in favour of Canadian tobacco it would be used in the manufacture of cigars only if there is an advantage in the cost price for producing and that there were many manufacturers in the United States who would bring capital to Canada and establish factories here. These companies would also engage in the work of educating the farmers in the methods of properly growing and caring for the tobacco plant; they would buy in a green state direct from the farmers cure it properly, and devote to the Canadian tobacco in-

dustry the knowledge they had acquired by years of experience in Wisconsin and Connecticut, and other states of the Union. I do not think the government would be under any financial burden in this respect, although perhaps a subsidy might be given to be applied towards the education of our farmers in tobacco culture. This prominent cigar manufacturer to whom I have referred, has told me that if no inducement is offered to Canadian manufacturers they will always prefer the imported tobacco for the reason that the foreign tobacco is better prepared than is the Canadian tobacco under present circumstances, and further, that the manufacturer is under a great disadvantage should he try to supplant foreign tobacco by Canadian tobacco in the market. I am led to believe that cigars filled with Canadian tobacco can be manufactured and sold cheaper than can cigars made of imported tobacco, and although at the start the Canadian cigars may be inferior, as time goes on they will prove to be equal if not superior to the imported article.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation.) As a representative of a county which is as essentially agricultural as the county of Montcalm, where tobacco-growing is a specialty, I wish to express my most hearty concurrence in the remarks of the honourable members for Joliette and Jacques Cartier. Undoubtedly the production of the papers asked for by the hon. member for Joliette is most timely, inasmuch as it will allow those hon. gentlemen who, not being familiar with the French language, are unable to appreciate the suggestions which he has made in his speech, to find in that correspondence and those papers the grounds which justify the proposition he is now making with a view to giving a new impulse to the culture of tobacco and the development of our native industry.

I coincide with the opinion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that the tobacco question has reached such a stage as to induce the government to take more efficient steps in order to secure for the Canadian farmers who engage in that industry all the benefits they may derive from it.

As early as 1897, at the time of the readjustment of the tariff, the government gave their best attention to that new-born industry, by raising the duty on foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed or unstemmed, to 10 cents per pound, which resulted in a great impulse being given to that industry. Since that duty of 10 cents was imposed on foreign raw leaf tobacco, our tobacco-growing industry in Canada has flourished wonderfully, and I may say in this connection, that in the county of Two Mountains, not to mention any other centres, whereas before 1897, our sales of tobacco amounted only to four or five thousand dollars a year, we now put on the market from ten to twelve thousand dollars' worth of tobacco every year. It goes without saying that this situation results from the readjustment of the tariff just referred to.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) referred a little while ago to the agents sent over to Belgium, one of them, Mr. Dugas, of Saint-Jacques l'Achigan, being recognized as an expert, in order to place on the foreign markets samples of our tobacco. My hon. friend called our attention to the fact that this tobacco, not cured, not packed, not prepared as tobacco should be, and being thereby in a state of manifest inferiority, did none the less obtain a most favourable reception from Belgian and Dutch dealers, men of great responsibility, who encouraged the exportation of our tobacco to European markets.

Unfortunately, in the province of Quebec, as also in the province of Ontario, we lack the services of such experts as might give our farmers an up-to-date training in regard to the curing and packing of tobacco, so as to enable them to prepare for the market as good a tobacco as may be grown in Wisconsin, Connecticut and elsewhere.

Our farmers are very willing men, but they lack method and experience, and I think that if we had the suggested experimental stations exclusively devoted to the cultivation of tobacco, under the direction of competent men, the whole farming community and the manufacturers themselves would be greatly benefited thereby.

There is a grievance of pretty long standing, which was particularly urged upon the attention of the government last year. I refer to the uniformity of stamps asked for. We have seen numerous delegations waiting upon the government from the counties of Montcalm and Joliette, with that end in view. The farming community are in favour of that uniformity, and a good many manufacturers who would like to see that industry grow and prosper, are also in favour of the same. Therefore, I believe that within a reasonable time, the government will deem it their duty to comply with the wishes of the interested parties.

Indeed, the government has already done a great deal to promote the growth of the tobacco industry. We have all witnessed the exertions put forth by the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur), when he was Minister of Inland Revenue, to stifle at its birth the trust of the American Tobacco Company. We have also witnessed his success.

Judging from what is taking place in the United States, and from the troubles existing in those states which that trust holds in its clutches, and which are ransacked by it, we should congratulate the Dominion Government for having nipped the evil in the bud in Canada.

Before resuming my seat, I wish to say further that from their accession to power up to this very day, the government have never hesitated to redress grievances, and

I have not the least doubt that, after having heard the representations made to them, they will amend the law as it stands, and even if necessary, they will not hesitate even to amend the tariff, by raising the duty on foreign tobacco, so as to allow our native industry not only to maintain its position on our domestic market, but also to hold a preponderating place on the foreign markets.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a tobacco-growing county I wish to express my concurrence in the desire that has been expressed that special attention be given to the very important question of the tobacco industry of Canada. The riding which I have the honour to represent is perhaps as much interested in this question as in any question which could be discussed in this House. Tobacco has been grown in the south-western peninsula of Ontario from time to time for the past two hundred years, which is a pretty good tribute to the adaptation of the soil for the growth of tobacco. I believe that the Tobacco Nation of Indians grew tobacco in Western Ontario a great many years ago. In the last ten years, however, there has been more progress made in the growth of Canadian tobacco than at any other period in its history, and instead of the government being censurable I think it is entitled to commendation for the steps it has taken to build up this business. In 1897 the government put a customs duty of ten cents a pound on tobacco. That, I think, has done very much to promote the growth of Canadian tobacco. Whereas there were perhaps 500,000 pounds of Canadian tobacco grown and manufactured ten years ago, there is to-day an annual output of 5,000,000 pounds and the industry has been so profitable in some years that as much as twelve cents a pound has been obtained. In the present year, I regret to say, there is more or less stagnation. The Empire Tobacco Company, the principal manufacturer of Canadian leaf, say that their warehouses are full owing to the large crops during the last three or four years, and this year the demand for Canadian leaf has not been equal to the production, and for that reason the prices have not been as good as they were during the three or four years previous. I believe that a great deal of the imported tobacco could be replaced by Canadian-grown tobacco. It is grown successfully in British Columbia, in the Okanagan Valley, and it has long been been grown in the province of Quebec as well as in the southwestern counties of Ontario. All who are interested in this question are, I think, unanimous in the opinion that the present stamp regulation, which has been in existence for many years, is an obstacle to the growth of the industry, and that there should be only one stamp. I hope the government will do something to remove that grievance. Another matter which I think ought to receive the attention of the government is the perfecting of the growth and maturing of the leaf. A great many manufacturers in Canada will have nothing to do with Canadian tobacco. I think they are prejudiced unnecessarily against it, but what they say is that it has not the proper flavour, not being properly grown or cured. If that is so, it is a matter which requires some experimenting. This might take two or three years, but even if it took ten years, and the country had to employ a high-priced man, who was acquainted with the methods of curing in other countries, to apply those methods to the industry in this country, the money would be well spent. No doubt there will be an opportunity for further discussion when the Bill is introduced. At the present time I merely wish to say that the matter deserves all the attention which the government can give to it.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member who has just taken his seat has struck the key-note of the whole matter. I do not think it makes much difference what kind of stamp we use for Canadian tobacco. The whole secret of success in bringing that tobacco into larger use will be the curing of it so as to impart to it a flavour equal to that of the tobacco which the great bulk of the people of Canada are now using—a flavour similar to that of Tuckett's in Hamilton or Macdonald's in Montreal. It would pay to spend a very large sum of money to secure this. Until a better flavour is obtained for Canadian tobacco, I do not think that all the regulations which this government can propound or enforce will bring that tobacco into general use. The objection to the tobacco is not that it is Canadian. We would prefer to use it because it is Canadian, but the objection is that it is not presented to the public with that agreeable flavour which those who use tobacco desire. I have made this statement in the House on previous occasions when the question of tobacco culture came up, and I wish to emphasize it now. It devolves on the minister who is in charge of this department to see that every possible means is taken for securing a flavour in the Canadian grown tobacco that will accord with the tastes of the Canadian people. I cannot understand why Canadian tobacco could not be made just as pleasant in flavour as American leaf grown possibly in the same latitude. Is it possible that the Americans have a secret which we have not? Is it possible that they have discovered a means of curing tobacco which is unknown to Canadians? Then, surely a government which is capable of all kinds of corruption should be able to corrupt some American by bribing him to give to the Canadian people this

secret. I press this upon the minister in charge, and I say as a user of tobacco for over fifty years that I am quite sure he will never succeed in getting Canadian tobacco generally used in Canada until he accomplishes what the hon. member for South Essex has suggested.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate my hon. friend from Joliette for having brought forward the motion which is now before this House, and especially having accompanied his motion with so remarkable a speech.

The tobacco question engaged my attention, when I sat as a member in this House, even before holding the portfolio of Inland Revenue. I further gave it my attention when I assumed the direction of that department.

Allow me first, Sir, to reply briefly to an astonishing remark fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, when he endeavoured to convince this House that the present government had done nothing for the encouragement of the culture of tobacco.

Mr. MONK (Translation). It is not what I said.

Mr. BRODEUR. I stated that the hon. member had suggested so. I am glad to see he acknowledges that the government has done something and even a great deal.

Mr. MONK. Not a great deal.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I shall endeavour to satisfy him that the government has done a great deal to promote that industry, and the results obtained so far are really surprising. My hon. friend will remember that previous to our coming to power—I recall the fact because he has thought fit to question the beneficial results of this government's policy—my hon. friend will remember that previous to our coming to power, in 1896, there had been forwarded to the late government numerous petitions requesting that a duty be imposed on the foreign leaf. On several occasions, delegations, not only from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but from other provinces as well, proceeded to Ottawa with a view to obtaining that something further be done towards promoting the growing of tobacco. Now, these petitions have invariably been ignored. The late government has made no effort to comply with these requests; far from it, it seems that no heed whatever was taken of them.

I need not insist on the importance of tobacco growing, especially in the older provinces. To-day the grain crops which used to be grown in these older provinces are produced almost exclusively in the West. The export trade of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec used to consist mainly of such products as are now exported by our friends in the western provinces, who have got ahead of us in this respect. It is up to us, therefore, to encourage new farming industries better adapted to the conditions of the older provinces, I mean the maritime provinces, Quebec and Ontario.

It seems advisable that intensive farming be taken up, and the growing of tobacco falls in that class. Of late years, we have made great progress in market gardening, as well as in the production of butter and cheese.

Tobacco growing is one of those Canadian industries which seemed to call particularly for encouragement on the part of the government. The late administration failed to realize the fact, but the present government has shown greater wisdom in this respect. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if we compare the output of tobacco in 1896 with the output to-day, as evidenced by departmental statistics, we find that 500,000 pounds represented the total amount of tobacco produced or manufactured in 1896.

Mr. MONK. It was much larger than that.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend states that it was much larger.

Mr. MONK. I mean that the amount of tobacco produced was much larger than that.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am referring to the quantity manufactured and regarding which we have reliable data. I am well aware that there is being sold some leaf tobacco, which has never passed through a factory. Now, according to the statistics we have in hand, it would appear that in 1896 the output of Canadian tobacco amounted to 500,000 pounds, while to-day the following figures are given in the report just issued form the Department of Inland Revenue:—

Cigars.	1905.	1906.	1907.
Canadian tobacco.. .. ..lbs.	2,262,400	1,167,600	1,178,870
Blend. . . . . .lbs.	7,221,760	9,265,405	7,002,774
Cigarettes.			
Blend. . . . . .lbs.	8,350,330	6,950,989	8,290,950
Canadian tobacco. . . . .lbs.	3,107,827	3,172,466	2,261,377
Blend.... .. ..lbs.	1,878,738	1,905,742	1,474,709

That statement is to be found at pages 22 and and 23 of this year's report.

As will be seen, the measure adopted since our advent to power, enabling manufacturers to blend foreign and Canadian tobaccos, has been very effective.

The figures I have just quoted, Mr. Speaker, are evidence that the growing of Canadian tobacco has made rapid strides, the enacting of a duty of ten cents per pound on foreign tobacco having put the Canadian grower in a better position to hold his ground against the foreign producer.

Moreover, the government have promoted by all means the growth of the best possible quality of tobacco. At my suggestion, my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) secured the services of an expert, who was then in the employ of the French government. That gentleman, who is very well up in the subject, has been with us for a couple of years and I hope we will be able to keep him many years more to instruct our farmers and our manufacturers as to the best means of turning out a good article.

I admit that the criticism made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is warranted as regards the past. It must be acknowledged that our tobacco was not, a few years ago, as good as might have been expected. But considerable headway has since been made, and I have no hesitation in saying that to-day we are turning out a quality of tobacco equal to the foreign brands. So much so, that I know a goodly number of manufacturers who to-day are using Canadian tobacco for the manufacture of the foreign article. They even go to the extent of paying the duty of 25 cents per pound on the Canadian weed for the purpose of blending it with the foreign article and offer it—possibly to my hon. friend from Halton—as imported tobacco, bearing as it does the black stamp.

The suggestions made by the hon. members for Jolliette and Jacques Cartier and several others in this House, as regards the advisability of having uniform stamps, do not seem to me as entailing serious difficulties, and the question is worthy of consideration on the part of the government.

As the House is aware, last year, when the hon. Minister of Finance brought down his revised tariff, it was suggested that some changes would be made to the Inland Revenue Act. However, for reasons known to the House, the session had to be cut short. But I trust and I am in a position to give the assurance that this year the government will bring down a measure to that effect. I am not at liberty to state just now what these changes will be. I repeat it, however, a Bill will be introduced this year with a view to amending the Inland Revenue Act, especially in so far as it relates to the question of tobacco.

I do not propose enlarging any further on what the government have accomplished towards promoting that industry; but I may say in conclusion that they have endeavoured to find out the best means of developing and improving that industry in the past, and if anything remains to be done, they will not hesitate to comply with the wishes of the people concerned.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I suppose the French press of our hon. friends opposite will attack me bitterly for not speaking to this motion in my mother tongue, but through courtesy to my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) and the majority of the House, who would not understand me if I did, I shall address the House in English though I should much prefer to speak in French.

This question of encouraging the cultivation of Canadian tobacco has become part of the political stock in trade of hon. gentlemen opposite, but that was not always the case, as I propose to show later on. We heard a good deal of this question the other day during the by-elections. Some remarks have been made to-day by some of my hon. friends from the other provinces, which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has not answered. There seems to be an understanding on both sides of the House that something requires to be done in this matter of stamps, but I hardly think that the reply just made by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) can be satisfactory even to the minister himself. If I understood well what the hon. minister said, it seems that the colour of the stamp is intended to deceive the consumers. It is intended to lead the man who buys tobacco with a black stamp on it to imagine he is smoking imported tobacco. That is the kind of trick which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) plays on my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). My hon. friend buys a piece of tobacco with a black stamp on it and imagines he is smoking imported tobacco, whereas he is smoking instead Canadian tobacco. That convinces me that something has to be done in this stamp matter. We have suffered a great deal in our province from lack of proper protection to the cultivation of Canadian tobacco. This is no new question in this House. In 1878 a gentleman who sat then on the left of the Speaker, and who is to-day Senator Bolduc, made a motion calling on the government, of which my right hon. friend was a member, to do something to encourage this industry. At that time the majority of the House, composed of Liberals, were very much opposed to the cultivation of Canadian tobacco—not only the Liberal members from the other provinces, but also from the province of Quebec. My right hon. friend himself was one of these. On the 23rd of April, 1878, in answer to the remarks of Senator Bolduc, who wanted the government to encourage the growth of Canadian tobacco, my right hon. friend, who was then Minister of Inland Revenue and, I presume, not more of a smoker then than he is to-day, opposed that motion. He said :—

He did not know to what point the two propositions were compatible. He could not see how the cultivation of Canadian tobacco, and the importation of foreign tobacco could be equally encouraged. . . . Was this country adapted to the cultivation of tobacco?. . Was it possible to maintain seriously that Canada could ever produce enough of this article to

enable it to be exported? It was well known that, above all in the province of Quebec, and in the maritime provinces, and also in Ontario, we could not produce tobacco which could enter into successful competition with the foreign-grown article. We produced an inferior quality of tobacco, which was used for local purposes.

It would hardly do for any of the right hon. gentleman's friends to repeat that statement to-day on the stump in the province of Quebec. Or if any one on this side were to say in the province of Quebec that the right hon. gentleman had ever used such language, there would be a thousand voices raised to deny that he had ever said anything of the kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but he has learned the contrary since then.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman then went on to say :

The agricultural class was frugal and economical, and it produced tobacco for its own consumption; but, on the other hand, it was equally certain that it was perfectly impossible to raise in Canada tobacco which could enter into successful competition with the foreign article, for the simple reason that we had not the climatic conditions necessary to its growth.

Climatic conditions in the province of Quebec must have changed greatly since that time.

The province of Quebec, above all, and all the provinces east of Quebec, could not raise tobacco on a considerable scale, for the simple reason that their climatic conditions were not proper to the growth of this plant, which was excessively sensible to such conditions. Again, our seasons were too short to permit its successful cultivation. Spring was too late, and autumn came too soon; and under the best possible climatic conditions, the tobacco which we cultivated could never attain maturity.

I do not want to detain the House any longer quoting this remarkable speech of my right hon. friend. I have quoted sufficient to show that he was then very much opposed to anything being done to promote the cultivation of tobacco, and the ground he took was that it was impossible to grow in the province of Quebec tobacco which could be smoked by anybody except its frugal economical farmers. The late Mr. Laflamme, who represented the county of Jacques Cartier, and who was then Minister of Justice, went still further. He spoke as follows :—

He contended that tobacco was not a natural legitimate product of Canada, and those who had entered into its cultivation on a large scale had, with rare exceptions, found it to be a ruinous production. The revenue on tobacco was indispensable to the administration, and could not be replaced in any other manner. In fact the duty ought to be raised, as this weed was injurious to the health of those who indulged in it.

Mr. BERGERON.

No doubt he meant Canadian tobacco was injurious to those who used it. I mention this to show that hon. gentlemen opposite in former Liberal administrations and their friends were very much opposed to the encouragement of the cultivation of Canadian tobacco, and if that industry has since flourished it is in spite of their opposition. It was the Conservative party which in its tariff of 1879, took the first step to encourage that great industry, and that step was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite by every means possible. We had to fight against their opposition on that question during the entire eighteen years we were in power. Whenever we wanted to encourage the cultivation of Canadian tobacco, we had to meet their most determined opposition. But when they came into power, they felt compelled to keep up the same tariff which we had introduced and only made some changes in the regulations. Yet after eleven years experience, their own friends from Essex and Joliette to-day tell them that their regulations are still inadequate. I believe, as we have always done on this side, that we can grow Canadian tobacco just as good as that which is imported, provided we take the precaution to cure it properly. I will go further and say that even to-day, although our native tobacco is not as well cured as it might be, those who smoke it say it is the best grown and will never smoke anything else.

An hon. MEMBER. They all die.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is a case of sudden death.

Mr. BERGERON. I strongly approve of the position taken by the hon. members for Joliette and Essex and would urge the government to do something else besides making promises. I would urge them not to confine themselves to making speeches on the hustings but to do something practical. We send out of Canada millions of dollars every year for the purchase of foreign tobacco, which money ought to remain in the country. Since our people will smoke and since we can produce in this country as good tobacco as any imported, why not encourage the cultivation of our own product ? Although I do not believe it is absolutely necessary that an expert should be appointed to find out the best way of curing tobacco, still I am in favour of doing everything possible to encourage the growth and the curing of our own product.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). I regret that a good deal of this discussion has taken place in a language with which I am not familiar. But I am very much obliged to my friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) for having for my special benefit, addressed the House in my own language. I am not familiar with what happened thirty years ago in this business, and I am afraid I cannot say

anything to relieve the hon. gentleman of his difficulty. However, this is an age of advancement and improvement, and, even in the question of tobacco and its growth in Canada, the conditions and opportunities are receiving, and have been for a considerable time receiving the very serious attention of the Department of Inland Revenue. I have been a smoker of cigars for many years, and I know that the numerous labels put on cigar boxes are a detriment to some extent to the native-grown article. If the adoption of one uniform label will place the tobacco growers of Canada in a better position than that they now occupy, for my part I know of no good reason why we should not have one uniform label. I agree also with the remarks of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that much may be done in instructing the tobacco growers of Canada in the best methods of growing and curing tobacco. One of the great difficulties is that the tobacco is not properly cured. I feel sure that Canada, particularly my own province of British Columbia, can grow as good tobacco as may be grown on the continent of America, excepting, possibly, the island of Cuba. I believe my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) intimated that this question was receiving the attention of the department and that we hoped, before the present session is over, to introduce a measure amending the Inland Revenue Act along the line proposed in the discussion here to-day. Just what that Bill will be it is premature for me to say; but I hope that, before many weeks have passed, we shall be in a position to announce to the House a measure that will, to a considerable extent at any rate, remove the difficulties under which the tobacco growers of Canada are said now to be labouring. There can be no objection, I take it, to the motion.

Mr. MONK. I desire to move a short amendment, which, I think, will be accepted by my hon. friend (Mr. Dubeau)——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Monk) having already spoken, is not in order.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I move :

That the following words be added to the motion: ' and that in the opinion of this House all revenue stamps to be used on Canadian tobacco should be of the same colour.'

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I submit for your opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is not in order, as not being germane to the motion before the House. The motion does not involve a question of policy but simply a question of the production of papers.

Mr. MONK. Speaking to the point of order, I may say I examined that point before preparing the motion, and I submit that the amendment is quite in order. I am very much surprised that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should raise this point. The amendment is to give effect to the wish expressed by every hon. member who has spoken in this debate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But this is not the orderly method of doing it.

Mr. MONK. I think the explanation is in the citation given by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). Evidently, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is opposed to what we want. The motion is—

For copies of all documents, petitions, memoranda and correspondence received by the government since 1904, to this day, regarding the amendments to be made to the Inland Revenue Act for the purpose of encouraging and protecting still more the Canadian tobacco industry.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a motion for papers merely.

Mr. MONK. There is my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) also opposing this. Does he coincide in the raising of this point of order ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly. I say that this proposed amendment is not germane to the motion. The motion is simply for the production of documents, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) seeks, by this proposed amendment, to declare a policy.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) interrupted me; I had not finished. I was explaining my point of view. It is very strange, considering that the object of the amendment is to incorporate into this motion an expression of the wishes of the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Dubeau)—and, I think, quite in accordance with the rules of order—that we should find two ministers trying to have it ruled out. But, upon the point of order : it will be seen that the papers asked for relate to amendments of the ' Act for the purpose of encouraging and protecting still more the Canadian tobacco industry.' My hon. friend (Mr. Dubeau) has stated, and every one of us has echoed his opinion, and the memoranda asked for, particularly and above all things, that the stamps should be made of a uniform colour. Will it be pretended for a moment that that which interprets the very wish expressed in these memoranda is not germane to the motion ? Why, it is giving practical effect to that which these memoranda contain. I submit that the amendment is germane; and I think it is extremely surprising to find my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) opposing it. But we have in the quotation given by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that the right hon. gentleman is opposed to the encouragement of the Canadian tobacco trade. And my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has also objected, though protesting that they wish to render justice to the Canadian tobacco growers.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that the point of order is well taken. The practice is pretty well laid down by Bourinot that an amendment must be relevant to the motion proposed to be amended. In this case, the motion appears to be merely for the bringing down of certain documents and the proposed amendment is in the nature of a declaration of policy on a question. I think the amendment will hardly be considered to be relevant, and so I feel called upon to rule that it is out of order. The question, therefore is upon the motion.

Motion (Mr. Dubeau) agreed to.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Mr. F. D. MONK moved :

That a select committee of this House composed of seven members be named to take into consideration the proposed convention respecting commercial relations between Canada and France laid upon the table of the House on November 28 last, with the view of ascertaining to what extent the said commercial arrangement will result in an increase of trade between the two countries.

That the said committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records, and to employ a shorthand writer to take down such evidence as the committee deem necessary; and that the said evidence be printed from day to day for the use of the said committee, and that ruly 72 be suspended in relation thereto.

He said : The object of this motion is to obtain the nomination of a special committee for the purpose of looking carefully into the French treaty, which is to be taken up by the House, and making a report as to how far the conditions of that treaty are favourable to Canadian trade. At the time the news of the conclusion of the treaty reached Canada, the treaty was shown to us through the organs of the government—in Montreal at any rate—as one of the most extraordinary strokes of policy that had ever been carried out by any government in this country.

I believe I am expressing the sentiments of everybody throughout the country, perhaps more particularly in the province of Quebec, when I say that we were all pleased to know that we were going to conclude a treaty with France, the country of origin of many of us, and a country at present on special terms of friendship with Great Britain, and tokens of that friendship having passed from one of the great nations to the other on several occasions quite lately. But at the same time we were not prepared, in the province of Quebec, for the extravagant demonstration which greeted the ministers on their return from France. Those of us who reside in the province of Quebec know that the whole fleet of government steamers, if I am not mistaken, was put into requisition to go down and meet these gentlemen in the gulf. There must have been, in connection with the triumphal procession which accompanied the ministers up the gulf to Quebec and from Quebec to the home of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a considerable expenditure of money. For my part it seemed to me at that time that as the treaty was not yet known in any sense, not yet confirmed, not having been brought to the knowledge of parliament and of the nation, it was almost an absurd manifestation, involving as it did so great an expense to the country, before we knew in reality what these gentlemen had done. Members of the House know that the conclusion of a commercial convention between nations is an every-day occurrence, it passes almost without observation among the nations of Europe and the civilized nations of other countries, because it is so frequent. Unless the convention contains some extraordinary and epoch making conditions, there is not much attention paid to it. It was in 1898, I think that Mr. Kasson, on behalf of the United States, concluded an important commercial convention with France. He came back quietly to New York, went to his office, and we find no trace whatever of such a triumph as that which surrounded the two ministers when they returned from France.

Naturally the people were led to ask what were the extraordinary advantages guaranteed by this treaty. Of course in that respect, whilst the triumph, the torchlight processions and the addresses at the landing stations proceeded, nobody was any wiser, because nobody knew what the proposed treaty contained. I noticed that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance switched off from the procession at Quebec, I think, and went away to his native province, or came to Ottawa; at any rate, he disappeared from the triumphal procession and left the honour to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, at every stage, was presented with an address congratulating the government on the extraordinary treaty just concluded with France, and more particularly on having obtained, for the first time since Canada became a nation, the right to conclude its own treaties. You can open every paper published in the province of Quebec, in the ministerial interest, and you will find that this great point was made salient in the addresses. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had at last bravely and courageously revendicated in England and before the face of Europe the right of Canada to conclude her own treaties, and he had succeeded in concluding a great and marvellous treaty with France. He had met with great difficulties, but had triumphed over them all. At first the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who had just arrived from Europe, did not know how to meet these demonstrations ; whether he knew that the contention was absurd, or what the reason was, I noticed that in replying to the first addresses he was extremely modest. But towards the close of the

triumphal procession, when he came to his own native village, he was told that no man in this country had every revendicated the right to Canada to conclude her own treaty, that he was the first who had obtained it. He appeared to have taken the thing quite seriously, for we find in the report of his answers that he said he had experienced a great deal of difficulty, but thanks to the assistance he had received from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in England he had absolutely claimed that right and obtained it for Canada and had put it into execution. That is what my hon. friend said; if he wants the quotation we can find it for him. Then he said that of course he could not reveal the terms of the treaty, but when they came to be known the whole country would see that it was a marvellous victory and would applaud him and the government.

Now, Sir, that is all buncombe, and my hon. friend knows it. I cannot understand how any man occupying the position of minister should, in the province of Quebec, where after all we are fairly intelligent, put forward such an extraordinary claim, and nobody being there to contradict him, to make the statement, which was publicly circulated, that he had been the instrument adopted by Providence to bring about this great advance, which he had achieved under great difficulties. Let me read to you in this connection something that will show you the way this treaty is regarded in France, a country where, whatever may be its faults, you cannot indulge in that kind of clap trap very long. Let me quote to you from the 'Patrie' newspaper of the 2nd of January, a correspondence from Paris containing the views of Mr. Seigfried, a distinguished Frenchman, who has occupied a very high position in France, and was, I think, at one time Minister of Commerce, at any rate he speaks with great authority on commercial subjects. This is what he says to a correspondent:

Mr. Charles Seigfried, reporter of the projet de loi on the Franco-Canadian Commercial Convention is a fervent friend of Canada. It was not necessary to ask that gentleman if his report would be favourable, his answer was prepared in advance. This projet, said he, is perhaps not without defects; what human work can boast of perfection? But as it is, this projet constitutes in its entirety a remarkable monument in respect of impartiality and anxiety to be just. Neither France nor Canada have been sacrificed, neither one country nor the other can reasonably boast of having obtained any very particular advantage. It is not easy, added Mr. Seigfried, to satisfy everybody. The Franco-Canadian treaty will be severely criticised, do not doubt it; but I think it will be ardently defended. Besides, its partisans are more numerous, on the whole, than its adversaries. The treaty will be voted, you may be pretty sure of that. My opinion is that the ratification of the treaty might be carried through about the last days of January. My report is ready. The modifications which I may be called upon to make will only be secondary ones. I intend depositing my report about the twentieth of the month, and to demand an immediate discussion. This discussion even admitting that it will not take place immediately, will soon take place. We will, therefore, be able to vote the treaty in the chamber and to send it to the Senate. In ordinary times the Senate might begin the discussion immediately.

He goes on to speak of the procedure. He expects that after the discussion on the treaty has been begun it will be carried through in about fifteen days.

Mr. Denis Guibert, former member for Martinique, well known in Canada on account of his writings in the 'Figaro,' and his works on Rome, would like the Canadian newspapers to put a little discretion into their triumph.

Will my hon. friend the minister make a note of that?

The treaty is advantageous to Canadians. That is true. But it is not well always to exaggerate the truth. So saying Mr. Guibert took from his pocket a Canadian paper in which there was an article with large letters at the head of the article 'Mr. Brodeur has thrown down the French ministers. The French ministers had not the necessary strength.' Evidently, continued Mr. Guibert, the Canadians are right in being satisfied, but they ought to wait in order to proclaim it, until all things are concluded, signed and perfected. Supposing this Canadian journal fell into the hands of some hostile senator or even some member of the Chamber inimical to the project, you could hear him easily reading these lines from the Tribune of the Chamber and that indiscretion would be quite sufficient to cause the project to fall through or at any rate to make the voting of it much more difficult.

I wished to quote from the high authority of Mr. Siegfried to show that people not only on this side of the Atlantic but on the other viewed with favour this treaty and hoped it would be carried through with such amendments as might be found necessary in the interest of the commerce of both parties. But, it is not the complete, the extraordinary triumph that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has tried to make it out to be. The members of the House know perfectly well that this treaty has been concluded under exactly the same procedure as all treaties concerning Canada for over thirty years. Does the hon. minister deny that? Certainly not. Neither would the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I will state that there were never any treaties negotiated exclusively by Canadian ministers as this one has been.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. What difference is there, as far as the method of discussing and concluding this treaty is concerned, between this treaty and the treaty concluded by Sir

Charles Tupper in 1893 ? What is the difference ? Can my hon. friend point it out ? There is none at all. My hon. friend knows it perfectly well. He is silent because there is no difference whatever.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am stating to my hon. friend that previous treaties were all negotiated exclusively, through the British ambassadors or by the British ambassadors alone and if he reads the papers relating to the negotiations of 1882 he will find there that instructions were given to the British ambassador in Paris to negotiate such a treaty although the Canadian government had asked to negotiate this treaty themselves. In 1893 the negotiations were not carried out by Sir Charles Tupper alone but they were carried out by Sir Charles Tupper and the British ambassador in Paris.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has not answered the question that I put to him. Sir Charles Tupper concluded the treaty of 1893 in Paris with the assistance of the British ambassador in the name of the Queen of England and this treaty was concluded in the name of the King of England in exactly the same manner and by the British ambassador in Paris with the assistance of these two hon. gentlemen. It is exactly the same. How can the hon. gentleman contend that there is any difference in the procedure ? In 1879 or in 1880, I believe, there was a treaty concluded by Sir A. T. Galt. There was a treaty with France and Spain in 1879, and Sir A. T. Galt acted in exactly the same manner as these hon. gentlemen acted in this instance. The procedure has not been changed in any way.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it has been.

Mr. MONK. It could not have been unless a change had occurred in our fundamental law. I point that out because there is no difference whatever in the manner of negotiating this treaty from the treaty of 1893 or the treaty of 1879, made by Sir A. T. Galt and the treaty that we made with Japan. We have no power to conclude treaties in our own name. My hon. friend knows that, neither was this treaty concluded in the name of Canada. If my hon. friend thought it was such an important point and if he thought that he could come back to Canada covered with so much glory for having dealt with a foreign nation in the name of Canada why did he sit silent through the entire time of the intercolonial conference and make no attempt to impress upon that conference the necessity of conferring on us the power to negotiate treaties in our own name ? He never opened his mouth on this subject ; neither did my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I merely wished to point out that phase of the question because an endeavour has been made to throw a false colour over it. This treaty has been concluded by Sir Francis Bertie, the British ambassador in Paris, and by the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries acting for his Britannic Majesty, as all other treaties have been concluded. There is no difference. If we incurred the very large expense which we incurred in sending the reunited fleet of Canada down to meet these gentlemen because they had done something extraordinary it was done under false pretenses.

Now, I come to the more practical object of this motion. I do not wish to take up the time of the House but the House will have seen, when I quoted the appreciation of Mr. Siegfried, that treaties, when passing through parliament in France, are examined most minutely and carefully. They are looked into by special committees of which the reporter is always one of the ablest men in the Chamber, a man conversant with the subject—in this instance, this being a commercial treaty, one of the highest commercial authorities in France, Mr. Siegfried—and they are thoroughly sifted before they are approved. I think that we, anxious as we are to cultivate commercial relations with France and to be on friendly terms with that country, should bring to bear careful attention upon this treaty and that it should be examined by a committee of the House. When we concluded the treaty with Japan in 1904, do you think that if the proposed treaty had been carefully sifted by a select committee of seven members of this House we would have had in it that unfortunate clause, article 1, which has been the cause already of so much difficulty in regard to immigration into this country and of which we have not yet heard the end ? Evidently not. If the treaty had been carefully examined by a committee the fatal difficulty of that clause would have been detected and very probably we would have had introduced into our convention with Japan such saving stipulations as were carefully introduced into the convention made between the United States and Japan and which saved the immigration question in the United States. It is because the treaty was passed without sufficient study and attention that the clause was passed over and we have had the difficulties which we have had. In this case it is not the same thing but the treaty requires to be carefully examined by business men in order that we should ascertain what are its advantages, what is the extent of the favourable changes it affords to our trade and in order that by timely suggestions, such as Mr. Siegfried mentions in his remarks we may make some alterations to it which may be very trifling but which yet may make a great deal of difference in the operation of the treaty. The situation in France, as the House knows, is a somewhat peculiar one. One would at first sight be inclined to believe, particu-

larly after reading the blue book which was laid, in the first instance, before the House, that we were deriving very great advantages from being placed under the French minimum tariff.

One would suppose from this blue-book that the articles mentioned are entitled to admission into France without paying almost any duty. That is clearly not the case. France is a highly protectionist country and its maximum tariff is almost prohibitive. Its minimum tariff is of course better, but it by no means gives unmixed advantages to those nations which have the benefit of it. I shall not go into any lengthy examination of the articles of Canadian origin which under the projected treaty are placed upon the French minimum tariff. But, take for example the item of horses, and the French maximum tariff on horses is 200 francs and the minimum 150 francs, or thirty dollars, for the class of horses which are generally exported from Canada. It is not probable that Canada can do a very large business in horses with France in view of this specific duty of thirty dollars per head. There is at present under the ordinary German tariff a lower duty than that, and yet we do not do a large trade in horses with Germany. The House will at once see that unless the French duty on horses is lower than the present minimum tariff, Canada cannot export many horses to France. The minimum tariff on butter going into France is $2.50 per hundredweight, and from what I can learn from the large exporters of butter in Montreal, if Canadian butter has to pay freight and insurance and $2.50 per hundredweight duty, there is not much chance of our developing a trade with France in that article. So it is with cheese and with eggs and with other agricultural products. In the case of live and dead meats there is an improvement in the minimum over the maximum tariff, but those who are conversant with the export trade in live and dead meats are not sanguine that there is much of a margin to work on to encourage trade with France in these articles. As to all kinds of grain there is no difference between the French maximum and minimum tariff; and we do not do any great trade with France in these commodities. Of course there is a clause in the treaty—otherwise the whole thing would be illusory—which says we are to benefit by any lowering of the tariff, and if in France they lower their maximum tariff (which is most improbable) or if they change articles from the maximum to the minimum, we get the benefit of that on the articles enumerated in the treaty. But, until something of that kind is done there is not much prospect of increasing our trade with France in grain, and wheat and eggs and articles of that kind. The House must realize that all these matters require to be carefully looked into. It is a matter for a special committee getting the evidence of the best authorities of the country on these questions in order to ascertain if the conditions can be improved in any way. At any rate the House, when it gets to the report of such a committee will know exactly where we stand, and if changes could be made in the projected convention which would make it more advantageous to us.

There are two clauses in this draft treaty to which I would take exception at once, unless the report of the committee should favour them. Under one of the clauses of the treaty we find ourselves to give the most favoured nation treatment to France on all the articles enumerated. That favoured nation clause is not meeting with much approval to-day amongst civilized nations; it is an old-fashioned clause which used to be introduced in treaties between nations which were almost constantly at war, and it has been found in modern times to operate most inconveniently as between nations who have been constantly concluding new and altering old conventions. I think all the modern economic writers are agreed on that point. It therefore seems to me that unless it is absolutely necessary it would be better to omit that clause and let each treaty with each nation stand upon its own merits. Another clause requires that in order to benefit by this treaty we must ship directly to France and that goods coming to Canada, to obtain the benefit of the treaty here, must come direct to our shores. If our exports go by any other than the direct route they are liable to the surtax, and the French surtax is prohibitive, it being three francs and sixty centimes per kilogram.

Mr. FOSTER. It is higher on some articles.

Mr. MONK. I am told it is higher on some articles. If we are to simplify our commercial relations with France, if we are to derive all the good we possibly can from this treaty, why should shipments be forced in this manner. Liverpool and other English ports have an immense trade with France, and if it be possible to ship via those ports, why should it be prohibited? The utmost latitude should be given to shippers; they should be able to ship by any route they like and when the goods reach their destination they should be given the benefit of this treaty. It seems to me that this treaty is susceptible of useful changes, and that some slight variation in its terms would operate advantageously. In France they are going to submit it to most careful scrutiny by a committee of their own parliament, and it is with the view that we should do the same, that I move this resolution.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I regret we are unable to accept the motion submitted by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk). I cannot help thinking that the hon. gentleman's method of dealing with the question is somewhat extraordinary. We have on the Order Paper a notice of

motion which will bring up in a proper way the whole question of the French treaty. The House has already been placed in possession of the treaty and the motion on the Order Paper is designed to invite attention to the whole subject with the view of parliament giving to that treaty the approval which is contemplated by one of its clauses. Why my hon. friend should endeavour to anticipate that discussion and raise the question now, before it has been properly reached in the House, is one of those things which no fellow can understand. I do not intend to follow my hon. friend in discussing the merits of the treaty; I think the time is not appropriate. I think that every word which my hon. friend has said in condemnation of this treaty, if he so meant it, is not only unjust and unwarranted by the facts, but, what is worse, is entirely out of place. I prefer, therefore, to confine myself to the object of my hon. friend's motion as it appears on the Order Paper, and that is that we should appoint a special committee for the purpose of inquiring into this matter. I am unable to concur in that proposal, because it is without any precedent. This treaty is a part of the fiscal policy of the government of Canada. It has been negotiated under the responsibility of ministers and it has been presented in this House in precisely the same manner as we would present any other part of the fiscal policy of the government. It stands in precisely the same position as if the Finance Minister should come down to the House and propose to increase or diminish or abolish the duty on any given article, or to do anything else in regard to the ordinary fiscal policy of the country, and I think my hon. friend will search the records of parliament in vain to find a case in which any part of the fiscal policy of the country, propounded by any responsible minister, has been submitted for investigation to a special committee. Believing that the course which my hon. friend proposes is unusual and improper, believing that he is attempting to anticipate a discussion which will properly come up at a later stage and in light of full information, I am compelled to take exception to his motion, and to ask the House not to permit him to establish such a precedent or to depart from the sound principles of government whereby the government are made responsible for the fiscal policy of the country. We need not discuss the merits of the treaty. Whatever its merits or demerits may be, it is presented to this House as a part of the fiscal policy for which the government must be responsible to the House and the country, and that being the case I see no reason why it should be sent to a special committee for investigation.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into the merits of the treaty. The motion of which the Finance Minister has spoken, when it comes before the House, will probably give us all the opportunity of that kind that is necessary. However, I do take exception somewhat to the reasons which have been advanced by the Minister of Finance why the matter should not go to a committee. First, he says that it is against precedent. Well, for a progressive people, and especially for a Liberal government formed as this government is, I should think that old precedents might very well stand their chance of revision. It seems to me that it is rather the essence of Liberalism that the old precedents should be thoroughly examined and if necessary new ones put in their place. What we want to do in this case is to approach the treaty with all the information we can possibly get, and I think it is quite possible for us to get more information than we have got. The Minister of Finance brought down the convention. That showed us absolutely nothing of the merits of the treaty. He then, at the request of gentlemen on this side of the House, brought down a tabulated statement, in which we find the three schedules of duties and some other information, but he might just as well put a Latin essay before the common man with an idea of his getting needed information out of it as to suppose that the information which he has given to this House in that document is sufficient. It is all Greek to the man who does not spend a good deal of time in examining and making calculations, and those calculations have to be made two or three times over. On a certain article we have the minimum and the general duty in France and we have the unit of the duty, which is the kilogram. Now, the kilogram, as I understand it, is 220 pounds and the franc is 19·3 cents, so that the man who wants to know what an article going to France by the direct method will be taxed has to inform himself first as to what the kilogram is and what the franc is and next to make double calculations. Then we come to other difficulties. The lumber schedule is an impossibility to a man who does not have a pair of scales and a thorough knowledge of the lumber business. In France the duty on lumber is determined by weight; our method in Canada is by measurement. The statement that there shall be so many francs of duty on a kilogram of lumber going to a French port does not convey a very luminous picture to my mind of exactly what the exporter will meet when he gets there. On another variety of articles you have the French measurement, and on that you have to make a somewhat abstruse calculation, involving both weight and measure in order to get at what the duty is. I plainly state that if the Finance Minister brings the treaty before this House tomorrow or next day and attempts to put it through with anything like fair speed, it will be put through before nearly all the

members of this House and anybody in the country outside knows or can form the least idea of what its advantages will be. Therefore, I think it will be a very good plan to select as intelligent a committee as can be selected from both sides of this House to examine the treaty. That does not destroy the responsibility of the government. The Finance Minister seems to fear that they will not have responsibility enough. I think there is plenty of responsibility on these hon. gentlemen now; I think they will find it is rather well heaped up. But why do they appoint royal and other commissions? In doing so do they throw their responsibilities from their own shoulders? They are quite willing when it suits themselves to throw the responsibility on a commission. They are quite willing, when it does not suit themselves, to declare that they will not do so. The committee is formed, takes its testimony, and gets the information for the ministry, and the information is necessary for this ministry, both in fiscal and financial matters ; I do not think they can have too much of it. But the hon. Minister of Finance says we ought not to discuss the merits of this question.

My view has been somewhat the same as that of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) that it would have been well for the ministers themselves to have refrained from having a jubilation over the treaty until its plain Anglo-Saxon meaning was made public. Perhaps, however, there was a little bit of wisdom in the conduct of these ministers. They have had, at any rate, the jubilation whether later they get the approval of the people with reference to the treaty or not, and that jubilation of course is a point gained. But proper consideration is what is necessary, and that consideration cannot be given in a talk across the floor from one to the other, on information furnished on the spur of the moment by the minister, and which cannot be assimilated by members of the House with equal expedition. It seems to me that not only would no harm be done, but it would be conducive to the enlightenment of the House to have this matter ventilated by a special committee, which would report to the House, and whose report would give hon. members the information they require before coming to a decision. Something has been said by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) with reference to the clauses of the treaty itself, but, as I have already said, I do not propose to go into these now. It will be time enough to do that when the question comes up on the motion of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I do not think, however, that anything would be harmed, on the contrary I think that much good would be done, by our having this treaty referred to a special committee. But, says my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), it is part of the fiscal policy of the government. Well, suppose it is. There is one thing about this French treaty which strikes me, and it is this. The policy propounded, as the all-sufficient policy last year, by these hon. gentlemen when they put their tariff Bill through, has utterly failed on the very first attempt made to get treaty conditions with a foreign country by its means. Last year they said that when they had a general tariff and an intermediate and a preferential tariff, they would have all the instrumentality required in order to enable this government to make a treaty and have it proclaimed into force by order in council. That is what they asked for and that is what they got. They asked and got that, because of their assertion that with a general, and intermediate and a preferential tariff, they had all the machinery required to negotiate treaties. Then they went to France, and the very first attempt they made to negotiate a treaty, they found that the intermediate tariff would not do the business, and they are obliged to come back to parliament with their treaty, as formerly and ask the sanction of parliament. This treaty has not been put into force by order in council.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend say that we declared last year we would make treaties by order in council ?

Mr. FOSTER. No, but what I did say was that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) declared that by this machinery of an intermediate and a general tariff, the government had the instrumentality by means of which they could make commercial arrangements with other countries, and once those arrangements were made, they could put them into force by order in council.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not quite correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Let my hon. friend tell us what he did say.

Mr. FIELDING. What we did say was that by creating a discrimination in our tariff, by having a general tariff and an intermediate tariff, we were able to offer some inducements to other countries to trade with us. We were able to offer them something in return for what they gave, and if we did not have that intermediate tariff, we would not have had this treaty at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, I notice in the memo. that with these two hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), it was a case of 'After you my dear Alphonse,' in every instance. First, it was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who writes to the French minister, and then, an hour or two afterwards, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) writes to the same minister an exact copy of that letter. Everything had to be done double in order that neither minister might take precedence of the other.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) managed to get the precedence in Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. So he did. My hon. friend will not deny that they were opposed on the question of giving the government power to make commercial arrangements by order in council which might be negatived by the House if the House did not find it beneficial ; for, as we pointed out, there is always the difficulty of negativing an arrangement which is in force between two countries, a difficulty which does not exist if the arrangement does not come into force until ratified by parliament. So that the intermediate tariff did not do what my hon. friend claimed for it. Foreign countries do not take these things just exactly as the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) arranges them here. The French government said to the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) that the intermediate tariff had very little force with them because it was the lowest and most favoured nation clause they were after. Therefore the first memo, of my hon. friend was not acceptable to the French government and he had to come down to another basis of arrangement. So that in this case, as I have stated, their fiscal policy fell short of doing what they supposed it would do, and they had to come to this House in the end for a ratification of the arrangements they had made. It is an inviting and an attractive field of speculation to try and estimate the mental strain undergone by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and his colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to convince themselves that they were accomplishing something effective, in this terrible battle, for freedom of action by Canada against what might be the assumptions of the mother country. That is rather an inviting field to enter, but I think we may have opportunity for that a little later, and I shall defer doing so on account of my desire to give the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) the opportunity of dilating a little upon this particular branch of the matter, as I perceive that he is anxious to do.

Motion negatived.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all tenders received up to date (November 30, 1907) by, and now under contract to, the Royal Commission appointed for the construction of that portion of the line of the Transcontinental Railway between the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, and the city of Moncton, in the province of New Brunswick; that such copy or return shall contain (1) signatures attached to the tenders; (2) the total amount of each tender as 'moneyed out' by the said commission; (3) the quantity of each class or kind of material as used by the said commission in figuring out the cost; (4) the price per unit of prices submitted by those who responded to the invitation for tenders; and (5) the total cost of each item in the schedule, which, added together, gives the grand total of each undertaking tendered for.—Mr. Taylor.

For a return showing the total quantity of freight carried on the winter steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the past two seasons, 1905-6 and 1906-7; the amount of freight that was delayed in transit for these two seasons; the freight rate on the different classes of goods carried; the amount received for freight during those two seasons; the amount received for passengers and the number carried; the number of days the steamers failed to cross in each of those years; and the amount of damages paid to shippers for delay of goods in transit.—Mr. Martin, Prince Edward Island. „

For a return showing: 1. What sums of money have been paid for advertising and printing, respectively, to the 'Sun' and 'Star' newspapers of St. John, New Brunswick, the 'Chronicle,' of Halifax; the 'Echo,' and the Glace Bay 'Gazette,' and the St. John 'Globe,' during the following periods respectively: the fiscal years 1904-5, 1905-6, and from June 30, 1906, to date.

2. In what offices or job offices the printing is done for the 'Sun,' 'Star,' 'Chronicle' and 'Echo.'—Mr. Foster.

EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to inquire of the government whether any steps have been taken to obtain the consent of the legislature of the province of Manitoba to the proposed extension of the boundaries of that province. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember that a Bill to that effect has been promised. He will recollect also, no doubt, that, under the amendment to the British North America Act, the consent of the province by its legislature is necessary. Has this proposed extension been communicated to the executive of the province of Manitoba, and have any steps been taken to obtain the consent of the legislature of that province to the proposed extension ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I do not believe that the government has to take any such steps, at this moment, to secure the consent of the legislature of Manitoba. In introducing this legislation, we are only complying with the request made by the legislature of Manitoba itself to have the boundaries of the province extended. Of course, when our Bill is prepared, and when the prayer has been looked into, and accepted in whole or in part as the case may be, it will be for the province of Manitoba to say whether or not it accepts that legislation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to understand the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The proposition, as I understand it, is that the extension of the boundaries is to be provided for by Act of

this Parliament, leaving it to the legislature of Manitoba to give or withhold its assent as it may be advised ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the matter in this way : The legislature of Manitoba has asked to have the boundaries of the province extended. It has made a very large and sweeping demand. Whether the whole extent of that demand can be granted or not is a matter which may come up for discussion later on. If we agree with the whole of the demand made by the legislature of Manitoba, I suppose there will be no question as to securing the consent of that legislature. But the province of Ontario has made a strong protest against the granting of the whole demand of Manitoba ; and the government has to decide whether it will accept the prayer of the province of Ontario or that of the province of Manitoba, or whether it will consider both. The Bill will settle that question, and it will be for the province of Manitoba to say whether or not it agrees to that Bill.

TREATY NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING QUESTIONS PENDING BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would also like to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether there are any negotiations on foot for the completion of a treaty between Great Britain and the United States with respect to matters that have been the subjects of controversy between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. My reason for asking this question is that, in a recent issue of a reputable journal in Great Britain, the assertion is made that negotiations have been under way for some time, and that a treaty is on the point of being arranged.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With respect to what question ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With respect to different questions—fifteen in all. One of them is the boundaries question, another the question of the Behring Sea fisheries, also the convention of 1818 relating to the fisheries on the Atlantic and other matters of a similar nature.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House has been informed already that the government of Canada agreed to have a reference made to the Hague Tribunal of the question of the fisheries understanding with the province of Newfoundland. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that there are also informal negotiations going on, I understand, between the British ambassador and the American authorities upon numerous questions, but these have not taken formal shape except in the case of one or two questions with regard to what is known as the International Waterways Commission.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). May I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if the report of the Civil Service Commission is ready to be brought down ? It was rather intimated that it would be ready by the first of the year.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I have not seen any of the commissioners lately. One of the gentlemen engaged in the service intimated to me during Christmas holidays that the report would be ready. I will endeavour to obtain the information desired.

THE MINT.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I had a notice on the paper of a question intended to bring out information with reference to the Mint. I changed it afterwards to a notice of motion, and it was carried in that form. . The Minister of Finance (Hon. W. S. Fielding) told me, as I understand him, that the information was ready. Can it be brought down at an early day ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I did not say the information was ready, but that I would give directions to have it prepared. It will be brought down at an early day.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENTS.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I have come to an understanding with some of the members from the west to take this Bill up as soon as they return. I hope to proceed on the next occasion when the discussion is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Railway Act. He said : This is a very simple Bill. It is to strike out a few words in clause 298 of the Railway Act so as to make it include a little more than it includes now. Section 298 reads, in part as follows :

Whenever damage is caused to crops, lands, fences, plantations or buildings and their contents, by a fire, started by a railway locomotive, the company making use of such locomotive, whether guilty of negligence or not, shall be liable for such damage——

Now this Bill asks to strike out the words 'to crops, lands, fences, plantations or buildings and their contents.' This would leave the section to read :

Whenever damage is caused by a fire, started by a railway locomotive, the company making use of such locomotive, whether guilty of negligence or not, shall be liable for such damage——

—and so on. I do not understand why these words that I have read were put into the Act. There are many other things besides those mentioned that are liable to destruction by fire caused by locomotives, and, certainly, the owner should receive compensation in the event of such destruction. I do not think there can be any objection to this Bill on the part of any one who looks into the matter carefully.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no objection to this Bill going to the Railway Committee. The words referred to were put in for a reason, but possibly that reason will be threshed out better in the Railway Committee than in a discussion taking up the time of this House. Opening up the section as my hon. friend (Mr. Kennedy) proposes would leave it pretty wide and make it include things which the House did not intend to include when the Act passed. But there is no objection to the Bill going to the Railway Committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no danger, I suppose of injuring the constitution by sending it to the Railway Committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend refer to the constitution of the Act or to the British constitution?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Both.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). moved the second reading of Bill (No. 28) to amend the Copyright Act. He said: This is a very simple amendment, and I propose it with a full knowledge of the unwisdom of interfering very much with the Copyright Act, which is to-day considered by all to be in a very unsatisfactory condition. If it is meddled with or tinkered with at all, it is hard to say how far amendments might go, or how far it might be wise to undertake anything like a revision of the Act. This amendment is designed to simplify the formula which is at present required to be printed upon the various books, maps, charts, photographs, engraving and other articles of that kind mentioned in the Copyright Act, and which are subjects of copyrights. This amendment is asked for by a large number of important publishing houses in Canada who strongly object to the disfigurement of many post cards, engravings, charts and other works of art by printing the very long formula now required by the Act, which is as follows:

Entered according to Act of the parliament of Canada, in the year , by A.B., at the Department of Agriculture.

This formula is considered to be very long and cumbersome, giving information that is not at all necessary. I propose to substitute for it these words: 'Copyright, Can., 190—, by A. B.' This is the form used in the United States and other countries in connection with their copyright. This amendment, as I say, is asked for by a large number of publishing houses, and I understand that the public generally approve of the Bill. I have spoken to the hon. Minister of Agriculture in regard to it; I do not see him in his place to-day. He did not intimate to me that he was in any way opposed to the Bill, though I am not saying he was in favour of it. I mentioned the matter to him and asked for his consideration. The Bill was introduced at the last session of parliament, but owing to the lateness of the session it did not reach its third reading. Since that time persons interested in the business have renewed their requests to me, urging that the Bill be passed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see no objection to this Bill; it seems to be in the right direction. I merely ask that after it is reported it shall stand for the third reading until the Minister of Agriculture is here.

Bill reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business do the government propose to take up to-morrow, which is now a government day?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up two Bills of the Minister of the Interior, on Irrigation and on Land Surveys. Then we will go into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 9, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I beg to lay on the table corres-

pondence and memoranda relating to the French treaty. This is the material which was to be printed during the recess. I lay it on the table that it may be included in the documents.

QUESTIONS.

CANADIAN-AUSTRALIAN STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to discontinue the subvention to the Canada-Australian steamship service?

2. If so, when was such decision arrived at, and what are the reasons therefor?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). On the 27th of July last, an order in council was passed authorizing the Minister of Trade and Commerce to renew the existing contract with the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand, Limited, for a steamship service between Canada and Australia. The contract has been prepared, and has been sent to New Zealand to be signed.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Tuesday next, to consider the following proposed resolutions :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide as follows:—

1. That the convention of the nineteenth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and seven, entered into at Paris by plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and by the President of the French Republic be approved.

2. That there shall be levied, collected and paid after the said convention is brought into force, and so long as the said remains in force, upon all natural and manufactured products enumerated in schedule B to the said convention originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, imported into Canada in the manner provided in the said convention, the several rates of duties of customs set forth in column 2, 'Intermediate Tariff,' of the Customs Tariff, 1907, and in any amendment of the same; and that there shall be levied, collected and paid, during the time aforesaid, upon all natural and manufactured products enumerated in schedule C of the said convention, originating and imported as aforesaid, the several rates of duties of customs set opposite to each item respectively in the said schedule C.

3. That whenever in the manner provided in the said convention the terms thereof are extended to Tunis, the provisions of the last preceding clause of these resolutions shall apply to Tunis and the products thereof, to the same extent and as completely as said provisions apply to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possession, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China and the products thereof.

4. That the Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such orders and regulations as are deemed necessary to carry out the said convention and the intent thereof.

5. That the advantages granted to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China by the said convention, with respect to the commerce of said countries with Canada, shall extend to any and every other foreign power which by reason of the operation of such convention is, under the provisions of a treaty or convention with His Majesty, entitled, in whole or in part, to the same or to the like advantages with respect to its commerce with Canada, to the extent to which in manner aforesaid such other foreign power is entitled thereto; and that such advantages shall continue to so extend to such other foreign power as long as the said convention remains in force, or until the right of such other foreign power to such advantages under its treaty or convention with His Majesty is sooner determined.

6. That the advantages so granted to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China by the said convention, shall extend to the United Kingdom and the several British colonies and possessions with respect to their commerce with Canada, so long as France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the said territories continue to be entitled to such advantages; and that during the period for which France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the said territories are so entitled to such advantages, all laws inconsistent with the enjoyment thereof by the United Kingdom, and such British colonies and possessions shall be suspended to the extent to which they are so inconsistent: provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall be held to diminish any advantage which the United Kingdom and British colonies and possessions now enjoy under the British Preference Tariff.

7. That from the date of the coming into force of the said convention as provided in article xx. thereof, 'The French Treaty Act, 1894,' and chapter 3, 58-59 Victoria, 'An Act respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada,' shall thereupon be repealed.

8. That the operation of all laws inconsistent with giving to the provisions of the said convention and of this Act their full effect shall from time to time be suspended to the extent of such inconsistency.

He said : His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject-matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Is it the intention of the minister (Mr. Fielding) to discuss the treaty really on this resolution ? It can be discussed either on the resolution or on the Bill ; it does not make much difference which, so far as I can see, but the House should be made aware which it is to be.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be happy to agree to the suggestion that the resolution might

be assented to pro forma, and that the Bill, which is to follow immediately, be made the subject of discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. Immediately ?

Mr. FIELDING. The same day. That will be convenient, I think, because one is really a copy of the other. It is put in this form to comply with the rules.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another matter of which I spoke the other day. We are glad of the information the minister was good enough to have printed, but it does not go far, as the minister himself will see. To understand the effect of the duties under the treaty, each individual member of the House must calculate every item in the different schedules, and that involves a good deal of labour. I would suggest that, if possible, a statement might be prepared showing in parallel columns, the duty as provided in the treaty and that duty reduced to our units—that is, calculated upon the ton or gallon, or whatever it may be, and shown in dollars and cents. Any one could make these calculations in a few hours, and such a statement would be of great convenience to the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I am most anxious to furnish, as far as possible, any information that hon. gentlemen may desire. Many questions have been put—proper questions—and I have endeavoured to answer them as far as possible. I have also given one of my officials instructions to see if he can do any more along the same line. But I am afraid that a statement such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has suggested would be more difficult than he imagines. One making such calculations would have to take the French trade returns and these duties expressed in French currency, and work them out in English and according to our standards of weights, measures and money. I question whether that is worth while.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty of making such a calculation is the very reason why we should have it.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not quite see that. Of course, there is a great deal of information that it would be very nice to have if one had time to get it out. But if you take the figures which show that, whereas in a certain article the present duty is 20 francs, and it is reduced to 15 francs, the proportion of change is at once apparent to every hon. member. It is not necessary to have a printed column of figures in order to show that. But that is part of the information that the hon. gentleman seems to desire.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the minister will see that that does not go far enough. Of course, we are to discuss this treaty clause by clause, and it would not be reasonable to ask us to pass a clause of the treaty unless we could first understand its commercial effects.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what we want, everything the minister has spoken of. I can sit down and to a certain extent pick these things out myself. There is the franc in which it is expressed, there is the kilogram, and when we reckon 220 pounds for a kilogram, and 19·3 cents for a franc, one can figure it out by arithmetic. But why cannot this be done by an officer of the department, and then we would have the exact information, and so reduce it to the dollar the ton, or whatever it may be. For instance, I look here at the iron schedule, and I find that cast iron, foundry iron, containing less than 25 per cent of manganese is 1½ francs. One and a-half francs what ? Per kilogram. I have to make the calculation to find out how much that is a ton. Now the fact that you get a quarter, or a third, or an eighth reduction does not bring to the mind of the examiner what he wants; he wants to know what the rate is compared with our own rate. For instance, in lumber, the ministers who made the treaty must have known what the thing figured out in the units we have in Canada, and they ought to be able to give us the advantage of what information they have. There is no desire to delay but rather to facilitate the examination of the treaty, and so far as the minister can help us in that respect, it will facilitate our object.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was going to say that probably if the minister looks up the records of the negotiations he will find that all this has been prepared, because it is difficult to understand how the treaty could have been negotiated without some calculation of this kind to enable the plenipotentiaries to understand exactly what they were doing.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree with the hon. gentlemen in their view of the importance of the points they have mentioned. It is of the utmost importance to us that we should get the best treatment on these various items for Canada ; that was the essential feature, that we should get the best treatment granted to anybody, and it was not necessary to enter into calculation to which the hon. gentleman alludes in order to determine that point. However, I have given directions to my officers to meet the various requests that have been made so far as possible, if it is possible to meet them, and if so, I shall be happy to bring down the information. But it may necessitate postponing the date of the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one thing that might easily be got, that is the total importations into France under the minimum tariff, and the average percentage on dutiable

goods under the minimum tariff; and the same thing with reference to the general tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree that these things are half as easy to do as the hon. gentleman seems to think, but I will endeavour to get what information I can. My observation is that a great many of the things asked for will be much more difficult in the preparation than the hon. gentleman imagines.

Mr. SPROULE. We want to be in a position to understand what advantage it would be to Canada to get this reduced rate, or any rate. We would like to know what the present rate is with regard to any particular line. We require that information to enable us to understand whether it would be an advantage or otherwise to try, not only to increase that rate, but to extend it as much as possible, and whether the advantages we are likely to receive from this reduction would stimulate that trade to any great extent.

Mr. FIELDING. I think what it is important for us to know is that on an article which concerns Canada mostly, we get the best treatment that is granted to anybody. If it is the best that is granted to any one, that is all that we can get. However, I shall try to conform as much as possible to all the requests that have been made for information.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not only important to know that we get the best treatment, because that may be of no value whatever to us, and in that case there is no inducement for us to make the treaty. We want to know if there are any special advantages that will accrue to Canada by this treaty, and in order to estimate what those advantages are, we want to know what we are doing now on those lines, and what the duty is on those lines in France. We should have those facts translated into our own coin so that we can understand them.

Motion agreed to.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if he would request the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee to call a meeting of that committee to-morrow morning.

Mr. FIELDING. The chairman informs me that the meeting has been called.

THE SUB-TARGET MACHINES.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to a question that I brought up early in the session. The First Minister moved that the Auditor General's Report and the Public Accounts of last year be referred to the committee. There was also a question about a subject which was under investigation but not finished, the sub-target question, and that remains unfinished. I would ask the First Minister if he will include that in the motion. The facts of the case are that last year when we got the papers, they were referred to the Public Accounts Committee, who went into the matter, and partly investigated it; but it remains unfinished. I would like if the First Minister would refer those papers to the committee this year in the same way as the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report. The committee meets to-morrow, and I want to subpœna witnesses so as to get the case on early.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). So far as I was concerned, I was simply endeavouring to discharge an undertaking I had made with the leader of the opposition. I am not aware what action has been taken with regard to the sub-target matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I can say to the First Minister that this was not expressly mentioned, but I think it would come within the spirit of what was undertaken, because in consequence of the arrangement which was made last year, the Public Accounts Committee did not sit again during that session. If it had continued to sit, of course this matter would have continued under investigation, and would no doubt have been finished. It was not expressly mentioned in the undertaking which the Prime Minister gave to me, but I think it was within the spirit of what was agreed to.

QUEBEC BRIDGE INVESTIGATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask whether the commission which was authorized to investigate the Quebec Bridge disaster has yet reported ?

Hon. GEO. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The report is not yet ready.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the government any information as to when the report is likely to be presented ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not definite, but it will be down very shortly.

LEASE OF WATER-POWER ON BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Prime Minister if he has any objection to let me have a copy of the new lease which has been passed between the government and the company on the Beauharnois canal. I understand a new lease has been made, and I would like to see a copy of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that a new lease has been made. I think everything has been brought down.

THE ALL-RED ROUTE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask for some information from the Prime Minister with reference to a despatch from London, which I find in the newspaper press, reading—

Mr. Sifton gave an interesting address on the All-Red route. The resolution of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at the imperial conference, Mr. Sifton pointed out, was for the purpose of providing a system of transportation between Great Britain, Canada and Australia. Canada was willing to contribute one-half of the amount necessary to secure an Atlantic service, and a very substantial amount of what was necessary to secure a Pacific service. There was absolutely no ground for supposing that Canada was endeavouring to lay the burden upon some one else, which she was not herself prepared to share.

I would like to know whether Mr. Sifton had any authority to pledge the government of Canada to one half of the cost of an Atlantic service or to any amount.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I do not understand that Mr. Sifton undertook to pledge Canada ; I think that Mr. Sifton rather expressed the opinion that the Canadian people generally would be disposed to contribute very generously towards that route.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government has any information as to the further continued immigration of Japanese into the province of British Columbia. There have been press reports within a week or ten days indicating that there is a very considerable influx of Japanese at the present time. I have taken the Prime Minister's warning not to trust too much to these newspaper reports and for that reason I am asking the government what they know about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend has acted wisely in taking a leaf from my own book. The information he has received, I think, is not correct. I am not aware that there is at this moment any influx of Japanese into British Columbia. I understand there is a possibility of some immigration but there is none actually taking place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has not begun yet ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware of it.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the Prime Minister aware that there is not any.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I think I may say I know there is none.

MR. SIFTON IN ENGLAND.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if Mr. Sifton who has just been referred to has a letter from my right hon. friend for any member of the British government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend mean a letter of introduction ?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection to say that I gave a letter of introduction to Mr. Sifton.

SURVEYS AND SURVEYORS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 9) respecting the surveys of the public lands of the Dominion and the surveyors entitled to make such surveys.—(Mr. Oliver.)

On section 18 ; variation of form when pupil is of age.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). When the Bill was under consideration in committee on a previous occasion, this section was held, as it was suggested that its working did not clearly convey the idea that it was desired to express. I beg to move that the following section be substituted for section 18 as printed.

If an articled pupil is, at the time of his entering into articles or of his transfer, of the full age of 21 years, form 'B' or 'E' may be so varied as to provide for the articles being entered into or the transfer made on the responsibility of such articled pupil himself, without reference to the consent and approbation of his father or of any other person.

The purpose of the section is clearly that the transfer of articles shall be on the responsibility of the pupil if he is of responsible age.

On section 22, as to surveyors qualified otherwise than under this Act.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to this section the question was asked by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) if there was reciprocity in the acceptance of surveyors between the different parts of the empire. In reply to that I would read to the House the statement prepared by the Surveyor General in explanation of the section as now printed, this being an amendment of the existing Act. He says :

This amendment is intended to apply to a class of men who, although well educated

and possessed of the very best qualifications, technical as well as practical, are too old to undergo an examination in school subjects. In 1900 Australia and New Zealand entered into an agreement requiring uniform qualifications for surveyors, examinations being held on the same days everywhere and the same papers being given to all candidates. Articled pupils are required to serve four years, of which two years must be in the field, and the standard of the examination is higher than in Canada. Surveyors who have been admitted anywhere in Australia or New Zealand, have the right to practise throughout these two countries.

Canada was invited to join in this arrangement but the existence of separate land surveyors' organizations in every province prevented united action in the matter. Moreover, it was felt that to increase the term of service of articled pupils and to raise the standard of the examination would further restrict the number of surveyors, which would be most inconvenient at this stage of the country's development. The invitation had therefore to be declined for the time being.

In South Africa land surveyors from other portions of the British empire who have passed examinations in certain subjects, equivalet to those required from South African surveyors, are dispensed from examinations in such subjects provided reciprocal privileges are granted to South African surveyors. The qualifications required from surveyors in South Africa, are, however, still higher than in Australia and New Zealand, so that Canadian surveyors cannot take advantage of the privilege of exemption from examination.

The fact is then that Canada was asked by Australia and New Zealand to enter into reciprocal arrangements and declined for the reasons given. Reciprocal privileges are given by South Africa but Canada is prevented from taking advantage of them simply by the fact that the qualifications in South Africa are much higher than those in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The net result will be that the minister proposes that this section shall remain as it is.

Mr. OLIVER. That would be my proposal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The advantage of being able to get men of this character from other dominions outweighs any consideration of reciprocity.

Mr. OLIVER. It would not outweigh any consideration of reciprocity; but seeing that reciprocity is now offered by South Africa and has been offered by Australia and New Zealand and was refused by us, it appears to me fair to accept the section.

On section 58,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This section deals with the method of determining the amounts payable for lands?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, for lands where there is a change. It is proposed in accordance with the suggestion of the leader of the opposition to add these words :

Or in case either party is dissatisfied with the finding of the minister, such an amount as may be determined by the award of a single arbitrator if the parties concur in his appointment; or if not, by the award of three arbitrators, one to be named by each of the parties and the third by the two so named, provided in the latter case that if either party refuses or neglects to name an arbitrator within one month after being notified so to do, an arbitrator may be named on his behalf by the agent of the Dominion lands of the district.

2. The award of the single arbitrator or of a majority of such three arbitrators shall be final and the proceedings upon such arbitration shall be governed by the laws in force in the province in that behalf.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 59,

Mr. OLIVER. There was a question asked by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) as to the placing of posts at every half mile. I am informed by the Surveyor General that iron posts are planted only at section corners; wooden posts being used at quarter-section corners for the sake of economy. It has, however, been found advisable to use iron posts at quarter-section corners in winter surveys owing to the difficulty of placing wooden posts in frozen ground. The use of wooden posts might be abandoned and the additional cost of iron posts is only about $10 per section. The change can be made by the minister without an amendment to the Act, and I have given the Surveyor General authority to use iron posts. I desire to add the following to the Bill as a repealing section:

Sections 16 to 80 inclusive, 200, 212, 221 to 224 inclusive of the Dominion Lands Act, chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, are repealed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand this is a repealing section which is made necessary by the consolidation of the Act it is now proposed to pass.

Mr. OLIVER. No. It is a repealing section made necessary in order that this Act may have effect no matter whether the present Dominion Lands Act remains in force or not. It is to separate from the Dominion the provisions in regard to surveys now existing in that Act, without regard to any further amendment of the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is simply to repeal these sections in the Dominion Lands Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked certain questions regarding the rates of pay on surveys. I have the information here; it covers four pages of foolscap and I can hand it into 'Hansard' if there is no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hand it into 'Hansard.'

Mr. OLIVER. Or I can lay it on the table.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be more convenient to have it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. OLIVER. May I be permitted to let it go into 'Hansard' without reading it?

Mr. SPROULE. So far as I am concerned, yes.

Mr. OLIVER. It is as follows:

291. When the services of a surveyor are of a temporary character, his salary is at the rate of $6.50 per day for ordinary surveys, but for surveys of block outlines and for services requiring special qualifications, the rate is $7.50 per day.

295. The surveyor is allowed the actual cost of hire of men, provided their number and rate of pay is not in excess of what is permitted by his instructions.

296. For the transport of himself and party and miscellaneous expenditure (not including meals, board and hotel expenses, camp equipage and stationery), the surveyor is allowed actual expenses supported by vouchers, provided they do not exceed what is allowed by his instructions. Requisitions for railway tickets are furnished to him and he is expected to obtain transportation at the lowest rate after inquiry from the ticket agents. Return tickets or excursion tickets must be used whenever practicable, or limited tickets when they answer the purpose as well as unlimited tickets.

289. The surveyor in charge of a survey party is allowed a special ration allowance of $1 per day for the party, such allowance being paid as long as the surveyor remains in the field. He is further allowed an ordinary ration allowance of 55 cents per day for himself and every member of his party while in the field.

299. For meals, board and hotel expenses of himself and party, while in the field, the surveyor is allowed, in addition to the ration allowance, a sum of 40 cents per day for himself and 4 cents per day for every other member of his party.

300. Camp equipage is owned and furnished by the surveyor. For its use he is allowed, while in the field, 40 cents per day for himself and 6 cents per day for every other member of his party.

302. When an assistant is regularly appointed as such by the Minister of the Interior, the board and camp equipage allowance for him are 25 cents and 10 cents per day respectively.

303. A sum of $10 is allowed for stationery.

304. While engaged at office work preparing returns the surveyor is allowed $1 per day for living expenses, in addition to his daily salary.

305. In special cases, when it is considered that any of the regulations respecting rations, board, camp equipage or stationery is not suitable, the surveyor may be allowed actual expenses supported by vouchers.

Contract Surveys.—312. Section lines are paid for at the rate of $2.50 per mile of line surveyed.

313. A further payment at the rate of 50 cents per chain ($40 per mile) up to ten chains in a section side is made for opening, cutting and blazing the line through woods, windfalls, underbrush or heavy scrub.

314. Any opening, cutting and blazing of the line in excess of ten chains in a section side is paid at the rate of 25 cents per chain ($20 per mile).

315. No payment is made under the provisions of clauses 313 and 314 where the line could have been measured without opening and cutting

320. A further payment at the rate of $3 per mile is made for section lines surveyed over rough or hilly country. A section side is classified as rough or hilly when the field notes show that it crosses a ravine not less than 100 feet deep, or two ravines not less than 50 feet deep, or that the difference of level between two points of the line not more than half a mile apart exceeds 200 feet, the depths or heights being measured by aneroid barometer. In case the corner of the section falls in the ravine or on the side of the hill, payment is made for either of the adjoining sections, but not for both.

321. A further payment at the rate of $4 per mile may be made upon a report of the Examiner of Surveys, concurred in by the Surveyor General, stating that the survey presented unusual difficulties on account of large rivers or of marshes too deep to be waded across. Payment, if made, is for the number of miles recommended in the report.

322. A further payment at the rate of $4 per mile is made for surveying the meridian outlines of a township when such outlines are included in a subdivision survey contract, but such payment is not made for resurveying or retracing lines previously surveyed.

324. A further payment at the rate of 25 cents per pit in prairie and 40 cents per pit in the woods is made for erecting a boundary monument, such payment covering the cost of planting and marking the post, building the mound and otherwise completing the monument. A witness trench is paid for as four pits. A stone mound is paid for as four pits in the woods. A long quartersection post planted in a marsh is reckoned as two prairie pits (50 cents).

325. Traverses of lakes and rivers and connecting traverses are paid at the rate of $11 per mile. For traverses of lakes and rivers the distance to be paid for is measured along the bank of the lake or river

from every point fixed by the survey in a straight line to the next point. Nothing is paid for offsets.

326. A payment at such rate as the Surveyor General may allow, but not exceeding $2 per mile of township outline or section line surveyed may be made for the determination of the astronomical direction of the lines of the survey.

329. A deduction at such rate as the Examiner of Surveys recommends is made from the payments to survey contractors for deficiency in the survey monuments, whether the deficiency be in the size of the pits, the marking or driving of the posts, or the scattering of the earth from the pits. The deduction recommended by the examiner is at the rate of 6 cents per cubic foot of deficiency in the pits in excess of a foot and a half per pit, and 5 cents per pit for not scattering the earth away from the pits. The deficiency is averaged on the pits examined and applied to the whole contract.

In paying for traverses, $1 is deducted for every offset less than the number required by the manual. Distances measured by means of improper triangles are not paid for.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

IRRIGATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 10) to amend the Irrigation Act—Mr. Oliver.

On section 4,

Mr. OLIVER. On this section the point was taken that although provision was made to require the consent of the municipality before the irrigation company could enter with its works within that municipality, it did not provide for the future protection of the interests of the municipality where these interests might conflict with those of the irrigation company. The point was also taken that there should be defined the form of consent that should be given by the municipality so that there could not be any possibility of doubt as to the consent having been given. In regard to the first point I submitted the question to the Department of Justice. The object of the section is of course to protect the rights of municipalities. The reply I received was in effect that inasmuch as the consent of the municipality was necessary to the entry of the irrigation works into the municipality, it was within the right and power of the municipality to dictate terms, such terms as would at the time and for the future effectually protect its interests, and that therefore it was not necessary to add to the terms of the section as it stands in the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Might we not be confronted with the same difficulty that occurred in regard to telegraph and telephone lines? Our understanding was that the municipalities had the same control over them that it is proposed by this Bill to give to them over irrigation companies; but it was afterwards decided by the courts that where a company had the right to erect a line, for instance, a long distance line, that right carried with it the power to compel the municipalities to allow it to pass through without imposing any restrictions or conditions upon it. Is it not likely that the courts would decide in the same way in this case? If we gave an irrigation company power to make a ditch fifty miles long, passing through several municipalities, would not that power carry with it the right to pass through those municipalities without being subject to any restrictions which the municipalities might attempt to impose?

Mr. OLIVER. The difference, I understand, is this. The railway, telegraph or telephone company holds its rights by a special charter, while the irrigation company holds its rights under a general law and is limited in its rights and powers by the general Irrigation Act, which we propose to amend by making this provision. It is suggested that a special Act might be passed by parliament giving to an irrigation company special powers which would over-ride this section. In that case the condition would be such as my hon. friend has suggested in the case of railway, telegraph and telephone companies. But that is not contemplated. What is contemplated is that irrigation companies shall be incorporated under the general Irrigation Act, and that their powers shall be only such as that Act confers.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Irrigation Act provide that they shall have the right?

Mr. OLIVER. No. This section would limit the rights of an irrigation company when it comes into conflict with a municipality.

Mr. SPROULE. What serious objection could there be to providing in this Act, as we have done in several private Acts, that when an irrigation company gets permission to pass through a municipality it shall do so under regulations made by the municipality, which are not inconsistent with the right of the company to carry on the work?

Mr. OLIVER. There are difficulties which exist with regard to irrigation companies which do not exist with regard to railway, telegraph or telephone companies; and a regulation that might be perfectly adequate and satisfactory as applied to one town might be absolutely inadequate and unsatisfactory if applied to another town; or, to put it another way, what might be absolutely burdensome and unnecessary in regard to one town might be an actual necessity in

regard to another. The purpose of this section is to place the municipality in absolute control of arrangements suitable to its own conditions.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in the understanding that if an irrigation company desires to take its irrigation ditch through a municipality, the municipal council can refuse it permission to do so under certain stipulations which it regards as necessary in the interests of the municipality ?

Mr. OLIVER. So I am advised.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that is right, for this reason, that the power to withhold consent implies the power to give consent subject to certain conditions or stipulations. A practical difficulty which might arise would be that unless a municipality, in giving its consent, reserved to itself the right in the future to make regulations with regard to maintenance, it might find itself without the power to do so. For that reason I would prefer that the suggestion of the hon. member for East Grey should be adopted, because then, in the event of an oversight of that kind, or apart from any question of oversight, that would confer on the municipality the power at all times to regulate the maintenance, so that the safety of life and property might be guarded. It may be guarded under this provision if the authorities of every municipality are vigilant and understand exactly its legal bearings; but if they should not be vigilant, a case might arise in which it would find its right of control gone.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Another difficulty might arise after a municipality had extended its limits. I am given to understand by the minister that he submitted that objection to the Department of Justice, and that they have advised him that when the consent of the municipality were given, such restrictions might be placed upon the right of the company to carry on its work as would protect the municipality in the future. It is absolutely impossible to foresee what works are going to be carried on in the neighbourhood of the municipality, and I would remind the minister that representations were made to him on this very point by the Union of Alberta Municipalities, which met at Red Deer on the 8th, 9th and 10th of January, 1907. A copy of their resolutions has been sent to him, so I have been advised by letter. Copies have also been sent to all the western members. On that very point, these resolutions say :

This convention also desires to add that some regulations should be adopted for any irrigation works which are already constructed and which will come within the limits of the municipalities as organized by law later on.

It is absolutely impossible for these municipalities to ascertain where these works are going to be carried on. They may be carried on within a mile or a mile and a half of the municipality ; and in the western country, where the greater part is not under organized municipalities, the point might arise as to what course should be taken in case the boundaries of a municipality or town should be extended.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or in the case of a municipality established after the irrigation works are constructed.

Mr. OLIVER. There is nothing to prevent a municipality, in its arrangement with a company, providing for the extension of its boundaries. When we vest a municipality or a provincial government, as the case may be, with the right to withhold or give, there does not seem to be any difficulty about the municipality or the provincial government, in its arrangement with the company, anticipating the future extension of its limits. Whether it is desirable that parliament should go further or not, I am not at the moment prepared to say. I am desirous of safeguarding in every possible way the interests of the municipalities, but it is very difficult to formulate conditions which would apply to every case. It seems to me a fair proposition that a municipality should be vested with full authority to protect its own interests and then depend on the municipality doing so. So far as I am concerned, I am very willing to limit the rights of irrigation companies in the public interest ; but, on the other hand, those who are acquainted with irrigation conditions will agree that that is a very serious responsibility to assume, and I am not anxious to assume it. Even if absolute necessity be shown, I would much rather not assume the responsibility of imposing regulations on these companies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand that there has been any suggestion of the necessity for regulation by the minister, but merely that the language of the section should be so extended that in all the cases mentioned by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy), and certain cases I mentioned, the public interests should be protected somewhat better than they are at present. The section, as it stands, is open to the difficulty which I mentioned a moment ago, namely, that unless a municipality reserves the right of future control, when giving its consent, it might have no future control.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) mentions the case of the extension of the boundaries of a municipality. Of course that might be provided against by the consent given in the first instance, but you would require very great foresight to cover all possible cases that might arise. Then there is the third

case mentioned by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy). That is the case of the establishment of a town upon a location through which irrigation works are already constructed. That does not seem to be provided for by the section at all. It would seem to be wise to make some better provision in the first two cases and some provision of the same character in the last case.

Mr. OLIVER. Take the case of irrigation rights having been granted. Take for instance the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which proposes to irrigate three and a half million of acres by the waters of the Bow river. That project involves tremendous expenditure, and its financial success depends on the company being able to carry out its project according to its original intent. We would have to consider very seriously the proposition to clothe a municipal organization with an authority which might seriously interfere with that irrigation project, after the money had been expended. We have to see that the interests involved in the success of the project are protected as well as the municipality.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You mean that the regulation might be of an oppressive or confiscatory character.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we would have to be careful in that regard. Where a municipality is in existence before the irrigation project is accomplished, the municipality has the right to lay down its conditions; but where the municipality comes into existence after the irrigation project has been established, is not at all a case to be put on the same level, and we would have to give a consideration to that case which we need not to the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would seem desirable in the public interest that there should be some regulation in the latter case. The regulation by a municipality might be made subject to the approval of some higher authority. I do not think the minister has made out a case for the absence of any regulation, nor do I understand that his argument leads to that conclusion. The only question is what should be the character of that regulation. Shall we give a municipality the power of regulation subject to an appeal by the irrigation companies to some higher authority? That might be one solution. But it is a matter which ought to be considered and provided for in this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not consider the idea of providing for an appeal to a higher authority opportune. Suppose an important irrigation project were on foot and it were absolutely necessary for that project to enter to some extent within the boundaries of an organized municipality, and suppose the municipality should absolutely refuse its consent, it is a question whether it would be in the public interest to permit the municipality to exercise such authority. I think it is provided, to some extent, in the Railway Act that, under such circumstances, in case of a dispute between a municipality and the company, there shall be an appeal. It seems to me that that might be a way out of the difficulty in the case of an irrigation project, which it was proposed to force through a municipality, and it might also apply to a case arising after the irrigation ditch was built. But, as these cases are not now immediately pressing, as no immediate difficulty has arisen, it seems to me that the matter might very well be left for the time being until we saw what the trend of circumstances might be. The present necessity is to provide for the protection of a municipality—to provide for its absolute protection, which is done by the Bill as it stands without any right of appeal. If we provide for an appeal we thereby take from the absolute authority of the municipality. Until it is shown, on the one hand, that the municipalities are liable to make improvident concessions, or on the other, that they are likely to hold up or obstruct useful enterprises, it seems to me, the safest and best policy, and the one most acceptable to the municipalities, will be to leave them, as the section does leave them, in absolute control.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a matter that, apparently, has been in the minds of members of the Union of Alberta municipalities referred to by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). For, I observe that one section of the first resolution which they passed says:

> This convention also desires to add that some regulations should be adopted for any irrigation works already constructed, and which come within the limits of the municipality organized later on.

They have in mind the case of construction of irrigation works and the extension subsequently of a municipality. They do not say that the municipalities should regulate, but they say that there should be some regulation. Of course, I am not so familiar with conditions in the West as the hon. minister (Mr. Oliver) is. It may be that these conditions would justify the postponement of the consideration of this question. I do not think it should be left out of sight, because the conditions in the west are those of very rapid development, and difficulties of this kind may come upon the people of the west very much more rapidly than any of us at present anticipate.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think there would be the slightest danger of these points passing out of consideration. But what I want to emphasize is that the point dealt with in the Bill is of immediate, pressing necessity, and that the section as it is plac-

ed before the committee is adequate to meet that necessity as it exists. The other conditions suggested by my hon. friend from Calgary, while well worthy of consideration, yet, as they are not immediately pressing, might fairly be left for consideration until they begin to arrive, when we shall have a fairer view of those conditions and a clearer understanding of what will be necessary to meet them than we now have when we are not absolutely face to face with conditions as we are with the conditions dealt with under the section.

Mr. SPROULE. But if we wait, is there not danger that a company will fall back on its vested rights, and say that it is not to be interfered with ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Even though conditions may yet be ripe, we can see that they may ripen in the future. Speaking for myself, I believe it is good legislation to provide for these conditions if we can draft a Bill in such a way. If the conditions arise, the Bill can be applied to them. It does no harm to have such provisions in the Bill. Let us make our legislation as perfect as we can for, otherwise, considerable trouble may arise. For instance, a project itself as has just been suggested, might be blocked by an unreasonable municipality refusing to allow it to go through that municipality ; or the development of a municipality not now in existence may need to be protected. I think we could so frame the Bill as to meet difficulties of this kind, and I believe it is wise that we should do so.

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite satisfied that we can frame provisions for this Bill that will, for the time being, and as far as we know them, meet the conditions that have been suggested. But I say also that we cannot frame any such conditions without derogating from the absolute right of the municipality, the protection of which is the leading feature of this section of the Bill.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I do not think the minister should press this section until an opportunity is afforded to communicate with the Union of Municipalities which has met twice, once in September in Medicine Hat and again in January at Red Deer, on both of which occasions they seemed to fear that if legislation respecting irrigation is passed, their future rights could not be protected. They have sent copies of their resolutions, as I have said, to the minister and to the members from Alberta. In writing the other day, the secretary of the Union of Alberta Municipalities, stated :

> The convention attaches very great importance to these resolutions, copies of which have already been sent to the Hon. Minister of the Interior, and which the convention hope will receive your favourable consideration and support.

Mr. OLIVER.

Now, it seems to me that the minister could go back to the Department of Justice and satisfy them that this question is one which, at the present time, is agitating the minds of the people of this country. He can very easily show them that the right of the municipality to consent would not protect the interests of the municipality which should extend its boundaries. I do not think the section should be allowed to pass until we have had an opportunity of communicating with these people with regard to it. Another reason why the section should not be urged to-day is that, as I observe, an entirely new Bill has been distributed, substituted for the Bill which we discussed before the Christmas adjournment. I am not familiar enough with the question of irrigation to discuss the clauses of the Bill without some opportunity to take those clauses up with the people who are so much interested and who have a right to be heard in connection with this matter.

Mr. WARD. Is it the intention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to take action this session in connection with the request of the Western Canadian Irrigation Convention, which, I observe, met in the city of Calgary last month. On that occasion a very strong resolution was passed in favour of the conservation of the forests on the watersheds. It was pointed out that the forests in which the streams rise were likely to be denuded, and the resolution of the convention is that some action should be taken to conserve the forests of the watersheds. It seems to me this strikes at the root of the source of supply of the whole irrigation system of the Northwest.

Mr. OLIVER. The various resolutions of the Western Irrigation Convention are receiving every attention at the hands of the department. The department was represented at the convention for the purpose of exchanging information and arriving at the best conclusion possible under the circumstances. The resolution mentioned by my hon. friend is being considered along with others. In regard to the suggestion made by the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), that we should hold this section over for further consideration, I have no objection. Certainly at this early stage of the session I would not wish to force any legislation that might be the better for consideration by the people who are immediately interested. However, I would point out that this section has been before the House ever since it opened, and there has been every opportunity to consider its provisions. Its provisions have been considered, and its principle is, I think, very clear cut. I would not like, on my own responsibility, to suggest any amendment to the section as it now stands, fortified as I am by the opinion of the Department of Justice

that as it stands, places the municipalities in control of the situation. If that is the case, I would not like to be a party to amending that section in any direction that would derogate from that control, unless and until it has been shown that it is either the desire of the municipalities themselves, or is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No one has suggested that control should be taken away from the municipalities, the suggestion from this side is that greater control should be given to them. The mere fact of getting the consent of the municipalities now, should not be a detriment in case their boundaries should be enlarged. The minister knows that he would not like to have to say now what sections of the country are to be brought under irrigation. The municipalities may not foresee that there would be any irrigation works carried on within their limits. Then the section as it stands to-day would be amply sufficient, I think it does protect the municipalities as it stands. But it is the point which is taken by the Union of Alberta Municipalities which I want the minister to guard against, the objection they take to the section as it stands. I am told and I assume it is correct, that on the 5th of December the minister communicated with the secretary of the municipalities and told him that a Bill would be introduced in due course. So the minister's statement is hardly correct when he says that this Bill as it stands has been before the House since the beginning of the session. I do not know the date of the first reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. December 5.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY Apparently the same date as that of the letter which was sent to the secretary of the union saying that a Bill would be introduced.

Mr. OLIVER. What I have said in regard to the sections we have had under consideration does not apply to a great deal of the printed Bill that is placed before the House to-day. During the adjournment I was able to go into the subject of irrigation a little more fully than I had been able to do before the opening of the House. Before the opening of the House my object was to meet the views of the municipalities in protecting their interests, and to make other provisions in the same direction. But during the adjournment, after looking carefully into the provisions of the Bill, and having had favourable opportunities of considering its possible operation, and knowing the Bill had to be considered again in the House, I thought it well to suggest certain further amendments, which I have had embodied in the proposed Bill, and have had placed before the House to-day. I would not press these new provisions to a conclusion to-day, but I would be glad if the committee would consider these amendments introduced to-day in place of the amendments that we considered before the adjournment; I would like to have at least a preliminary discussion upon them, so that the country may have an opportunity of considering them as a result of this discussion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that would be quite satisfactory, coupled with that the further reference, that before the Bill finally left the committee copies of it should be sent to the Union of Alberta Municipalities, so that we may know what criticism they have to make upon its provisions.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me this is rather a strange mix-up. Notice is put on the paper of an Irrigation Bill, and it is introduced in the House, explanations are made, the discussion takes place upon the principle, the House assents to the principle, and we are prepared to go into committee on that Bill. But after an interregnum of a short time, we come back and find another Bill put into our hands materially different from the one which the House considered, and sent to the Committee of the Whole. We are asked now to take up this new Bill in place of the other one. Now what is the authority of the minister for passing around this new Bill in place of the old one? I scarcely think the circumstances justify his changing the Bill and handing us another one.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill that was before the House before the adjournment is before the House to-day in its reprinted form. I presume it would have been quite in order, after the amendments which were contained in the original Bill had been considered in committee, or during their consideration, to have made other amendments. It would have been however inconvenient, or impossible in fact, for the House at large to have acquainted itself thoroughly with these amendments as they would have had to be moved from time to time. Therefore I thought there could be no objection, although slightly deviating from the ordinary rule, if I took the opportunity of embodying the proposed amendments in the Bill so that each member should have them in his hands. A comparison will be noticed between the sections of the Act as it stands to-day, and as it is proposed with the 'amending words.' Although this is a deviation from the ordinary rule, I hope the House will accept it for the sake of arriving at a good understanding of what is wanted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A reprint of the Bill as now proposed?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. With regard to section 4, the reprint is different from the clause first proposed. Is it proposed to carry the clause as it originally came down, or as reprinted?

Mr. OLIVER. The reprint contains an amendment which was suggested by the

hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and which we desire to propose to the House should we consider the passing of the section; as at the suggestion of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) I do not intend to push the section to a conclusion to-day. I would move, if it is necessary, that we take up the amendments as placed before the House to-day and consider them from the beginning in order that I may explain the purpose of each proposed amendment.

Section 4 allowed to stand.

On section 1, interpretation clause,

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of this amendment is to make a convenient and suitable provision so that we may use the expression 'domestic purposes' in a sense more in keeping with its true intent. The existing Act provides that 'domestic purposes' means household and sanitary purposes and all purposes connected with the watering of stock and the working of railways or factories by steam.' In applying the Act we find when we wish to use the words 'domestic purposes' we are compelled to use them in a sense that will cover the operation of railways and factories, which is not, properly speaking, domestic purposes, and we think it better to make a change providing a section which will cover purely domestic purposes, putting the use of water for railways or factories under a provision for industrial purposes. We would propose that section (k) of section 2 should read :

'Domestic purposes' means household and sanitary purposes and all purposes connected with the watering of stock and the working of agricultural machinery by steam, but shall not include the sale or barter of water for such purposes.

That is to say we want to allow the use of water to generate steam in a threshing machine, crushing machine, &c., as domestic purposes, but as I said we do not want to include under this, water required for railways and factories; that should come under 'industrial purposes' for which we provide under section No. 2.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the expression 'industrial purposes' used in the Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes, in section 10.

On section 5, use of water for domestic purposes.

Mr. OLIVER. This amended section makes clearer our purpose in making the distinction between domestic and industrial purposes. We thought that whenever any person acquired the right to use water for irrigation purposes he should also have the right to use it for domestic purposes. But as domestic purposes were originally defined in the Bill, the water could thus be used for railways and factories on the pretense that such purposes were domestic purposes. After amending the definition of domestic purposes we think we are justified in saying that wherever a man has secured the right to divert water for irrigation purposes he should have the right to use water for domestic purposes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But not for industrial purposes?

Mr. OLIVER. Not for industrial purposes.

On section 6, the right to use water for preservation of life, &c.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 11 in the original Act preserves the inherent right to use water as it flows. The section reads :

No application for any purposes shall be granted where the proposed use of the water shall deprive any person owning lands adjoing the river, stream, lake or other source of supply, of whatever water he requires for domestic purposes.

We desire to add to that words that will preserve to any person the right to use that water wherever he may find it for the preservation of life, or the protection of property. The right to the water is inherent in the government ; that is to say in the whole people. Although we allow the irrigation company to use the water under license for the purpose of irrigation, we consider that they should not be entitled to prevent any person from using that water to drink or to put out a fire. It is more a matter of principle than it is a matter of real utility. We want to affirm the principle that the actual right to the water remains with the people ; we sell only the use of the water to the irrigation company, we do not sell them the water itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The drafting of that section is not happy. Reading the amendment without the context one would get the idea that the applicant for the right was the same as the person who is not to be deprived of the water, and that is not the intention. It would be an improvement were it to read :

And any right to water granted to any applicant under this Act shall not deprive any other person of the right to the use of such water for the preservation of life and property.

Mr. OLIVER. I will make a note of that and attend to it. Now, section 15 of the original Act provides for the filing of plans with the commissioner of irrigation, who, when this Act was passed, was also the Commissioner of Public Works for the Northwest Territories. The offices are now divided and the commissioner of irrigation has no connection with the provincial government. While providing for the filing of plans with the commissioner of irrigation, we have to make provision for the filing of

plans with the Commissioner of Public Works for the province, as we provide for requiring his consent in respect to the crossing of roads and other property under the control of the province. There is an amendment to provide for that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand this amendment with reference to the authorization of a work by the Dominion government, and the withholding of consent by a municipality.

Mr. OLIVER. It is hardly a business-like proposition in a way, but it is in case the provincial authorities should refuse to give their consent until the Dominion government had authorized the work. Now we will not authorize a work until the provincial authorities or the municipality gives their consent and this amendment is to get over any possibility of a dead-lock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You should insert the word 'satisfactory' before the word 'evidence' so as to make it read : 'satisfactory evidence.'

Mr. OLIVER. Very good.

On section 13,

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of this amendment is to make definite and clear the responsibility of the minister in regard to the agreements between the company and the users of water. As the section stands at present, the by-laws, regulations and tariffs of the company are subject to the approval of the minister. This places a very heavy burden of responsibility upon him, and yet does not give him that full right or power of protection of the interests of the users of water that he should have if he is to be charged with such responsibility, inasmuch as an agreement might be made which might be to a very great extent to the disadvantage of the users of water, and that would not be under the supervision of the minister. It seems to me that if the minister is to be brought into this matter at all, he should be vested with the full right of protection, otherwise he should be relieved of the responsibility of protecting the users of water.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the practice ? Is there a standard form of agreement ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. The form of agreement is submitted from time to time for approval. Each agreement is a standard for itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I mean, has each company a standard form of agreement ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and it is a question just how far the authority of the minister goes in regard to that agreement. I think the doubt should be removed, and that if the minister is to have any responsibility at all he should have full responsibility.

On the question, that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to pass any legislation such as was asked for by the Western Canada Irrigation Association, which met in July last, and at which there were present representatives of the Department of the Interior, the government of British Columbia and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. One demand which they particularly made was that certain lands should be withdrawn from sale and settlement, after investigations had been made, for the purpose of establishing natural reservoir sites. I would ask the minister if he intends to introduce the legislation they request in that regard, either in this Bill or in a separate Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that legislation is necessary to meet the requirements in that regard. For a long time there have been certain reservations of land with a view to their use as reservoir sites and other purposes necessary for irrigation, and I think the government has still authority to make such reservations.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Last session I asked the minister what was being done in this regard, and he informed me on the 11th of March, 1907, that he had three men in the field making investigations, gauging streams and seeing what steps could be taken to preserve the water supply. This was his answer :

> Last season three parties were in the field. One party was occupied in gauging the rivers and large streams to determine the flow of water therein and in obtaining general information for the hydrographic branch. The other two parties were employed in gauging the smaller creeks in addition and in inspecting works in connection with irrigation schemes.

I do not know how the minister proposes to do this without legislation. A school section might be found to be the proper sight for a natural reservoir. It seems to me that some legislation would have to be passed to withdraw these lands from sale and settlement. The Western Canada Irrigation Association made other demands to which it is not necessary for me to refer the minister, as they are in his department. What I would ask is what he intends to do with regard to the resolutions passed by that association ?

Mr. OLIVER. As I have already said, the intention of the department is to give every consideration to the resolutions passed, and to deal with the subjects discussed in those resolutions from time to time as it seems possible to do so. Regarding the question of the reservation of reservoir sites, as I have already said, the government has for many years been clothed with authority to make such reservations. That authority

seems to be sufficient, because a number of such reservations have been made. With regard to school sections, inasmuch as they are already under reservation and can only be disposed of by authority of the department, it does not seem to me that legislation is necessary to protect the interests of irrigation in that regard.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Is the department taking any steps to select natural reservoir sites at the present time ? Have the three men who were out making investigations made any report ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend is under some misapprehension as to the chief purpose of the employment of the three men whom he mentions. While they are taking notes of the general conditions governing irrigation, gauging streams and looking out for reservoir sites, their main purpose is to meet the requirements of proposals which are from time to time put before the department looking to active irrigation. The time they are able to give to a consideration of the general question is only a small part of their time. But from time to time, as they arrive at a conclusion and place that conclusion before the department, the department is prepared to act as may seem best in the public interest. It is impossible for me to say that the department is prepared to reserve every possible piece of land in the Northwest which may at some time become useful as a reservoir site. On the other hand, it would be impossible for the department to refuse to reserve a piece of ground that is represented as necessary for the purposes of irrigation. We have to deal with these matters as they come up.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Last session I put this question to the hon. minister regarding the investigation being carried on by these gentlemen :

To what extent, if any, is the government, or any department thereof, carrying on investigations in the western provinces, bearing upon the measurement of streams and the conservation of the water supply for irrigation and other purposes by the location and withdrawal from sale and settlement of natural reservoir sites?

The minister replied that these three gentlemen were making an investigation. I would like him to inform the House to-day what the Department of the Interior is prepared to do in the matter. I would like him to say whether, after hearing the representations made last session and those which were made to the officials of his department present at the meeting of the Western Irrigation Association, he has decided that certain sites should be set aside at present as natural reservoir sites for the conservation of the water supply.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be impossible for me to give the information this afternoon, but if my hon. friend will move for a return with regard to any of these matters there will be no difficulty about procuring it.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. Whom does my hon. friend expect to serve by this Bill? Is it intended to serve private companies or to impose restrictions on irrigation companies? On reading over the Bill it seems to be full of objections to the operations of any one who wants to irrigate in the Northwest. Would it not be a better policy for the government themselves to irrigate the Northwest? That work has been done by the United States government in the western parts of the United States, and I do not see why the Canadian government should not do the same thing in our Northwest. When I was in the Northwest I was told that there are millions of acres in that country which would yield three crops a year if irrigated. If that be the case, why leave this work to be done by private companies, subject to all the restrictions put upon them by this Bill? Why not let the government do it and let those who use these fertile lands later on pay their share?

Mr. OLIVER. No doubt for the same reason that the government does not build all the railways and steamboats and other public utilities in the country. There is still some room in this country for the exertion of private enterprise and the application of individual energy. While the question of irrigation by the government is one that may fairly be considered, on the other hand irrigation is one of these things which may always be dealt with by private enterprise. The fact that there is a great deal of irrigation to be done is not conclusive evidence that the government ought to do it. There are limitations even to the ability of the government.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. All the business of the country cannot possibly be prosecuted by any government.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. If there is one kind of work which seems to me that should be done by government it is work of this kind. How can every private owner of lands in the west irrigate them himself without encroaching upon the rights and privileges of his neighbours? I do not quite understand how such work can be carried on by private parties, but can quite understand that it might well be done by the government on a large scale or by a large company like the Canadian Pacific Railway which has been spending a great deal of money in irrigating its own lands. If it is profitable for the Canadian Pacific Railway to do so, would it not be good policy for the government to irrigate those immense areas of government land, the

irrigation of which will make them so fertile?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt a good deal in what my hon. friend says and it is a fair matter for consideration. But up to the present there does not seem to me to be any cause for complaint that irrigation works are not being prosecuted on a sufficiently large scale or that there has not been a fairly rapid development of irrigation enterprise in the Northwest. Even yet irrigation in the west on a large scale as a commercial undertaking is a matter of experiment. That experiment is being carried on by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Alberta Irrigation Company and other companies, and until irrigation has been demonstrated a commercial success, I think it would be well for the government to refrain from undertaking the vast expenditure which would be required in order to bring under development the areas that now require irrigation.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. My hon. friend knows that irrigation of public lands has been the policy of the United States government for some years past. He knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not have gone into that business unless assured of success. I think the success has been proved already. I believe they have spent over $3,000,000 on irrigation and propose spending more next year and every other year until they have irrigated all their lands that require irrigation. If it pays the Canadian Pacific Railway to do this, why would not the same policy be a good one for the Canadian government. That is the proposition I submit to my hon. friend, and the adoption of such a policy would dispense with the necessity of introducing Bills such as this, which seems to contain restrictions rather than anything else.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has said about the operations of the United States government is absolutely correct, and these operations have resulted in this beneficial feature. In the United States these lands when irrigated, are handed over to the settler at the cost of irrigation. But in this country, under the policy lately inaugurated by this government, as exemplified by the Robbin's irrigation deal, the lands are sold to the settler at such prices as the company may see fit to exact. There is no limit fixed on the price the company may exact from the settler. Under these circumstances, what my hon. friend said is worthy of our gravest consideration. The United States irrigation system has been a vast success—there is no doubt about that. It has been carried on by economical and businesslike methods and is to-day adding enormously to the wealth of the United States by bringing into the market for the benefit of the settler great areas of land upon which the crops are always certain. In this country we have a very large area which can be irrigated. Up to the present time, this work has been altogether left to private enterprise. We might not complain so much about that, if it had been left to private enterprise under the latter policy of the government, under fair conditions. But it has not been left to private enterprise upon conditions that are fair to the settler. I allude again to the illustration mentioned just now of the Robbins Irrigation Company, which seems to have been devised not only to hold up the settler in the future but more particularly to put into the pockets of friends of this government about $750,000 or $800,000 without the expenditure by these gentlemen of more than a trifle. I should think that, under these circumstances, the attention of parliament ought to be very carefully directed to this question of irrigation in the west; and so I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is very timely.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I regret that I do not seem to be able to make myself clear to the Minister of the Interior. I have tried to get from him an answer to a question similar to one which I put last session, as to what steps the government have taken, and what they intend to do with regard to the conservation of the water supply in that country. People in that country to-day are becoming alarmed at the concessions given to such concerns as the Robbins Irrigation Company and other large companies covering permission to tap some of the largest streams. Therefore, an agitation has grown up in that country in favour of an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining what length of time the water supply will last, having regard to the amount of land likely to be brought under irrigation. I asked last session, and I repeat the question now: What does the government intend to do? Is the government making an investigation at the present time? If so, has it determined that certain lands should be set aside as natural reservoir sites to conserve the water supply? The minister tells me that I had better move for a return. I fail to see how a motion for a return can bring to light what the government intends to do with regard to this question. I have put the question fairly and have tried to make myself clear, and I would like to get a fair answer from the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know any better way for the hon. gentleman (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to learn what the government has done than to move for a return. As to what the government is going to do, I have stated to the hon. gentleman, and I can only repeat, that the government is taking

such means as indicated in the answer last year to arrive at a conclusion as to what is necessary and practicable. We will act according to the information secured from time to time as the circumstances require. I am sorry if I have not made myself clear, but that is the best I can do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the government information on the subject?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is it, in effect?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the papers before me, nor have I the facts at my fingers' ends. But, from time to time and from year to year, the government has collected records through its surveyors in regard to these matters. These records are available, and I shall have great pleasure in placing them before the House if they are desired.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the government acquired sufficient information to enable it to reach a determination upon the question of policy?

Mr. OLIVER. The question of policy cannot be altogether decided by a mere investigation upon the ground. The question of policy is raised by my hon. friend from Beauharnois, that is, how far the government will assume governmental responsibility with regard to the irrigation of that country. There are different degrees of governmental responsibility that might be assumed. That is a matter of policy not decided by the results of the surveys. But there is no difficulty in giving to the House and to the country from time to time the conclusions which have been reached and the information which has been collected by the different surveys that have been made during the many years past with a view to arriving at a knowledge of the conditions. Of course, it will be obvious that until we have a very complete knowledge of the conditions, it is doubtful what policy we should follow. We must be guided to some extent by the conditions as we find them on the ground and also by our own limitations in regard to financial and other matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the two questions which the minister seems to think identical were absolutely distinct. The question brought up by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) related to the undertaking by the government of a system of irrigation as a public work, while the question brought up by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) is the location and survey by the government of sites available as reservoirs for the storage of water. This latter work might be carried on quite compatibly with leaving the work of irrigation itself to private enterprise. The question was with regard to the government's policy, and it was on that my hon. friend from Calgary wanted information. I can understand that the government's policy would depend a great deal upon the information which may have come into their possession.

Mr. OLIVER. Dealing with that point: If we were going to take hold of irrigation as a governmental responsibility, we should certainly make reservations for reservoir sites, though we would not make such reservations if we were depending in this matter upon private enterprise, for depending upon private enterprise we must not only consider the possibility, but also the reasonable probability, of a certain area being used as a reservoir site in connection with irrigation, so that we need not make useless reservations. It is just as necessary that we should not make useless reservations as that we should make useful reservations. Therefore, there may be many places where a survey would show that, if the government were undertaking the responsibility of irrigating the whole country, it would be wise and proper to make a reservation of a reservoir site, where, unless and until the government assumed that responsibility, it would not be wise to make a reservation, because the loss by making the reservation would be greater than the gain from the use of it by private enterprise at a future time.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister must have come to a decision before sending out the survey parties to get information. He had decided then upon a policy of some kind and he sought for information on the subject. That is two years ago. And, in the meantime, it is to be supposed, he has received information from the parties sent out to make the surveys. What the House is anxious to know is what the minister has done on the information he thus received. Has he decided upon a general policy, or has he decided upon any irrigation work at all?

Mr. OLIVER. So far, the government has not decided upon any irrigation——

Mr. HAGGART. That is what we wanted to get at long ago.

Mr. OLIVER. Then why did you not say so? So far, the government has not decided upon undertaking irrigation work in the west as a governmental responsibility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, the minister has not met the point yet, he is talking about something else altogether. I understand there is not enough water available in the west—the minister will correct me if I am wrong—to irrigate all the land which could be used for that purpose. Then, whether the government is going to undertake the work of irrigation or whe-

ther such work is to be carried on by private individuals and corporations, it is certainly manifest that we ought to know, in the interest of the people, what supply of water can be made available for that purpose. For that reason this association of persons interested in enterprises of that character has asked that there shall be a location and survey, not in their interest, but in the interest of the people as a whole, in the interest of carrying on this work, whether by government enterprise or otherwise—that there shall be a location and surveys of waters available for irrigation in order that we may know exactly how much may be made use of for that purpose. It seems to me that is a very important question for the people of the west, and that we ought to have a little more information on the subject than the minister has given us. He has contented himself simply with saying that the government have not decided to carry on this work as a government work. What have they done, what information have they obtained as to the quantity of water which can be made use of for this purpose, and what proportion of the irrigable area in the west can be made into fertile land by means of that water ? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend wishes his remarks as they will appear on the 'Hansard' to stand as a motion for returns, there will be no difficulty in meeting his views. I suggested a motion for a return to the hon. member for Calgary so that I might see in black and white exactly what he wanted to know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister understands it now.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I think I can get it from 'Hansard'.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has no more approximate statement to make to the House ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. These surveys have been going on for many years, and we have obtained information from time to time as a result of them. But we have not thought it necessary, or thought that the time had arrived, to put all our information together in a form which would suit my hon. friend. It may take some time to do that, but we are willing to have that information made available and put before the House. All I want is a definite statement as to what the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite proper. One more question. Has the government taken any action on the information already collected, or has it come to a conclusion as to a policy upon that information ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it has not come to any conclusion as to any change of policy. The present policy has been in vogue ever since the Irrigation Act was passed in 1898, in fact I may say that since the first Irrigation Act was passed about 1893 there has been no change of policy in regard to irrigation. There was an amendment to the Act in 1898 introducing a number of changes, but the principle was the same right through. We have not yet arrived at the point of deciding to change that policy.

Mr. FOSTER. What appears regrettable is the delay. The minister says he has been getting information for the last six years, as I understood him.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman may add six years more.

Mr. FOSTER. For at least ten years the department has been gathering information with reference to this question and yet the minister has not done anything towards making this information public, he has not thought it necessary to bring that information before the House. When questions are asked him requiring information to be brought before the House, he asks us to make motions therefor. What appears to me to be the radical defect is that all this time delay is going on, insufficient information is being gathered. As I understand the minister, he is just getting what his own officers and surveyors pick out from time to time and report to his department. The question of irrigation and that of water reservation are different. What my hon. friend from Calgary has been talking about is the reservation of the water sources. These are important questions, and I think the government ought to have a policy as to whether they intend to do irrigation work or not. The great wants in that wide country are water, and timber and fuel. With reference to the water supply of the country, the government has been getting information, but it has not been utilizing this information. Has it been, during this time, granting water rights to private parties, and may it not wake up some day to the conclusion that it is necessary to take this matter into its own hands when it finds that rights have been given away to private individuals for a mere trifle, and then may it not have to go to work at great expense to acquire a reversion of these rights to the government ? That is where I think the trouble is. The minister does not appear to think that there is any urgency. All the while that he is thinking there is no urgency, private individuals are getting hold of these sources of water supply. I do not know how many have been given already, the minister himself will be better informed on that point. But in a question of so much importance, the government should be alive, and make up its mind whether it is going to control or reserve the water supply on any broad and general principle. If it simply gives to this applicant, and that applicant, and the

other applicant the sources of this water supply, why, the country may wake up by and by to find that they are in the hands of a few individuals, and the government may wake up to find that it will be at large expense to get these back into its own hands. Therefore time has been lost, and expense has been made which otherwise would not have been necessary. I read not long ago a very suggestive article in a United States magazine which was highly appreciative of the position of Canada in this respect. The main idea of that article was that Canada, for a hundred years to come, in the last analysis, is the great remaining source of water supply and of timber supply on this continent, and that thoughtful men on the other side of the line look to the country north of the 49th parallel for the great ultimate supply of timber for this continent. The timber and the water supply are very closely joined together. If a country is denuded of timber, the water supply goes with it. If the water supply is to be preserved, the timber resources of the country must be carefully looked after. Now this is the greatest franchise that the Dominion has in our northwest country. Your minerals, your agricultural lands are not so valuable, as a franchise, as the timber resources and the water resources of that great Northwest. In times past we have extravagantly and recklessly disposed of the great franchises of this country to private individuals, for nothing or next to nothing. All governments in this country have been wise after the event, and have been foolish before the event. But there is now a general stirring up of public opinion in all countries to-day especially on this continent with reference to the conservation of these great natural resources.

The government could put itself to no task which is more important or which, if properly carried out, would bring greater benefit to the country than the task of absolutely controlling the cutting of timber on all areas which belong to the government with economy and prudence with a view to keep the supply constantly up to the demand. With proper care you may cut these great areas so that at the end of 100 years you will have a better forest reserve than when you commenced to cut; you may do this not only without expense to the country but actually with a revenue from these forests. To do this the forests must be treated as possessions of the country, not belonging to any individual or to any party for party purposes but the franchises and possessions of the country and they must be worked as a business man would work a patrimony, looking not to his lifetime alone, but also to the interests of those who come after him.

The minister undoubtedly has a great opportunity; he has command of the great Northwest, he has an army of officers, he has all the money he wants at his disposal. Every yard of land suitable for forest or water reservation that is available in this country ought to be diligently surveyed and carefully mapped by the government no matter what it costs, and some policy ought to be adopted, whether government control with private ownership or the government development of some system of irrigation; an intelligent and persistent policy should be adopted looking, in the first place, towards co-relating all these sources of water supply so that they may be used to the best advantage for all the people and in the second place reaping the advantages that may come from them in the way of preservation of your lumber and timber areas and the future fertility of that western country and its power to sustain its population. These things depend on the preservation of the water supply; dry up the water supply coming from the hills protected by forests, and your summer suns will do but little towards making fertile the mighty plains which stretch for a thousand miles and which depend for their fertility on the supply of moisture that comes from the mountain tops.

Nothing I say that could be done by the government would redound to the benefit of this country than a systematic and scientific study of these matters and comprehensive and intelligent action in reference to them. If we had been wise in the past all the mighty water-powers which we have given away in this portion of our country could have been preserved for the use of the people and would have been an enormous source of profit and benefit to the people as a whole instead of being, as they are, a great advantage to a few people. Nothing is more important than the preservation of this great Northwest. If it is allowed to go to the hands of speculators, private individuals and corporations, seeking to reap what benefit they can for the year, the Northwest will in the future, instead of being a fertile garden, become something more like a partial desert, for nothing will keep it fertile but the rains and the waters, nothing will give you this moisture but the forests properly preserved.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—salaries, $108,200; contingencies, $21,150.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that whereas last year we paid for 56 employees in that office the minister this year is asking for 77; that instead of 9 second-class clerks he is asking for 15; instead of 13 junior second-class clerks, he is asking for 18; instead of 4 third-class clerks, he is asking for 13. I presume the minister is making this tremendous change

as the result of his investigation into the account system. Am I right in that ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). No.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not ? Then I withdraw all I have said so far as it bears on this; but it seems to me that before we are asked to vote this very large increase we should understand the nature of that investigation and the conclusions come to by the contractor who has cost this country $42,000 to give some hints on bookkeeping and the management of offices. We should know exactly the ground on which the minister asks this increase. Then too, a royal commission composed of three able gentlemen has been appointed to investigate the civil service and these gentlemen have gone into the different departments including his department. It does seem that before saddling this department with 21 more clerks, it would be well to wait for the report of that commission. Does the minister want to forestall that report and what the House may think it is reasonable to carry out ? Would it not be wiser to leave this over until we have this report of the commission ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that I have not increased by one man the number of employees in the department. When I entered the department I found there were a number of temporary employees paid out of various votes and who were doing ordinary clerical work.

Mr. FOSTER. They were not on the civil list.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were not, and I thought the system was irregular and not in the interest of the public service. I gave instructions that when these employees passed their examination they would be put on the civil list and that has been done. There is no real increase in the number of employees ; it is simply that temporary employees have been put on the permanent list.

Mr. BERGERON. The statutory increases would not account for the $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an extra chief clerk, Mr. McElhinney, who is an old employee of the department, who has been a faithful officer, and who I thought deserved promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he is a good man and a good officer ; a very faithful man.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an increase of $100 for Mr. Bell-Dawson, a very good officer, who has charge of the diving service.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the chief engineer?

Mr. BRODEUR. Colonel Anderson. There are four statutory increases to technical officers. Mr. McElhinney being promoted and Mr. Gordon having died, their places will be taken by Mr. Roy and Mr. Campbell at a salary of $1,500 each. There is a statutory increase to fourteen. In the second-class clerks there is an increase of $4,937.50. Mr. Roy and Mr. Campbell who had salaries of $1,400 each, are promoted and their places will be taken by two officers at $1,200 each ; ten clerks get a statutory increase of $50 and one of $37.50. There will be an addition of four clerks in this class at $1,200 each.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are to be four new second-class clerks.

Mr. BRODEUR. They will be taken from the junior second-class and promoted to the second class.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are they ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not absolutely decided who are going to be promoted, but the selections will be made from amongst Mr. A. M. Ross, Mr. M. D. Kelly, Mr. Houde, Mr. Rodd, Mr. Frechette, Miss Tremblay, Mr. Hawken, Mr. Gorman, and Mrs. Lamouche.

Mr. BARR. How will the minister make the selection ?

Mr. BRODEUR. According to merit and the values of the services they have rendered.

Mr. BARR. Political service will have nothing to do with it, I suppose ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say there would be no increase in the number of clerks in the department. How many are in the department now, all told ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Do you mean temporary clerks and all ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I mean the staff we pay for.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are 77 clerks provided for in the estimates ; there are 22 draftsmen in the office of the chief engineer; there are five clerks in the office of the construction of lights who may be called temporary clerks ; three in the ship channel branch, one in pilotage, and one in marine hospitals, making a total of 103.

Mr. TAYLOR. I figure from the Auditor General's Report that you have 108 clerks, and according to the Auditor General's Report for 1896 there were 74 all told, so that you have increased the number by 34.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is precisely in accordance with the statement which I made, that the number of officers in the department is not increased. What I did was this: I found that there were many officers who were purely clerks on the temporary list and whose salaries were charged to various outside services, and I gave instructions that they should pass the examination and be put on the permanent list.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the staff was increased by 34.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I did not increase the number of officers employed in the department. I simply had people who were on the temporary list placed on the permanent list, as I thought it was more regular.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend says he has not increased the number of persons employed in the department. If he looks at the Auditor General's Report for 1895-96, at pages K—3 and K—4, he will find that the total number of officers employed was 74, whereas to-day, according to the Auditor General's Report, he has 108, making an increase of 34.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not pretend that the number has not increased since 1895-96. My hon. friend knows that the business of the department has increased immensely since that time. The work in connection with the St. Lawrence ship channel and the work of the hydrographic survey have been added to our department.

Mr. TAYLOR. In every department of the government the staff has practically doubled.

Mr. BRODEUR. The country has been growing.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the minister why, with the staff he has at his command, he cannot do the work of his department without hiring men from other departments. At page P—37 of the Auditor General's Report it appears that he paid to Horace St. Louis for services in drafting Bills *re* Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and Three Rivers $200. Then at page P-97 it appears that he paid E. Lacas, clerk in the Public Works Department, for making blue prints of lights, &c., at 14 cents per square foot, $449.90. Why cannot the hon. gentleman have this work done by the staff of his own department?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. St. Louis was instructed by the late minister to prepare a Bill relating to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. It was a very difficult Bill to prepare, entailing a great deal of work, including an examination of all the legislation passed with reference to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners for a great length of time. Mr. St. Louis was paid $200 for that work, and I do not think the amount can be considered too much for a work of that importance.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is a translator paid by the House?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I think he is a sessional clerk. With regard to the other case mentioned, Mr. Lacas is photographer to the Department of Public Works, and he has been doing some work for us as photographer.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister pay the man or the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was paid himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the minister see that as this gentleman is an employee of the Public Works Department and gets his salary as such, his time and services are due to that department? If the minister wants some work done which the Department of Public Works can do through one of its servants, he ought to negotiate with the Minister of Public Works and pay the Department of Public Works for the time of the servant taken from that department.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the way that I understand it was done.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend said that the pay went to the man and not to the department. If it went to the department that would be a real economy, because it would prevent my hon. friend setting up a photographic establishment in his own department. This is irregular and all the row made against the Conservative government for the double payment plan was on account of the practice which my hon. friend is now putting in force. He is paying an employee of another department $200 while at the same time he gets his pay from another department.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the first time the matter has been brought to my attention, and I shall be very glad to look into it. The Department of Public Works might require his full time and we might not be able to get his services so easily, unless we had an arrangement with that department under which we would pay a part of his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. That is perfectly right, if the minister and two or three other ministers would pool their issues on the photographic business, and each contribute a part of the salary. But this is evidently an afterthought of the hon. gentleman's. What has been done has been to take this man from his regular work and pay him extra.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall inquire into the matter, but there is good reason why our department should pay something in order to ensure that the services of this man will be at our disposal. Otherwise the Minister of Public Works might not be willing to lend him to us.

Mr. FOSTER. I never knew the Minister of Public Works to deny anything. He will do all the service he possibly can and do it willingly.

Mr. BENNETT. The complaint of the House and the country will not be regarding what is paid the permanent staff but what is paid the outside staff, because this department is notorious for outside extrava-

gance. In the past few years they have rushed in every direction to try and spend money, and what is worse is that they get no return for the money expended. Let the hon. minister turn to page P—171 of the Auditor General's Report and he will find there this startling item:—

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, commissioners—
John Birnie, Collingwood, advances not yet accounted for, $2,250.
J. J. Noble, Little Current, advances not yet accounted for, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman wait until we have reached that item? The officers of the fisheries branch will be here when we discuss the fisheries estimates, and I shall then be glad to give all the information he wants.

Mr. BENNETT. I had better introduce the matter now, and the minister will be prepared to fortify himself later. He knows what these items represent. They represent one of the grossest travesties perpetrated on the country for years. These two Collingwood men went about the country on a fishery commission. One of them was not a fisherman at all, but a lawyer. And the government have actually paid these men over $3,000 and have not got a bill from either of them to show what value they have given or what they have done. Last year we had something of the same kind appearing in the Auditor General's Report. In that report I find that the Auditor General asked the department to get bills from these men for the amounts paid them. Yet in the face of that warning last year, the minister paid these two gentlemen this year over $3,000 more without a single voucher or bill to show what they did with the money. The minister's deputy is here at his hand and must know all about it because he is the deputy minister of the fisheries branch as well as of the Marine Department. When we are voting the salary of the deputy minister and other officials, are we not entitled to an explanation as to how it could possibly happen that over $3,000 should be paid these two gentlemen this year, without their rendering any bill, especially when the Auditor General complained last year that money had likewise been paid them for which they had given no account. How is it that these payments are made when we have all these officials to prevent abuses of that kind?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows that it is customary, when officers of the department have to travel, to advance them moneys for their disbursements, and it may happen that their accounts have not been put in before the close of the year or have not been settled. If I remember right, in this case there were some advances made to these commissioners for travelling and other expenses. I think their accounts have been put in and are now in the hands of the department, but I suppose not in time to be embodied in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. minister to obtain for us the information where this Mr. Lacas, who got $499 for making blue prints, is at present, and what department he is working in? I understand that he is spending the money on a trip to England.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask the hon. gentleman also to have the information to-night regarding these payments to Messrs. Birnie and Noble of over $3,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. When we reach the estimates I shall have all the information.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) find out what Mr. Lacas is doing now?

Mr. BRODEUR. He is not in our department, as I explained. But I understand that he is on leave of absence.

Mr. TAYLOR. But he was employed in doing work for the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Brodeur's) department.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, as I explained before recess.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister may remember that when the Liberal-Conservatives were in power some of the ministers, in order to economize, gave out copying to civil servants, the work to be done after hours. But charges were preferred and these civil servants were dismissed for doing this work. I understand that an order in council was passed to prevent a repetition of this kind of thing. But here is a clerk in the Public Works Department to whom this minister of Marine and Fisheries pays $499.90 for doing extra work—the work, no doubt, done during the hours when he ought to have been working for the Public Works Department. And this, notwithstanding the fact that the minister of Marine and Fisheries probably has in his own department men who might just as well do the work. And the same in drafting bills. They have a law clerk in the department, a law clerk in the House of Commons, the Solicitor General with his staff, and yet the minister must come to Mr. St. Louis and give him $200 to draft a bill. That is a scandalous way to handle the people's money. Perhaps the minister has some further examination. If not, I have another matter to which I wish to refer.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may repeat what I have already said. The work done by Mr. Lacas was special work. We had to choose between employing a man for this work at a cost of perhaps $1,500 or $2,000 and having the work done by Mr. Lacas at a cost of $499.90.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the minister know what blue prints are worth ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think this was for making blue prints.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General says it was—making blue prints at 14 cents a foot, and that is just double the price that the work can be had for anywhere.

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant of the department informs me that this was for blue prints. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is right.

Mr. TAYLOR. And does the hon. minister know what this work can be done for outside ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Personally, I am not aware what blue prints are worth. But these accounts are certified by Col. Anderson, the chief engineer of the department, and I am sure that he would not certify any account that was not right.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will move for this account in the Public Accounts Committee. I understand that in this item we are voting also the salary of Mr. Fraser who is in charge of the Dominion light station at Prescott. I look upon that as simply an institution to harbour a hundred men or so for the purpose of trying to change the political complexion of that constituency. Let me read an article from the Prescott 'Journal,' a good Liberal paper, in which article the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) is referred to :

Dr. W. C. Brown was the recipient of a handsome gold-headed cane on Friday evening last, the donors being the workingmen at the Dominion lighthouse depot. The presentation took place in the parlours of the Revere, which were tastefully trimmed for the occasion. The donation was accompanied by the following:

Prescott, Ontario, November 28, 1907.

Dr. William Brown,

President Liberal Association of Grenville.

Dear sir,—Your many friends of the workingmen employed at the Dominion lighthouse depot, Prescott, take this the first opportunity of thanking you for the deep interest you have taken in their behalf since your election as president of the Liberal Association of Grenville. We know that you have worked hard, and accomplished much in the general interests of the Liberal party. It would not do to go into details at the present time with reference to matters that you have dealt with during your short time in office, but we know that what you have done in our behalf will be plainly seen when the proper time arrives.

When voting time comes round these men will be on deck.

We feel that as workingmen, it is a pleasure to approach you with any misunderstandings between ourselves and the department for which we labour, and that everything has been so agreeably arranged by you that we cannot allow this festive season to pass without in some way showing our appreciation, and would ask you to accept this gold-headed cane as a slight token of the esteem in which you are held by the workmen at the Dominion lighthouse depot, Prescott. We trust you may be able to carry it many years as a support to help you to continue your good work.

As our representative, we would ask you to convey to the Hon. Louis P. Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, also those in authority at the Prescott works, our thanks for the many acts of kindness shown in our behalf. To Mrs. Brown and the little Browns, we express our deepest feelings, wishing you all long life and prosperity.

Now are we going to pay men, a hundred and more, employed there, making I dont know what, some trimmings for a lighthouse, at an awful expense to the country, and very little use to the seamen, simply as a political school, who say, according to this letter, that 'when the time comes we will show our appreciation of you as president of the Liberal Association.' When the proper time comes their votes are ready for the candidate that supports this government. This is the way that the public money is wasted in supporting a hotbed of Gritism. I say it is a disgrace, and the government ought to repudiate any such statements coming from their employees. I hope the minister will repudiate it at once.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am very glad to hear from my hon. friend that these people in Prescott are satisfied with their lot. I had to-day a delegation from Prescott asking the department to do something for these men, saying they were not treated fairly, and they ought to get a bigger salary. From what my hon. friend says, I am glad to see that they are satisfied with their position. Of course we have not been able to meet all their wishes concerning an increase of salary, but I am not without hope at an opportune time of doing something for them.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is this gentleman, the president of the Liberal Association, an officer of the government at Prescott ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he has no connection at all with the department.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Well, I understood he was.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he is not an officer of the department at all, has no connection with the department.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Has nothing to do as an official of the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he is not in receipt of any money from the government.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is very indelicate for any establishment belonging to the government to allow its employee to put on record such an exhibition as that. It is clearly barefaced misconduct, and I think it should not be overlooked by this House. It should not be allowed, and would not be allowed if the gentleman at the head of that department had a proper appreciation of the propriety of the situation. This is a political machine, made up of employees of the government, who are under control of the department, and the head of the department has not one word to say against such conduct. I am surprised that the Minister of Public Works, who is member for Brockville, does not repudiate it, because he is reputed to be a fairminded man who desires to do what is right.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice in the Auditor General's Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries that no less a sum than $45,997.11 of the people's money was spent in travelling by the ministers and his officials, during nine months.

Mr. BRODEUR. Where is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can give the hon. gentleman the page in the Auditor General's Report for every item. Let him look first at page P—6 to begin with. This is the way the people of this country are deceived. Hon. gentlemen supporting the government do not take the trouble to inform themselves of what is going on. I dare say there is not a gentleman on the other side of the House who has looked over the report to see the extravagance of this government. I am preparing a statement, which I will present in a few days, showing a comparison of the expenditure in that department for travel in 1896 with what it has cost this last year for only nine months. On page 6 there is a sum of $1,730 for travel; Hon. L. P. Brodeur, $596; F. Gourdeau, $290; A. W. Owen, $234; M. P. McElhinney, $100; R. A. Willard, $400; R. N. Venning, $97; Napoleon Potvin, $11. That is all right, nobody objects. Then on the same page he will find 'Travel of Ottawa officials paid from votes other than Civil Government,' and these items amount to $8,388.19. If the hon. gentleman will turn over every page of the Auditor General's Report he will find items for travelling mixed up with other items. For instances, turn to page 29:

Advances to Minister of Marine and Fisheries for trip to England, $2,000; ocean fares of minister and party, Canada to England, $890; sleepers to St. John, $25.

Now the price of a sleeper from here to St. John is $2.50, so the hon. gentleman must have taken ten persons in his party to make up the $25. Then he had to take his secretary and a messenger to make the party complete, $1,150 to these two gentlemen. Altogether, we have in this place about $4,000. I could go over page after page and show where the people's money has been thrown away in this manner. Take page 12, $114; page 28, $26, $518, $1,204, $868; page 29, $84.20, $172.71; page 31, $319. So it runs on page after page. On page 78 you find an item of $4,059 to Commander Spain, that amounts to $10 a day for the nine months, supposing he travelled every day. He went over to New York, and we had evidence last year what he was doing in New York; he spent the people's money in trumping up evidence in a divorce suit. Yet this government paid over $4,000 to Commander Spain for travelling. So it goes on all through the book, the total coming to some $4,000. I want an explanation from the minister as to why these officers have received this money.

Mr. BRODEUR. I see on page 6 that the minister and deputy minister received some travelling expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not object to that.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman does not object to that. He does not object I understand to travelling expenses of Ottawa officials being paid from votes other than Civil Government.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think a good deal of that has been extraordinary.

Mr. BRODEUR. I might explain what the duties of these officials are and then my hon. friend will perhaps see that the expenses are not too large. Col. Anderson is the chief engineer of the department and has to look after the work from British Columbia to Halifax.

Mr. TAYLOR. His assistant has received over $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, Mr. D. H. Fraser, who has been travelling a great deal. Mr. Fraser has had special supervision of much of the work, especially the work on the St. Lawrence. He has gone to British Columbia and I do not think that the amounts which have been spent are too large.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was Mr. Fraser, doing in New York at the end of October?

Mr. BRODEUR. I see he went to New York but I do not know exactly for what purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister let us know about that and also about Commander Spain's trip?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall be very glad to give the information.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister let me have the information about the advance to Messrs. Birnie and Noble?

Mr. BRODEUR. I asked if we could get the information to-night but the department was closed.

Mr. BENNETT. The officers who are with the minister must know how it occurred that this further advance was made to these gentlemen after the Auditor General had called the attention of parliament and of the department to the fact that the previous amounts had not been fully explained.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that these advances were made on the recommendation of Prof. Prince, chairman of the commission, but I shall get all the information.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surprised that the minister should be informed that these advances were made on the recommendation of Prof. Prince. The minister knows that Prof. Prince was not with these men on their peregrinations for several months past.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sorry my hon. friend wants to discuss this question just now. It properly comes under the Fisheries branch and I do not think it fair to ask for details on the item now under consideration. My hon. friend said this afternoon that he wished the information when we reached the item and he will get more information from me if he will be kind enough to wait until then.

Mr. BENNETT. We are voting the salaries of the general officers of the department who should know about these advances in view of the attention called to them by the Auditor General. Did not the minister authorize the advance of $2,500 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember but I do not think I did; such accounts never come before the minister. I worked in the department from nine in the morning for about fifteen hours in the day but in spite of that I am not able to look into all these details.

Mr. BENNETT. Then who did advise the advance ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall be glad to give the information when we come to the item. I know that Prof. Prince, who he says did not know anything about what was done by his colleagues on the commission——

Mr. BENNETT. I did not say that, I said he had not been with them and as a consequence would not know how much travelling they had done.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was under the impression that he had been accompanying them for most if not all the time. I know he was engaged on some other commission, and perhaps he has not been there for some time, but it is easy to ascertain whether these gentlemen were doing their work or not by looking at the evidence and ascertaining the dates and places of sitting.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am at a loss to understand why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) should so persistently renew his attack on the fishery commission. The hon. gentleman knows full well that Professor Prince is the chairman of that commission, and consequently the director of it, and if he did not want the commission to sit in his absence all he had to do was to say so, for as chairman he would dominate. It is idle to say that Professor Prince did not know what was going on and what was being done; if he did not know then he was derelict in his duty, and I do not think that even the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will say that. It is easy for the hon. gentleman to get up and say in glib language, that the doings of that commission are a travesty on justice, but we have not had one title of evidence and not one statement from his mouth in condemnation of the work of that commission. To my way of thinking that commission has done good work; it has informed the public of the depletion of the fisheries in that district; it has warned them of the necessity for waking up to the situation if the fisheries in the future are to exist in anything more than a name. If they have done that and that only the commission would be worth the money expended on it. Last session the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) saw fit to make a very vicious attack on Mr. John Birnie, a member of that commission, and although I was in the building at the time the hon. gentleman did so, I was not in my seat for the moment. Again this evening, the hon. gentleman has made some slighting remarks with regard to Mr. Birnie. In the first place he stated that Mr. Noble and Mr. Birnie, two members of the commission, come from Collingwood. In that statement the hon. gentleman is absolutely incorrect. Mr. Noble is not a citizen of Collingwood; he resides at Little Current, and for his appointment I am in no way responsible. For Mr. John Birnie's appointment I am responsible; I recommended his appointment, and I have had no word of complaint from any fisherman or any citizen on the Georgian Bay in respect to that appointment. I happen to know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has had a personal and private quarrel with Mr. John Birnie; some kind of a business disagreement, something outside of this commission altogether, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman is not behaving as an hon. gentleman ought in the discharge of his public duty when he brings up in this House extraneous matters with regard to which his personal feelings may have been hurt, and makes a malicious attack in this House against a man who cannot protect himself. Mr. Birnie doubtless will have to account for every dollar he has had, and Mr. Birnie is capable of doing so. Last year Mr. Birnie was held up by the hon. gentleman as too bad for words to describe. Well, let me tell the House that in the first instance Mr. Birnie is a King's

Counsel, and in the second instance he has been for years the legal adviser of the municipality of the town of Collingwood. As the hon. gentleman knows, Collingwood is, at all events in local politics, a Conservative town; it has given the local member in past years from 10 to 200 majority. Mr. John Birnie in the last election when the Ross government was swept out of existence, ran as a Liberal against the very popular member for West Simcoe, Mr. James Duff. The town of Collingwood, Conservative as it always had been up to that time, gave Mr. Birnie a majority of the votes. If his reputation is so bad as the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) would lead us to believe, he is at all events recognized as a man of considerable standing, considerable integrity, and considerable reputation in his own town in which he has resided for many years past. I say this, in justification of Mr. Birnie, I say it because of the pertinacity of the hon. gentleman in pressing this question, even to the extent of bringing it up at an inopportune time, when the question is not properly before the House, and when he can only bring it before the House on the flimsy excuse that this being a vote for the civil service at Ottawa, some civil servants have been derelict in their duty. As the minister has pointed out, the chairman of that commission is responsible for the money paid out to the commission; it cannot be had without his recommendation; he must say that the commissioners are entitled to it. It may be that these gentlemen were entitled to a great deal more than they got when the money was advanced, although the money may not have been accounted for at the time, and indeed it may have been already accounted for although not published in the Auditor General's Report. It appears to me that it is quite unfair for the hon. gentleman to force a discussion on this matter at the present moment. We have not got the facts before us; the papers are not here. There are many ways of investigating the matter. When the vote for the fishery commissioners comes up we must get full explanation in regard to it, and if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the explanation given here, the Public Accounts Committee is open to him to make further inquiry. He made a motion last year for the papers in regard to the moneys paid to Mr. Birnie in the Public Accounts Committee, and that can be investigated there. I do appeal to the hon. gentleman, that it is only fair to Mr. Birnie—for whose appointment I am responsible, having recommended it—that the hon. gentleman should wait to discuss the matter until we have all the facts before us.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has said that I made a vicious attack on Mr. Birnie. I do not know what the viciousness of the attack consists in, because my attack was directed on the department; that after this department had had its attention called to the fact that one of its officials had not made a proper explanation of moneys advanced to him, the department should have advanced to these two gentlemen $2,500 more. I am in the judgment of all fair minded men that that is the extent of the attack I made. I never said anything about Mr. Birnie's professional standing. True I have not lauded him as my hon. friend has; true I have not told the House and the country that Mr. Birnie is a King's Counsel. It was only modesty that prevented the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) from telling the House that he is in the same batch. There was a time in the province of Ontario when the government was so busy at grinding out K.C.'s and J.P.'s that there were as many K.C.'s created as J.P.'s. The Minister of Railways who was in the Ontario Legislature will, I think, bear me out in that.

Mr. GRAHAM. With reference to the J.P's; I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) is referring to this past year.

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) is quite right that the J.P.'s were rolled out in the past year for the benefit of the province of Ontario, and he knows full well that many respectable J.P.'s were reappointed, and he knows full well how many of the older type of J.P.'s were not. The time has gone in Ontario when so-called magistrates are carted around as they were formerly to counteract the judgment of the presiding magistrate and to make a travesty of justice as was the system under the Ross government. Did the Minister of Railways ever read the celebrated case of the Queen and McCrae, tried in the county of Simcoe, where it was shown that half a dozen of these magistrates were brought there, and where Chief Justice Armour said it was a disgrace that the government should appoint men who would allow themselves to be reduced to the position of trying to crowd out the presiding magistrate in that case. True, there have been K.C.'s rolled out or rolled in as you please to call it, and Mr. Birnie was created a K.C. and so was my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy). In these days it was similar to the conditions after the late civil war when nearly every one was made a colonel. Since my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) has introduced the subject as an evidence of great legal standing and impresses us that Mr. Birnie is a K.C., I need only point out that Mr. Birnie is a K.C. who shuts up his law office and travels all around the country for six dollars a day. That is a fair sample of how cheap the position of K.C. has been reduced in Ontario, when a K.C. shuts up his law office and hawks around the country for six

dollars a day. It strikes me that when a K.C. can shut up his offices and go hawking around the country at $6 a day, there must be a pressing necessity on his part to be paid in advance. Why has he not made an explanation of the prior charges.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the accountant of the department that he made the explanation, and when we come to discuss this question I will give the hon. gentleman the explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister cannot shield himself by that. He is on trial for all the work of his department. We are to-day running through his executive—his deputy, his technical officers and all the machinery by which he carries on the work of his department, and this House has a perfect right to refuse to vote the supplies for civil government if it considers that the minister has not well administered his department to the meanest branch of it. It is a mere matter of convenience as to when you will discuss that; but when you come to the rights of the case, my hon. friend from Simcoe has a perfect right to discuss it, and get the minister's answer before this item goes to a vote.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not quite agree to the principle just asserted by my hon. friend. The estimates of the department are composed of many items. We are now considering the salaries of the officers, and my hon. friend claims that under these he has a right to go over the whole administration of the department. Is that his contention ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I do not know much about parliamentary procedure, but that does not look to me to be in accordance with the rules of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me put this point to my hon. friend. He has charge of a dozen different branches of his department. We will suppose that one of these branches is absolutely corrupt and is shown to be absolutely corrupt within the knowledge of the minister. Would he have the House vote the moneys for all the other branches of the department and put them at the disposal of the minister in the face of a circumstance of that kind ? When we are voting the minister's salary and the salaries of all his officers, and we ask a question as to which the minister has some knowledge, is he going to refuse to answer on the ground that it is not according to parliamentary practice? No. My hon. friend is here to answer for his department, and when he will answer as to what is a mere matter of convenience. I have no doubt, however, that my hon. friend from Simcoe will not press the question unduly if the minister shows a fair disposition to give an answer. But the minister and his deputy together ought to be able to give an answer that will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. BRODEUR. I might of course give an answer to the hon. gentleman, but at the same time I must tell the House that I shall be in a better position to give all the information when we have the papers. I will lay before the House all the papers in reference to this matter. We can then discuss it very much better, and see whether there has been anything wrong in connection with it. With reference to the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman, that on the civil service estimates we can discuss everything connected with the department, I cannot agree with him. I think it would be very much better that on these estimates we should discuss only the salaries of the officers. To enter into a discussion now of the administration of the Fisheries Commission would not be fair either to the House or to the minister.

Mr. BENNETT. Had the minister before six o'clock volunteered the information which he has given just now, that the first account to which the Auditor General called attention had been satisfactorily adjusted, the whole matter would have dropped. Can he tell me whether it is $6 a day which Mr. Birnie has received ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure it is more than that. It would not be fair to him, in view of his position, to pay him only $6 a day.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister what he is paid ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $17, I am informed.

Mr. BENNETT. Exclusive of expenses ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Exclusive of expenses.

Mr. BENNETT. What is Mr. Noble paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy says $6 or $7 a day.

Mr. BENNETT. Was it agreed at first that Mr. Birnie should be paid $17 and Mr. Noble $6 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether the order in council mentioned how much they were to receive or not.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, it is a great tribute to the sagacity of this department. A commission is appointed to investigate the fisheries of the Georgian bay. Three gentlemen are selected. Nobody will take exception to Professor Prince. Nobody will take exception to Mr. Noble as a practical fisherman. This practical fisherman, who is supposed to know something about the subject, gets $6 a day, and a lawyer gets $17 a day. This will not commend itself to common sense men. One thing the minister will thank his stars for is that he did not make

this arrangement. Is he the minister responsible for arranging the pay, or did he find it arranged when he came in ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Being at the head of the department I am of course responsible for everything done there even before I became minister. My hon. friend wants to discuss the case of Mr. Birnie before the papers come down.

Mr. BENNETT. I will discuss it again.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose it would be better for all concerned if my hon. friend would wait until we have the papers. I may tell my hon. friend that Mr. Birnie was not only a member of the commission ; he was also the secretary of the commission, doing all the clerical work in connection with it, preparing subpœnas and documents of all kinds, and that is the reason he was paid $10 a day extra.

Mr. BENNETT. When all the documents and correspondence come down there will not be a title of evidence to show that Mr. Birnie was to be paid $17 a day at the outset, but they will show that there was a dispute as regards his remuneration. Had the hon. minister said a while ago that the account to which the Auditor General had called the attention of the House had been settled, he would have prevented all this discussion. On himself and his deputy and the other officials rests the responsibility for prolonging it. He will find nothing in the arrangement made at the outset providing that this celebrated K.C. was to receive $17 a day. He was paid to make out subpœnas and that is about all the K.C.'s appointed under the Ontario government are fitted for.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman might give his experience as a K.C. There was a batch that did not live long.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister only gave us part of the information with reference to his travelling expenses. He did not explain the point I raised in reference to Commander Spain having spent $10 a day during nine months.

Mr. BRODEUR. I promise the hon. gentleman that I can give information regarding those travelling expenses to New York.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let him explain for himself how he took $2,000 over to England and charged the expenses of his party against the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not charge the expenses of any one accompanying me. I paid myself all the expenses of those who were with me. What happened was this. An account was sent to the department to cover not only my own accommodation on the steamship and trains, but also that of the commissioner who was accompanying me besides my secretary and some other persons. The department paid that, and I have given instructions to reimburse the amount.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's Report says plainly that they were paid by the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. We left here the beginning of April or end of March, and it was just at the end of the fiscal year. I was away six months and could not render an account before I came back, but I have rendered it since.

Mr. TAYLOR. But this was twelve months ago, immediately after the adjournment of the session a year ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was away until the month of October. What my hon. friend sees is the money advanced just before I left. I was away during six months and therefore could not render an account or settle with the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. This report is to the 31st March of last year and there is no credit in it for a rebate. The minister took over $2,000 and charged the country with the expenses of himself and party to England. Surely he did not pay all that for his own passage nor did he pay $25 for a pullman from here to St. John. This was done a year ago last spring, and the Auditor General's Report closed the 31st March last.

Mr. BRODEUR. The settlement will appear in the accounts of the existing fiscal year ending the 31st March, 1908. The money was advanced just before I left, and in the Auditor General's Report to the 31st March, 1907, there is no account of those $2,000 because I came back six months later. Since then the matter has been adjusted between the Auditor General and myself.

Mr. TAYLOR. But this was a year previous.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, this was done the 31st March, 1907, and not the year previous.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister was here on the 31st March, 1907.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I started at that time. I started at the close of the fiscal year, and this money was advanced on the eve of the closing of that year. Of course there was no account adjusted between the minister and the Auditor General because the minister was away, but in the existing fiscal year the adjustment will appear.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand the minister, he left between the 1st of April and the 9th.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the 4th or 5th .

Mr. FOSTER. He made a requisition before the end of the last fiscal year, thinking, I suppose, it was rather risky not to get his money lest there might not be funds

to meet his expenses. So he made a requisition days before he needed the money and just at the close of the last fiscal year. The $2,000 written up against him is money which he has expended during the current year ending the 31st March next, and the mistake was made of charging up not only his own expenses, but the expenses of other officials of the government, making them appear as the minister's own expenses. Who were those officials?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Venning, assistant commissioner, and my secretary.

Mr. TAYLOR. Your secretary has a separate charge.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Canadian Pacific, after I left, sent an account to the department, not only for my own accommodation, but also for the accommodation of the others, including my wife, who were accompanying me. I heard that my secretary had been doing that and I wrote to the deputy minister not to pay and that I would pay the amount on my return. But it was paid at the time by the deputy minister against my orders and since my return I have adjusted that.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman ever adjusted the matter of disobedience of his orders by his deputy?

Mr. BRODEUR. When my secretary informed me of that I wrote to the deputy, but he replied that the amount was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Had the minister, when he arrived, explained the matter to the Auditor General he would not have been put in a false position. The Auditor General would have put in an explanation if the minister had asked him.

Mr. BRODEUR. I sent the accountant to see that the matter should not appear in the public accounts, but the Auditor General said they were already printed.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend's explanations might satisfy himself, but certainly not me. He left here on the 18th or 19th of April.

An hon. MEMBER. The 4th.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he was here up to the 18th or 19th. He did not pay for his pullman until the day he went—$25. That would be the 18th or 19th of April. How does that amount come into the accounts of the year that closed with the month before that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have already explained that the account was sent in by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and paid by the department. I wrote the deputy minister not to pay the account out of public moneys, as I would pay it myself. But I was too late to pay the money or to have the matter set right before the Auditor General's Report was prepared.

Mr. TAYLOR. But how does the Auditor General take accounts contracted on the 19th of April and put them into the previous month?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken—it was about the 5th of April.

Mr. TAYLOR. Even so, the amount should appear in the accounts of this year, not of last year.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know why the amount appears in the accounts of last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. And why was this amount of $800 for ocean tickets put into last year? The minister was here on March 31 and for several days in April.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister sure that this does not refer to his previous year's trip?

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not make a previous trip to Englnd.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the minister's explanation can hardly be accepted by the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have told what happened so far as I know it. I applied to the department for an advance of money about March 31 or April 1.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister got his advance of $2,000. But that is not what we are talking about.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to the other, I have already explained—that the account was sent in by the Canadian Pacific Railway and paid before I could arrange the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister buy, or send his secretary to buy, tickets, or does he get them on tick?

Mr. BENNETT. And with $2,000 in his pocket?

Mr. BRODEUR. We had the tickets, and I supposed that my credit was good.

Mr. FOSTER. In our day, we had not the cheek to ask for tickets without paying for them.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Times have changed. Honest men now.

Mr. FOSTER. Times have changed indeed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand the tickets were sent to the department and no money was paid to the railway company.

Mr. TAYLOR. But how did the account for the steamship tickets get into the Anditor General's Report for last year? Did the steamship company also send in an account?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. I have explained the matter several times. If the object is to have me explain it again, I am quite willing to do so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did the steamship company send in an account ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. When was it paid ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who purchased or ordered the tickets ?

Mr. BRODEUR. My secretary, I suppose.

Mr. TAYLOR. He travelled as one of the party ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a charge of $1,150 for the expenses of the secretary and messenger, besides $2,000 that the minister got and $890 for ocean passage for himself and party, and also $25 for pullmans.

Mr. FOSTER. I really think this item will have to stand until we receive an explanation that will commend itself to the House. This business of walking aboard a steamship and leaving somebody who happens to remain on this side pay the account is a new thing. By the time the bill is sent in the minister is half-way across the ocean, and cannot be reached except by Marconi. And then, somehow, the account does not appear in the accounts of the fiscal year in which it was paid. Could it have been dated back ? In any case, the minister had $2,000 in his pocket; why did not he pay his way like a man ? Was he economizing for a grand blow-out on the other side ?

Mr. FIELDING. Where his credit was not so good.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, where his credit was not so good. He could not walk aboard a steamer crossing the English channel, say, and tell the purser to send the bill to some official in Canada. But there is more. The Minister of Finance has told us that some $16,000 had been appropriated for the expenses of the ministers attending the Intercolonial Conference, and that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries bagged $4,000 of that. Is that in addition to this $2,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister sure of that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance has told us that $4,000 of this went to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That will appear in the accounts of the current year. I am quite sure the Minister of Finance would see to it that no such contretemps would arise as that money paid after March 31 should be charged before that date. So, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will find in this year's accounts $4,000. He has already had $2,000—total $6,000. But even that is not all. There is a private secretary, who, in these matters, is, in effect, the minister. I find that it is convenient sometimes for a minister of this government to have a private secretary to appear in the public accounts for sums of which the minister gets the benefit. The private secretary got $400; he got also $1,000 —total $1,400. Then, the minister has $596.05 charged up to him outside of this. This makes a toal of $8,890. That is a sufficiently large sum. This is the growing time, but amongst all the things that grow there is nothing that grows like the ministerial travelling expenses of that department. The minister is an extravagant minister. There may have been one more extravagant—his predecessor. Now am I right or not—I am not going to cavil about proper expenses—am I right or not in saying that all the expenses of the members of the Intercolonial Conference were paid by His Majesty's government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not all the expenses, not the travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the hotel bills ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some of the hotel bills were paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Then by what rule or reason can a single man take $4,000 out of the treasury of the country to visit an intercolonial conference, even if he spent a couple of months, when the hotel bills, the automobile bills and all that kind of expense, are generously provided by the inviting government, and justify it before the House ? The Minister of Finance is extravagant in some respects, but he is a model, and deserves an illuminating medal, alongside of his brother minister. He went over to the other side of the water, he spent just as much time as my hon. friend, he ate, I daresay, just as much, and enjoyed himself I think just as well, and his bill was $1,400.

Mr. FIELDING. My bill is not yet paid. That is not fair to my colleagues.

Mr. FOSTER. Will it be more ?

Mr. FIELDING. There will be something in addition.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to say it won't come up to $4,000. But whether it does or not, I say the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has no right to take $4,000 of the taxes of the country and spend it for a trip to the other side ; he cannot spend that legitimately, it is impossible ; and if the minister has taken that much, he had better let his conscience assert itself and make a return to the Auditor General—as some of his officers in that department have had to do.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say, at first, that the figures which have been given by the hon. gentleman, the calculation he has made with regard to my expenses, are not correct, and I hope he did not know they were not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I take the figures I have here.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then if my hon. friend is not sure, why does he assert such and such a thing ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell you what I am sure of, I am sure of the figures that I have read out of this book.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is all very well, to mix up figures.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not mixing figures.

Mr. TALBOT. But you make it a case of conscience.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) is not my bishop, although he looks very much like one. I take exactly the figures that are given here, figures given for the information of this House and the country by the Auditor General, an officer of parliament, and he tells me in plain print that the minister, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, got $596.05, that his private secretary got $1,400, that the minister himself got $2,000, that for the ocean part of the trip $890 was spent. Then the Minister of Finance tells me that $4,000 was taken out of that particular vote of $16,000, for the expense of ministers to the conference. Now that is the state of things that has come before the House. That is all I have stated. If the minister has any explanation to make of that, he ought to make it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I have already made an explanation. I am very sorry to see that the hon. gentleman, who is generally a fair-minded man, should still quote figures before the House which I have several times declared were not absolutely as represented. Now he wants to charge me with the amount of $890. I told him this amount had been reimbursed. Why then does he persist in stating that I charged $4,000 outside of that ? Is that the act of a fair-minded man ? I leave the hon. gentleman to judge for himself whether it is or not. Now he says that I got $2,000 in advance. He says, Well, you got this year $4,000 ; the Minister of Finance says $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman says that I got during the existing fiscal year $4,000. He takes the $2,000 of last year, and the $4,000 of this year, and says now that I got $6,000. Then he adds the $1,400 for my secretary, and says he gets $8,000 or $9,000. I have already told him that one of his items is absolutely incorrect. I also told him that I had reimbursed one of the other items. When we started on the trip there was no money available. The hon. gentleman knows that, and still he tries to create the impression in the country that I am extravagant, that I am spending money which I have no right to spend. He knew very well, however, that this amount which had been voted for the Intercolonial Conference was not available, I could not take the money out of that vote, and I had to get an advance from the department out of some other votes, and this I have reimbursed. My hon. friend won't give me credit for that. I say that is not the argument of a fair-minded man.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, I do not think the minister has said that before. I have heard him say to-night that he had to get that advance out of another vote and pay it back out of the $4,000 which went to him after that came to be available. He never mentioned that until this moment.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will look at the Auditor General's Report which he has in his hand, he will find that this was taken from some other vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Where ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman read the item, he must know where.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me very improper to take money from one vote and use it for another purpose. One of the objects of putting every item in these votes under its own head is for the purpose of enabling parliament to see what that money is required for, and to see that it is spent for the specific purpose for which it was voted, and no other.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has made his own case worse, in trying to get out of a difficult hole he has fallen into a bigger one. That is the fact that is now pointed out to me. The minister is responsible for the policy of the department, he has to lay down the law to his officers, and he ought to be a model of the way in which appropriations are made and spent, he ought to set an example to every one of his departmental officers. But the minister actually takes $2,000 out of a vote for ice-breaking and applies it to a trip across the Atlantic to the Intercolonial Conference. Is that the principle on which my hon. friend runs his department ? It is, he has done it in case after case. It is a most vicious principle. And what is the example my hon. friend is setting ? It is an example to every one of his officers to get money, if there is any vote at all out of which it can be got, and afterwards try by some hocus pocus to get it back again into its proper place. The minister had no right at all to take $2,000 from the ice-breaking vote ; parliament did not authorize that vote to be spent in taking

ministers across the Atlantic. When they want to buy buffalos they take the expedient of a Governor General's warrant, and they buy their buffalos with it. There are other ways of getting expenses besides breaking the plain and constitutional practice of the country. There is no department in this government that is so guilty in that respect as my hon. friend's department. He does not care where he can get the money if he can lay his hand on it ; he will take it and divert it from one plain parliamentary purpose to another with which it has nothing whatever to do. So my hon. friend made his position worse instead of better. He tried to put me in the wrong by saying that I knew that he got this as an advance from another vote and that he had explained this to the House. He never said that to the House ; the first I heard of it was when he made the statement just now. That is susceptible of explanation. If he wrongfully took $2,000 out of another vote as an advance and used part of the $4,000 he got afterwards to pay it back, that is capable of explanation and explains it to some extent, but the minister has not given information to the House yet as to how it was possible for bills incurred in April are charged back by the Auditor General to the previous fiscal year and it remains yet to be explained what this hon. gentleman has taken out of the country for these travelling expenses. At the best it will be found to be a very extravagant sum.

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant informs me that the ticket had been ordered before the close of the fiscal year, so that will cover the point made that this amount should not have been charged to last year, but should have been charged to this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Had they been bought and the bill rendered before that?

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant is not very sure about that, but my hon. friend knows that as a question of administration bills are rendered sometimes after the close of the fiscal year. A month or six weeks is allowed for the payment of bills which have been incurred before the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. If incurred before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. FIELDING. I know nothing of the particular case, but what would probably happen would be that the arrangements were made just before the close of the year and in that sense the obligation was incurred, but it could be paid any time before the time fixed for the closing of the accounts.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that this a matter which the minister ought to explain at once without waiting for any information, because the position stated by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) seems to be perfectly logical and clear. I cannot understand why my hon. friend cannot explain it. He must not think that these questions are asked or this criticism made in a carping spirit. They are not. As one who has sat in this House for 12 years I must say that the rate at which the travelling expenses for members of the government have increased since I have been in the House has become perfectly scandalous. Wherever a trip has been made the expenses have exceeded anything just or reasonable. Another abuse which used to be condemned, but which has been greatly magnified since this government has attained power, is the use of private cars. My hon. friend himself was one of those who used to condemn that on every hustings in the province of Quebec, and when that aged statesman, Sir John Macdonald, happened to move in the province of Quebec in his private car, it was my hon. friend himself who used to criticise him with most virulence.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend never heard me say any such thing, never.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is surely not serious. His memory seems to be wonderfully defective of late. I could never understand that criticism, because I believe there are occasions when a minister should have a private car, but it has been carried to an extent never heard of in the past. Trips to the United States, as an hon. member says. What possible reason can there be for ministers—they do not all do it, it is confined to some—they go to the United States and take a private car and take their friends; they go to Montreal and take their friends. In an election campaign for instance, where both parties are suppose to be waging a just fight, is there any sense in a minister going to a county in a private car taking his friends? In this instance it is particularly flagrant. As I understood the reasoning put forward by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) it was not answered by the minister when he said he would be obliged to repeat what he had said; he was not giving any information because his previous statement contained no information. What we have is a distinct statement from the Minister of Finance that of the $16,000 vote $4,000 was paid to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There is here a payment in advance to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of $2,000. I have listened to what he said and I do not understand whether to-day he stands as having received $6,000 or whether he has reimbursed a portion of that. He received in cash $6,000 for this trip, the expenses of which, the House and committee must remember, were defrayed by the home government. My hon. friend says the travelling expenses were not paid. That is news to me; I thought an amount had been set aside for that. At all events,

all expenses on the other side were paid. The Minister of Finance has a bill of expenses of $1,400——

Mr. FIELDING. It is not fair to make any such comparison. I did not attend the colonial conference, although I was one of those chosen for the purpose. As my hon. friend knows I remained until the close of the session. I went over afterwards on other business and no portion of that colonial conference money was drawn by me. I was away about five months, chiefly on treaty work, and I am afraid when the bill comes in I will hardly be in a position to receive the compliments of my hon. friends.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be a little sparkling in Paris——

Mr. FIELDING. At all events the prices sparkle in Paris.

Mr. MONK. By his explanation my hon. friend makes the case stronger, because his own expenses were not met by the home government and they appear to be $1,400.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not final.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is not one of those who incur great travelling expenses.

Mr. FIELDING. The $1,400 is not a fair comparison at all. That does not represent my expenses.

Mr. MONK. It is very fortunate my hon. friend represented the government at Paris in this instance, because I know some others who would have cost us much more. I do not wish to harp on it, but here is an additional expenditure, absolutely unexplained, of $890 for tickets incurred probably in April, which is charged to the fiscal year closing March 31, and unless the explanation given in the last instance by the Minister of Finance applies, there is no possible way of understanding how this amount comes to be charged in the Marine Department's account for an icebreaking steamer for the lower St. Lawrence. Eight hundred and ninety dollars for tickets for whom? My hon. friend has stated in the last instance that that amount has been reimbursed. When and by whom has it been reimbursed? I think we are entitled to an explanation of that as well as of the item of $25 for sleepers to St. John. I say once more that I think the mode of expenses on travel, especially in the last six or seven years, ought to be a subject of closest scrutiny by the House. It has passed all the bounds of what is reasonable and just. As regards the employment of private cars, if anything of this kind comes up this year I am going to call it in question with every manner of detail. Now, here we have the hon. gentleman apparently having received $6,000, with those other charges that to me are not sufficiently explained up to the present time. How was the money provided which was expended in the trip made by the minister from Rimouski to his residence. The whole of the government fleet was down to meet the ministers when they returned from the old country; there must have been an expenditure of several thousand dollars for coal, for men, for food, and liquid refreshments upon these steamers which brought the minister from the ocean steamer to his home in his own county. Was this deducted from the large amount received by the minister? Where does it stand charged against the people of this country?

Mr. BRODEUR. I must say at once that there appears to be in the public mind a wrong impression with regard to the use of private cars. They do not cost anything to the country; everything we take on a private car we have to pay for it. For my own part I would like very much to use private cars oftener, but they are too expensive. The hon. gentleman has said that the ministers used private cars and that it was very expensive to the country. It is true that some times we may use private cars, but we have to pay for——

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman say that the ministers pay for the private cars themselves?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but the railway companies give a permit for the private cars to travel on their lines, and it does not cost a cent to the country.

Mr. BENNETT. Who buys the cars?

Mr. BRODEUR. The government.

Mr. BENNETT. You mean the people.

Mr BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) wanted to create the impression, or he was under the impression, that the nourishment we take on private cars is paid for by the country, but that is absolutely erroneous. We have to pay for it ourselves. I have used private cars four or five times when I believed it necessary in the proper transaction of the business of my department, but generally speaking I do not use a private car for the simple reason that it is too expensive.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do the railways charge for hauling the cars?

Mr. BRODEUR. The railways do not charge.

Mr. FOSTER. They get return courtesies on the government railways.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that is the custom between all railways, and I presume it is done on the Intercolonial Railway, and that courtesies are exchanged in that way. I suppose there is no harm in the Intercolonial Railway doing the same thing as other railways are doing. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) spoke of steam-

ers coming to meet me at Rimouski. Yesterday he said they met me in the Gulf, but to-night he fixes on Rimouski, and I can tell him that no steamers came to Rimouski to meet me. We came up the Gulf and to Rimouski on the steamer which carried us from Liverpool, and so my hon. friend is mistaken in regard to that. He says there was expense incurred, well it did not cost anything.

Mr. MONK. Will the minister deny that steamers went down to meet him and that they conducted him to his home?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not to Rimouski.

Mr. MONK. Well, never mind the exact place, where was it?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was none. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his information.

Mr. MONK. Where there any government steamers which took the minister on board with his friends who accompanied him so far as his home.

Mr. BRODEUR. What happened was this : I came from Quebec to Three Rivers and Sorel in a government steamer. There was no fleet and all the expenses incurred on that boat were paid by myself personally as I generally do. In connection with that—I do not know that I should boast of it in the House—but since hon. gentlemen opposite seem anxious to attack me in regard to this expenditure I may say that last year I made an inspection trip and when I came back I asked the agent to give me a statement of all the expenses in connection with the running of the boats and the supplies taken on board as I wanted to pay. He said to me: that never was done, and he added: it was never done even in Mr. Foster's time. It therefore would appear that I was not any more extravagant than even my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries in connection with that. Now, as to the $2,000 being charged to the vote for an ice breaker, I explained that there was no fund available for the expenditure which was to be incurred, and as I was going to England and Germany for the purpose of examining into ice breakers with a view of obtaining the best one available, the amount was charged to that vote, with the understanding however that when the proper vote is available this money will be reimbursed, with the exception, of course, of the money expended in connection with the visit to Germany and Russia.

Mr. J. D. REID. Didn't the government steamer go from England to Russia? Was not there a government steamer in England which had just been repaired and didn't she make a trip from England to Russia?

Mr. BRODEUR. I don't know what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. J. R. REID. How did the hon. gentleman go from England to Russia?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the cars.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there not a Canadian government steamer being repaired over there?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Russia?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, in England?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Stanley' was sent over to England to get new boilers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did she come from England direct to Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. She didn't go to Russia.

Mr. J. D. REID. Didn't she go from England to Russia?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. J. D. REID Did the minister use the 'Stanley' when he was in England?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. The 'Stanley' was being repaired.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did the minister use her after she was repaired ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I never saw her there.

Mr. FOSTER. The rumour arose in this way: I saw the statement going the round of the papers. Some of the enthusiastic friends of the Minister of Marine thought, I suppose, that it would be 'infra dig' for him to go to Russia in a commercial or tramp steamer, and they issued the statement, and it went the round of the papers, that the minister had mounted a government steamer and was going to steam right up into the Czar's dominions in royal form.

Mr. BRODEUR. That must have been in the Conservative papers.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it was in the same papers which, before this government came into power, were indulging in giving verbatim reports of the vehement denunciations of the Minister of Marine because there was an appropriation of $1,000,000 for arms for Canada. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) will make the same remark with reference to that, as he did in reply to my friend from Jacques Cartier, that he does not remember ever making such speeches as I refer to.

Mr. BRODEUR. Which statement ?

Mr. FOSTER. The statement that it was a very wrong thing to tear from the arms of French mothers their sons and send them abroad to be slaughtered by the cannon of the enemy, and that it was altogether wrong to spend a million dollars of their hard earnings to buy artillery for the equipment of the defence of Canada. My hon. friend does not remember that. With reference to this matter of private cars and private

inspection trips, my hon. friend was too particular. It makes one suspicious, when he went on an inspection trip for his own department, in a vessel of his own department, to find that his conscience was so tender that when he came back he asked how much sugar and how much tea and coffee he had used, and offered to pay it himself. The country will give him no credit for that. If a minister is going on the country's business, the country will raise no objection to his using a private car or any other conveyance for the purpose.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was speaking of the friends who were with me.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a different matter. But the private car business has been carried to an absurd and scandalous extreme. I commenced clipping from the newspapers every item I saw about a minister in his private car from Ottawa. Sometimes it was to Montreal to attend a play. The names of the large party with him were given, and a little bit of high life was enacted on the car. These trips were chronicled until it became painful to read of ministers going to New York almost every week or fortnight, with the names of all the young men and young women who made up the party. It is a scandalous thing. As a member of this parliament doing good work for my country, I went down to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and looked around a little. I had to do it at my own expense. I was inspecting in a certain way. I had barely got across the straits and entered Nova Scotia when I saw a government car with a gaping crowd around it. Having it at his command was a member of this government, who used it to come from his place at Cornwallis to Digby and show the inhabitants what an immense man he was. Why should that be ? There is no reason why it should be. That minister is not here tonight; but the Finance Minister told us that the Minister of Militia and Defence took $4,000 of that $16,000 for his trip of a few weeks to the continent. The people of this country will not endorse that. The minister is not here, but we shall have another opportunity of taking this up. I have never cavilled at the reasonable expense of ministers since I have been in opposition; but the thing has gone so far that in justice to the members of the cabinet who do not trespass in that way it is high time that the matter was ventilated.

Mr. MONK. I take it, then, that there was an amount of $4,000 plus $2,000 plus $890 paid for crossing the Atlantic and $25 for sleepers to St. John. That is the way the account stands so far, from what we have heard from the minister. I would like to know in what form the British government defrayed the expenses of the visiting colonial premiers. Was it simply by the payment of their hotel bills, or was there an amount handed over to them ?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Imperial government took charge of most of the hotel bills, I understand.

Mr. MONK. There was no money given to the ministers ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No money was given to the ministers.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know from the minister how this $2,000 was got from the Auditor General for this trip. I understand that the Auditor General cannot allow any money to be paid for something for which it has not been voted. There must have been a wrong certificate or wrong information given to him, or he took it upon himself to allow this money to be wrongfully taken. If so, I think he is entitled to the censure of this House, and the minister should explain why $2.000 was taken from the money voted for ice breaking on the St. Lawrence to pay the expenses of this trip ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was understood before I left that there was serious difficulty with the ice breaking steamers on the St. Lawrence and in the Northumberland straits. It was represented that the steamer we had was not strong enough, and an appropriation was made for another. I took the opportunity of my trip to England to look at the ice-breaking steamers in Europe, and that is the reason the money was taken out of that account.

Mr. MONK. I see on page P—29 of the Auditor General's Report an item which in the statement I made a moment ago I seem to have omitted : 'Detailed under travel of Ottawa officials (Potvin and Wiallard), $1,150.' I understand that Mr. Potvin was my hon. friend's secretary; is that correct ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he was a messenger.

Mr. MONK. Is that the Mr. Wiallard who is now agent in France ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the matter of Lacas was finished. He is an employee in the Department of Public Works, getting a salary of $1,500. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries employed him and paid him for work done for the Marine Department $500 in round figures. I want to point out to my hon. friend that there is I think an order in council which absolutely prohibits anything like that being done. My hon. friend knows that in the investigations which took place under the Liberal-Conservative regime clerks were punished and ministers were held responsible because clerks were given work to do outside of their office hours and were paid for that work. There was no question at all that they did the work outside of hours and did their regular office work during office hours. Nevertheless that was considered a demoralizing practice. Clerks were dismissed for having been

implicated in it, and deputy ministers and ministers censured for having allowed it, and an order in council was passed expressly forbidding it. That order in council has been contravened by this transaction, if it be as I have stated it. The minister is simply doing what no minister ought to do if he has any regard for discipline and a healthy condition in the civil service. What is the result ? Some man who is doing his office work and earning his salary conscientiously finds that another man, who is working in the same capacity, but who happens to be wanted by some minister, for some purpose or another, slights some of his work, is absent when he ought to be at his desk, and gets besides his pay $500 from another department. Can there be anything more demoralizing or more calculated to excite jealousy and discontent ? The only proper way in which the services of a man in one department might be utilized by another department would be to make the other contribute part of his salary, but not give this man extra pay for doing work, which he cannot do, without neglecting his regular duties. But we are told that this man was not a photographer and that therefore the minister was entirely wrong in the explanation he gave, and that he got $500 for copying out blue prints at an extravagant rate. That is something for which the minister owes an explanation.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was under the impression that he was doing photographic work because I knew he was a photographer, but as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) tells us it was not photography he was doing, I shall inquire into the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister will find the item on page P—97 of the Auditor General's Report. It appears by the item that Mr. Lacas was paid for making blue prints of lights, etc., at 14 cents per square foot. One-half that price per foot would be a very large price. The government gave him $449.99, to make it appear that they have cut him down to the finest point. He is in the employ of the Public Works Department and is on a six months leave of absence. He went to Cobalt and speculated there, made a pile of money in some way, and now is taking a trip to the old country, doing up France, Germany and England after doing up the minister, and is still drawing his $1,500 a year from the Public Works Department. Are these facts correct ? How did he get that big pile at Cobalt ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am afraid I cannot explain that.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the minister interested ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, not in Cobalt. I shall make inquiries, but I am informed that before we got that work done by this gentleman, we were paying more.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not wonder at that.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend said the price was extravagant. I am informed that it is an improvement on what was paid before.

Mr. TAYLOR. Something like the improvement in the lights which were to cost so much less than the old system and that the saving in the lighthouse keeper's salaries would pay the difference. But we shall deal with that on another item. All this is on the same line. What the minister wants is to throw out money. He wanted a bill drafted for the harbour commissioners and he paid a gentleman, who is employed for the revising of the French Consolidated Statutes, $200 to draft a couple of Bills for the harbour commissioners, and he did this although the department is teeming with law clerks and other clerks doing nothing, and although the Solicitor General's department has half a dozen solicitors in it, all lying idle. It is simply throwing the money of the people away for the benefit of political friends. I would like the minister to explain how it is Mr. Spain spent on an average on travelling expenses $10 a day during nine months. And I find that Mr. Spain was not satisfied with a couple of trips to New York himself but took Mr. Anderson with him and Mr. Fraser, the commissioner of lights.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Spain is a wreck commissioner and has to make investigations all over the country. There is an item in this account for a trip to New York, and I said I would make inquiries into that. I suppose it must be a trip on business connected with the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. minister think that $10 per day is a modest sum for the travelling expenses of an official during nine months besides his salary, and travelling with a pass in his pocket ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether he has a pass or not.

Mr. FOSTER. When the government is paying him $10 a day for travelling expenses, the minister ought to know whether he has a pass or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think we are paying that amount.

Mr. TAYLOR. $2,508 for travelling expenses during nine months is $10 for every day.

Mr. FOSTER. Taking out the Sundays, it amounts to more than that.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would not be fair to say that the amount is $10 a day for his expenses. Included in that are his travelling expenses. Toronto and Windsor, July 27 to August 7, $158.60. You must add the travelling expenses, car fares, and so on.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is all travelling expenses.

Mr. BRODEUR. But my hon. friend said he was in receipt of $10 a day. Perhaps it amounts to that, but if a man has to travel a great deal by rail and pay his fare, this is not extravagant.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps not for the minister, but surely it is for a civil servant. I leave it to any man in this House who has commercial travellers out to say if this is not an extravagant charge. Why $5 a day is all that a first-class commercial traveller is supposed to pay, including fares and hotel bills. But this government is flush with the people's money and quite reckless with it.

Mr. BRODEUR. These men have not to travel long distances. Suppose a man has to go to the Pacific coast, it will cost him $10 a day to pay railway fare.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister knows that is not a fair comparison. This man travelled from Ottawa to Toronto——

Mr. BRODEUR. I see that he went to Winnipeg and to Port Arthur. He also went to Windsor.

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement is made here that this gentleman also had a pass in his pocket.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) sure of that?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the information given to me by a friend——

Mr. BRODEUR. Then, the hon. gentleman makes the statement that he knows this to be the case.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not my duty to know. But it is the minister's duty to know every one in his department who has a pass; and the man who uses a pass should not be paid for railway fare.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never went to ask the officers whether they had passes or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the minister pays their accounts just the same.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never see their accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a royal method. The minister can afford that, for the money is not his own.

Mr. BRODEUR. I rely on the officers of the department for these matters. If they are not faithful to me, so much the worse for them. I cannot be expected to find the time to examine all these accounts. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has been head of a department. If he tells me that he made it a practice to examine these accounts, of course I will accept his statement, but I do not believe he will say so.

Mr. FOSTER. But it would not take many months of the minister's time to simply issue instructions that no man should be paid for expenses that are covered by favours from corporations in the shape of passes. After the minister had done all this, if he would take the rest of the time, he would have plenty of time to himself.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) may be sure that the officers of the department who certify these accounts have to see to it that a man does not get paid for railway fare when he travels on a pass.

Mr. FOSTER. The officers of the department know their minister. And the minister knows that Merwin, for instance, simply put on his hat, walked across the street and bought engines and machinery for the government and sent in his bill for from $200 to $600 more than he paid, and he found officers of the department to certify to the Minister of Finance that the charge was reasonable and just. And millions of the people's money has been paid on the certificate of officers of that kind. And those officers are there yet, and money is being paid to-day on their certificates.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister does not say that $46,000 is too much for travelling expenses for his department for nine months. But there are the facts in the Auditor General's Report. This is simply an outrage on the country. In a few days I shall have a comparative statement made with the travelling expenses for the year 1896.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose the hon. gentleman will include in the account for 1896 the travelling expenses for branches of other departments that, since that time, have been added to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister name them? There is the ship channel, but there are no travelling expenses connected with that. The travelling expenses are practically all connected with the Marine Department and the Dominion steamers.

Mr. BRODEUR. I see some expenses connected with the St. Lawrence channel.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is Nap. Potvin given a cheque for $150 to be accounted for? The minister will find it at page P—6 in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know exactly, but I will make inquiries.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister does not think $10 a day is too much to allow a man for travelling expenses. I have no hesitation in saying that, if any man drew $10 a day for travelling expenses and hotel bills,

he put some of the money in his pocket. I think that will be shown before the Public Accounts Committee; and so far as I am concerned, now that this matter has been brought up, I think that we ought to have the whole matter investigated.

Mr. BRODEUR. I should be very glad.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose the minister feels that the oppositon criticises him harshly when it says that he is extravagant in his department. The figures in the Auditor General's Report convince me that the Department of Marine and Fisheries under its present head is more extravagant than any other department of this government. We had reason to suspect that the present minister would be extravagant as the head of a department. He was practically the head of a department some years ago as Speaker of this House. Now every Speaker of this House of Commons for the last twenty-five years only spent, on an average from $500 to $800 a session for the expenses of his office, but during the three years the hon. minister was Speaker it cost $8,929 simply to enable him to sit in this chair as Speaker of the House and pay the expenses in connection with that position. That shows that as Speaker he was a very extravagant man, and the facts that are now coming out show that in the department he is now administering he is pursuing the same extravagant habits. For that reason I think he deserves the criticism that has been made.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not complain of criticism. My hon. friend says that I was very extravagant as a Speaker. I do not think so, I think I was very economical. I may tell my hon. friend that whatever money was expended in connection with that office, it was not for my personal benefit but in the public interest. Sometimes it is necessary to discard old furniture in the Speaker's apartment and purchase new furniture. My hon. friend knows that sometimes distinguished strangers visit the Speaker, and surely he would not wish the Speaker's apartments to be shabbily furnished. I do not think I spent more than other Speakers in that respect. I do not complain of criticism of my department. But some of the charges of extravagance which have been made against the department I have disproved entirely. I have tried to do my best, and to administer the department as economically as possible. Indeed, I have often heard complaints that I was too economical.

Mr. J. D. REID. When we look at the number of steamers the hon. gentleman has, travelling up and down both the lower St. Lawrence and the upper St. Lawrence, doing practically nothing, entirely unnecessary, we must come to the conclusion that he is an extravagant minister. He has more steamers than are required for his service on the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Kingston, and if he will investigate the matter he will come to that conclusion. I know for a fact that he has a yacht lying down here at Ottawa for the last two or three seasons, doing practically nothing. The minister knows that boat is absolutely useless. Why should the men on that boat be kept here from one season to another, paid a salary for doing nothing? And still the minister goes on buying more boats.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose my hon. friend has read the report of the departmental officers; if so, he will find that they report sometimes that more boats are absolutely needed for the service. Let him read the report of Col. Anderson, the chief engineer; he states that it has been impossible for him to do some absolutely necessary work because of a lack of boats.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the reason for that is that the minister uses the government boats a great deal too much himself. There is a steamer practically in charge of the head of each department of this government. I know for a fact that there are more steamers used on the St. Lawrence than are actually required.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not according to the reports of the officers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps not. But I know for a fact that some of those steamers belonging to the lower St. Lawrence go all the way from Montreal up to the Welland canal, when there is no necessity for it whatever.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is making a statement that is not correct. He says that I use the government boat a great deal. I did not use it for two days.

Mr. J. D. REID. He was away down the gulf more than two days.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was the year before.

Mr. J. D. REID. This summer he was away in the old country. We are speaking now of last year. He says he only used it two days. He knows that is not a fact.

Mr. BRODEUR. I went down from Quebec to inspect the different stations and called at Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, that was the year before. That was a necessary trip, made to get information.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman says there have been complaints that there were not enough boats. I think the reason is because too many of the boats are used by ministers. I remember a case last summer when one of the Canadian Pacific Railway Empresses could not land her mails at Rimouski because the 'Lady Evelyn,' I believe it was, which had been built purposely for that service, was engaged in carrying a minister down the gulf.

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Lady Grey' was never used for that purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. It was used by the acting minister and the Postmaster General, who were inspecting something in the gulf. The 'Lady Evelyn' not being available for landing the mails, a little boat at Rimouski had to be used. The 'Empress' had to wait eight hours to get the mails landed.

Mr. BRODEUR. The boat at Rimouski is not under the charge of this department.

Mr. BERGERON. The 'Lady Evelyn' was the boat which was mentioned, I saw the statement in a Liberal paper, complaining that the 'Lady Evelyn,' or the boat that should have been at that place, was down the gulf promenading some of the ministers. Later, when the Prime Minister came back from the conference in England, all the government boats were pressed into service. There was even a row between the Postmaster General and the Solicitor General; they did not agree amongst themselves at Quebec.

As to the passes I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that he should find out from the railway companies which employees of the government are favoured with passes. We on this side of the House have nothing to say as to the railways granting passes to any employee of the government; that is the company's business, but the heads of departments should find out from the railway companies which of their employees receive passes and then when these officials travel they should not be permitted to charge their transportation expenses to the government. We had a case of that years ago. One of the chief engineers of the Department of Railways and Canals was travelling on a pass and charging his expenses to the country. This was proven before the Public Accounts Committee and is not a practice which should be continued. This should be found out from the companies and not from the employees.

Mr. BRODEUR. You must have more faith than that in our employees.

Mr. BERGERON. That is childish. The man who charged his expenses although he had a pass was an old man, one of the most trusted employees of the department, an engineer of renown. He thought there was no harm in that. He was not the only one; that year five or six were shown to have charged their travelling expenses while travelling on passes. They said they had many small expenses they could not charge and covered them in that way. But to return to the item, would the minister state what employees of the second-class in his department are going to be raised to the new positions he is creating?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have twice given the names of the nine out of whom four will be selected. I could not give the four names exactly at the present.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is not the intention of the minister to take on new temporary employees in the place of those now placed on the permanent list?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no.

Mr. BERGERON. Where does the difference of $8,000 come in? Is it statutory increases?

Mr. BRODEUR. Statutory increases and the appointment of more employees on the permanent list.

Mr. BERGERON. The names on page 16 do not represent all the employees of the department, only certain classes?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. There are, for example, draughtsmen, technical officers who are permanent men. I cannot expect these men to be appointed permanently because they are discharging particular duties. My policy is that all those doing clerical work must pass examinations and become permanent officers.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say that when he was occupying the Speaker's chair he thought he was very economical. I have looked up the Auditor General's Report for 1902, one of the years in which my hon. friend occupied that position, and I find that he went to Montreal and purchased from Messrs. Cody & Brodeur two clothes baskets at $9. Who ever heard of paying $4.50 for a basket for holding soiled clothes? He went to another firm, Messrs. Richard & Desjardins, and had them reline a quilted silk coat and vest for which he paid $22.

An hon. MEMBER. For whom was that?

Mr. TAYLOR. For himself or some of the officers, I do not know, what business has this government with such expenditures? The minister says he ran the Speaker's Department economically. Nine dollars for two clothes baskets and $22 for lining a coat and vest! Yet he talks of running his department economically. Other speakers expended $800, but he ran it up to $3,000. These are but samples. I can read page after page of these items. Economical when he and his officials spent $46,000 in travelling expenses in nine months and ask the country to pay for it.

Mr. J. D. REID. During that time the minister spent $1,090 for silks and satins, silk draperies, silk cord, bed covers, &c. There is $822 for silk damasks, silks, satins, &c., I suppose all these things were left in the Speaker's apartments?

Mr. BLAIN. As the question of the extravagance of the minister is before us perhaps it would be worth while to place on record the expenses of the different speakers

of the House as compared with the record of my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) when he was Speaker. The expenses were as follows :—

Mr. Speaker.	Term.	Expenses.
		$ cts.
Mr. Ouimet, July 1, 1890, to April 28, 1891.	9 months and 28 days.	1,175 23
Mr. White, April 29, 1891, to August 18, 1896.	5 years, 3 months and 21 days.	4,976 15
Sir James Edgar, August 19, 1896, to July, 31, 1899.	2 years, 11 months and 13 days.	4,189 29
Mr. Bain, August 1, 1899, to February 5, 1901.	1 year, 6 months and 5 days.	229 27
Mr. Brodeur, February 6, 1901, to March 11, 1904.	3 years, 1 month and 5 days.	9,899 20
Mr. Belcourt, March 12, to January 10, 1905.	9 months and 29 days.	703 51
Mr. Sutherland, January 11. 1905, to July 1, 1906.	1 year, 5 months, and 20 days.	301 69
Total expenditure in 16 years...		$ 19,474 34

When we were discussing the so-called extravagance of my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) it may be well to point out that he learned some of these habits when he was Speaker of the House. Whether he is getting any less extravagant, a search in the accounts of the Marine Department will tell. But he appears to be learning some new lessons now that he is commencing to pay his own expenses, and possibly if we wait till we see him next year he may further improve.

Mr. FOSTER. Does Mr. Anderson, the engineer, prepare all the plans that are necessary for the lighthouses ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; he prepares all the plans in connection with the construction of lighthouses.

Mr. FOSTER. In view of the fact that we are spending about $1,000,000 a year on this service, does the minister think that one man, no matter how competent and faithful he may be, can properly do all that work. I find that Mr. Anderson has a great deal of travelling to do ; does he not have an assistant engineer to go on with the work in his absence.

Mr. BRODEUR. What I intended to convey was that the plans are prepared under the supervision of Colonel Anderson ; he has under him some draughtsmen, two architects, and some assistant engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. These gentlemen take their instructions from him.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the plans are prepared under his control.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Continue in supply.

Mr. FOSTER. The same ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 10, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election of Peter Douglas McLean, Esquire, for the electoral district of Centre York, Ont.

REPORT PRESENTED.

The Canadian Year-book, and Report of the Experimental Farm.—Mr. Fisher.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to ask with reference to two returns, an order for which was made early in the session, one with reference to an expert employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and another with reference to a cold storage company in the city of St. John, and correspondence in relation thereto. These papers should not take long to prepare, and I would like to have them.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). With reference to my department, there are ten or fifteen different reports made in connection with the book-keeping there. These are being copied, and will make a voluminous return.

Mr. FISHER. I will inquire about the St. John matter. I think the report must be nearly if not quite ready. I will see that it is brought down.

SUPPLY—ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE —CHARGE AGAINST A CADET.

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

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). Before you leave the Chair, I desire to bring to the attention of the House a matter of interest to the militia of the country, as it concerns the military college at Kingston. We all know that in schools or colleges of that class there is always more or less freedom among the students to go into each other's rooms and take cake, fruit, apples or tobacco. That is common, not only in universities, but in the Royal Military College at Kingston. A year ago a gentleman who occupies a seat in this House found that an injustice, as he considered it, had been done to a young cadet attending the Royal Military College, and whose father was dead. This gentlemen had also a son at the college at the time, and he took up the case of this friendless boy and had it placed before the Minister of Militia. I understand, though I am not familiar with the details, that the order of the commandant of the Royal Military College was reversed with reference to that case a year ago. At that time the member whose son was attending college was warned that it would be indiscreet on his part to champion the case of this young man, on account of his own son being there, and he would likely find that he was making trouble for himself. Time wore on, and just previous to the last Christmas holidays the trouble culminated. A number of cadets, of whom this young man to whom I refer was not one, were found guilty of the crime of taking some fruit cake, or sponge cake, from each other's rooms. These young men had entered the rooms of their comrades and, according to the custom that prevails in most of these institutions, had helped themselves to the cake of their neighbours. These boys were rusticated. At the same time a charge was made against the young cadet, the son of this member who had championed the friendless lad a year ago, that he had been guilty of stealing. The charge was investigated by a sweat box process, and I want here to say that the sweat box process, I understand, is in vogue in that college. Evidence has been produced before the minister and some of his officers, I believe, showing that the commandant of the college brought these young lads before him or one of his officers, one after another privately, not in presence of the cadet who was charged, but in front of himself or his officer privately, and by every species of questioning, and by impression sought to get from these young men unfavourable answers against their fellow cadet.

I regret to say that the evidence, in so far as I have been able to ascertain, does not disclose one solitary cadet as having the manhood to tell the commandant that he was pursuing a cowardly, underhand and sneaking procedure in getting this evidence from them. A few years ago I chanced to be one of the members of the Board of Visitors of the Royal Military College and my fellow visitors will bear me out in saying that when, as had been the custom previous to that time, the Visitors brought these cadets before them privately and sought to ask questions concerning the professors and others in connection with the college, I dissented from that line of conduct and refused, in so far as I was concerned, to ask any cadet any question excepting it was in the presence of the man in regard to whom the questions were being asked. It is the only manly way and if we are going to send these young fellows out into the world as men, we have to train them that the first principle of British justice—a principle which has been established for hundreds of years—is that the accuser and the accused shall stand face to face and that there shall be no sweat box process employed in the training of these young gentlemen whom we are going to send out as officers and engineers in the Canadian or British army. This commandant brought these boys before him and, by this sweat box process, in the absence of their comrade, sought to get evidence from them to incriminate him. He absolutely failed in the attempt. To the credit of the boys they gave no evidence against their comrade. I suppose if they had had any they would have given it freely, but to their eternal discredit, and I want this to be impressed upon their minds and hearts, we have no evidence that one solitary cadet stood up, looked his commandant in the face and said : You are taking a cowardly course when you ask us in secret to peach on a comrade. Ask us any thing before him and we will tell you but we want none of this private sweat box process. However, the charge was dropped, he had to drop it but he raked up another one against this cadet of having cheated at cards. That was carried on by the sweat box process also. I understand that poker is not allowed in the college, but nevertheless it seems that the young gentlemen are fairly well versed in the arts of the game. This was this young gentleman's first game and he told them : You fellows know nothing about poker ; I do not understand the game very well myself, I did something or other and you never caught on but I would not take your jack pot under any consideration; take it back. So, that charge fell to the ground. Another charge, I believe, nearly a year old, was raked up by this sweat box process and it was that this young cadet had, on one occasion when he was on sick leave and absent from duty hanging around his room, been guilty of walking into the room of a comrade—a very common thing in college—taking his cigarette case and offering some of the cigarettes to the boys, asking them to have a cigarette on—naming the lad who was the owner of the cigarette case. He returned it. In the afternoon again, not being allowed out on account of illness, he walked into his com-

rade's room, took the cigarette case again and finished the three cigarettes that were left in the case. About this time the owner of the cigarette case and a couple of other boys came up and asked him : Have you my cigarette case ?—and the lad promptly handed it out and said : Yes and I have smoked all the cigarettes but I was waiting to refill it. On this being brought out by the sweat box process the commandant took action and his order was to rusticate this boy. The father of the boy promptly brought it before the authorities, the matter was tried before the minister, the deputy minister of justice, the general, the adjutant general and other officers—I do not know who all were concerned in it—the judgment was reversed, the order of rustication was cancelled entirely, it did not take one solitary mark form the cadet and his restitution to the college was ordered. This order was communicated to the commandant of the Royal Military College. When the young cadet was ordered to report to the college he went there and in place of being treated as a free man, as he was under the judgment, he was placed in close confinement and kept there until two o'clock in the afternoon although at eight o'clock in the morning the officer commanding the Royal Military College had the judgment in his hands clearly exonerating the cadet from any fault in the matter. Then the cadets, that afternoon, were assembled in one of the buildings and in place of reading the judgment of his minister and of his general without comment, the commandant of the Royal Military College delivered a harangue condemning the father of the boy, telling the young cadets that the father had practically, in his presence, lied to the minister and the general and in that way had obtained a reversal of the judgment, that he had restored the other four cadets whom he had rusticated for hooking the sponge cake so that they could not be classed with this other young man, and he did every thing he could to heap odium on this young cadet. I have understood that on this reaching the notice of the minister, orders were promptly issued that the cadets should have the full judgment of the court, as I may term it, read to them. They were yesterday assembled—I think it was yesterday—and in addition to the judgment being read another harangue, another speech, to the cadets blackening the character of this young cadet and seeking to heap odium upon him in the college, was delivered. As an old teacher, as a man who has had much more experience in military tactics and discipline than the commandant and as a man who understands as much about honour and comradeship between man and man, I have no hesitation in saying that the commandant of the Royal Military College, if these statements are true, and I believe they are, is unfit to stay twenty-four hours longer in his job. I have nothing more at the present time to say. I think that in justice to the young men of this country we have to instill such a spirit into them that they will not submit to such treatment, that when they are put into the sweat box they will tell any commandant that they refuse to answer questions unless they stand face to face with the young man against whom they are asked to testify. I am surprised that among a lot of young gentlemen coming from the best families in Canada not one of them seems to have the manhood enough to stand up and tell the commandant face to face that he was pursuing a cowardly course.

Mr. TALBOT. Would the hon. gentleman approve of such conduct as a military man ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Of what ?

Mr. TALBOT. Approve of the conduct of these young men in telling the commandant that he was pursuing a cowardly course ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly I would. The military rules of Canada or any other nation that I know of require no officer or man to do a cowardly or contemptible trick. The subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary, or contemptible, or cowardly measures. Therefore I am surprised——

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Does not the hon. gentleman think that the fact that all the cadets agreed to take the same course is some proof in favour of the commandant of the Royal Military College ?

Mr. SAM HUGHES. No, not at all, but I know that boys in college all feel they are subject to military duty, and the natural tendency the world over is to bow to tyrants. But I want to put a little manhood into the hearts of these fellows, so that if this is ever done again the commandant will be shown that he has no authority under military or civil law or under any code of honour the world over, to ask a boy to stoop to such a degradation as has been attempted. I bring the matter before the minister and the House in the hope that some action will be taken.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Under ordinary circumstances I think it undesirable that questions of discipline in the Royal Military College should be discussed in this way or discussed at all if it can possibly be avoided. However, my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) told me this morning that he intended to bring the matter up, as I understood with particular reference to a cadet whose name he has not mentioned, but whose name I presume I have liberty to

mention, Cadet Lancaster, the son of an hon. member of this House. Cadet Lancaster has been disciplined, together with a number of other cadets by the commandant of the college. I have not the papers before me to go into the general question of discipline, but I must say, in justice to the commandant, that I cannot for a moment think he would be actuated by any low motive in his conduct towards any cadet. I think it is only fair that I should say that and that whatever methods he may have pursued, I understand that he has pursued only the methods which are customary in the service.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is a military college.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well it has always been assumed to be and under military control.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister pretend that he has any evidence that such a system has ever prevailed in any military college ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think the evidence will disclose that anything which would be unusual, we will say in connection with the discipline of a regiment has occurred in connection with the college. However, I have not the papers here, and I will leave the matter in that way. My belief is that the commandant has proceeded regularly.

Now to come to the point, I happen to have here the judgment which I gave in connection with this particular case and in a moment I shall read it.

Mr. TISDALE. Was an appeal made from the judgment ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not exactly an appeal, no. This is the case : When a question of discipline is considered in the college and the commandant gives a decision, we will say to sentence a cadet to rustication, the sentence cannot take effect until it is approved by the minister. That is the way in which this case came before me. There were several cases, I might mention, of irregularity.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Against other cadets.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Against other cadets, some four or five, I think five cases in all. As my hon. friend has said, four of them had been proved to have taken articles, cake, chiefly, belonging to brother cadets. They were sentenced to rustication, four of them for one month, but the sentence was immediately remitted and these cases never came before me.

Mr. LANCASTER. Remitted by the commandant.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And they never came before me. There was a fifth case, that of Cadet Lancaster, in which the commandant came to the conclusion that a cigarette case belonging to another cadet had been taken criminally, taken with the intent to keep it, and for that the cadet was sentenced by the commandant to four months rustication. That case was referred to me and I think it desirable that what I have to say about that should be given by reading the judgment which I gave and which was sent to the commandant with subsequent instructions to read it to the college. It was read yesterday or the day before to the cadets and professors, duly assembled for the purpose.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Was any complaint made by the lad who lost the cigarette case that had been lost or stolen ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think not. The cigarette case, as a matter of fact, was returned within a few hours after it was taken.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As soon as asked for. The minister said the instructions to the commandant were to read this judgment to the cadets. Was the judgment read to the cadets by the commandant on its first being received by him ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, but it is only fair to the commandant to say that the judgment was sent to him and the instructions to read it were not sent until the next day.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A speech was made on the first occasion.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. On hearing that the judgment had not been read I sent word to the commandant to read it and he has read it. This is the decision :

1. This case comes before the minister to review the sentence of four months' rustication pronounced by the commandant. The commandant at the trial or investigation of the matter proceeded upon oral testimony of which, in accordance with the customs of the service, no written report was made, but the nature of the case and of the evidence offered has been made by the commandant; and Mr. Lancaster, on behalf of his son, who was present during the proceedings, has been afforded an opportunity, of which he has availed himself, to state his recollection with regard to it.

The minister entertains no doubt that the commandant proceeded regularly in accordance with the regulations and practice in such cases, and that in reaching the conclusion and awarding the punishment which he did, he was governed solely by his view of the testimony and the punishment which he deemed to be deserved, having regard to the character of the offence found by him and in the interest of the discipline of the college.

2. The minister is, however, upon the case as represented to him, unable to adopt the finding of the commandant that Cadet Lancaster took the cigarette case with criminal intent.

The testimony given, as understood by the minister, fails to establish a case inconsistent with an intention on the part of the young man to do more than temporarily avail himself of the use of the cigarette case, and the improbability of an intention to commit theft seems also to the minister to be a reasonable assumption from the circumstances of the case.

There can be no question, however, that Cadet Lancaster did take the cigarette case, using the cigarettes which it contained, and did keep the same in his possession for several hours without the consent or permission of the owner, to whom, however, he afterwards returned the empty case upon demand. Admitting the intention claimed on behalf of Cadet Lancaster not to deprive the owner permanently of his cigarette case and to restore the same, Cadet Lancaster's conduct was, nevertheless, in the opinion of the minister, an act to the prejudice of good order and military discipline of the college, especially at a time when more serious offences with regard to misappropriation of property were occurring and were the subject of inquiry on the part of the officers of the college.

3. The commandant, therefore, could not have properly overlooked the offence of Cadet Lancaster when brought to his attention, as it was, but he erred in considering the more serious offence of theft to have been established beyond reasonable doubt by the evidence at the hearing of the case.

4. In the opinion of the minister the justice of the case will be satisfied without danger to the maintenance of the discipline of the college if he records Cadet Lancaster as guilty of the minor offence of being in improper possession of the cigarette case without the consent of the owner, and reduces his sentence by remitting the unexpired portion thereof, which he hereby does.

(Sgd.) F. W. BORDEN,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

Ottawa, January 6, 1908.

One word more. My hon. friend referred to the fact that Cadet Lancaster was placed under arrest when he returned to the college on Sunday. As a mater of fact, he was under arrest and was allowed to leave the college during the Christmas vacation, and of course when he returned he came back to the position that he was in before. I understand that he attended his classes, so that there was no serious detriment to him in that respect. The moment this decision reached the commandant the cadet was relieved from arrest, because the judgment I gave at once relieved him from rustication.

Mr. H. A. WARD. I would ask the minister if rustication and arrest are synonymous terms? Is he under arrest when he is rusticated ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. He was under arrest previously, during the trial of the case. He had been under arrest for some time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But he was rusticated after the period of arrest ceased?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think he remained under arrest until my decision was reached.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may tell the minister—I do not know whether he is aware of it or not—that the commandant of the Royal Military College has no authority to place anybody under arrest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be a good deal in what is suggested by my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). I have not examined carefully the statutes relating to the college, but I think there may be reason to doubt whether the powers of military discipline assumed by the commandant are founded on any law permitting him to take the course he did. So far as the main aspects of the case are concerned, I had some opportunity of inquiring into the evidence upon which the decision of the commandant was founded, and I am bound to say that in my judgment there was not one iota of evidence which justified his finding. It was just about the same as if one hon. member of this House on intimate terms with another should go into the other's room and take up his cigar case and put it into his pocket and keep it for a few hours. That is all there was about it. It was a mere boyish prank, and it seems to me that the decision at which the commandant arrived was of the most extraordinary character, and one which indicated his absolute inability to appreciate the evidence brought before him, and his further inability to understand the real essentials of the crime with which he undertook to charge this young man. I am very glad indeed that the minister has taken the course of setting this decision aside. It is quite true that there may have been something in this boyish prank which would call for some very minor punishment in order to maintain the disclipine of the college, but to endeavour, as was done, to attach the stigma of a crime to this young man was an intolerable decision, and for my part I cannot understand how any reasonable man could have arrived at it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I do not wish to go into the merits of this case, but I think a word should be said in defence of the Commandant of the Military College. Those who have the pleasure of knowing him know that he would not do anything that he did not deem proper, but judging by the document that has been read, the offence that was committed appears to have been merely a boyish prank. At the same time I think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) should not have said that the commandant acted in a cowardly way or that the cadets did, because the cadets had only one choice, to answer the questions that were put to them, and my hon. friend knows very well that in mili-

tary matters when an investigation takes place the accused is not taken before the investigators.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, he is.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, because I know that in the case of a man named Gouin, in Quebec, the evidence was taken in his absence.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It was all wrong.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Well, he took an action for damages and the courts decided that it was all right and that must have been a good judgment, because it was rendered by Judge Seymour. At all events, the Commandant of the Royal Military College acted under the evidence that was taken, and I do not think any blame can be attached to him. Is not Captain Lafferty the commandant?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, Lieut.-Col. Taylor.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. However, my hon. friend knows that the commandant did not act in any other way than according to the evidence that was given, and when the judgment was referred to the minister the commandant obeyed the minister's order, and therefore the matter was one which I think should not have been brought before the House.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (Norfolk). There are one or two things connected with this matter which I think might serve as a warning to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia to look into the practice of the Military College. I believe it is usual in cases of petty offences for cadets or privates or non-commissioned officers, or even officers, to be quietly brought before the commandant before any other step is taken. I do not know whether this course is legal or not in this country, but certainly it is provided for in the Queen's Regulations. I am not going to speak of the merits of this case at all. Everybody seems to concur in what the minister did, and I am sure he would not reverse a decision of a commandant unless he had good reason for doing so. But where a criminal offence is charged it is a different matter from the class of petty offences incident to the maintaining of discipline and good order in the college. I do not think we should look too closely into the methods of those in charge, but I do think that if this commandant has the power which he exercised in this case, it ought to be taken from him or any other commandant. It puts into the hands of an enemy or those who want to annoy or bring discredit upon a young man the power to have him charged with a crime and tried without his having a chance of being defended.

If it be the fact that the commandant has that power, it ought to be promptly taken from him. Here is a college which young gentlemen enter in order to get a military education and be fitted to command our volunteers, as they should be commanded, and be fitted also to enter the Imperial service for the defence of the empire. It is essential that these young men should be taught to assume the responsibility of their conduct, and the best way to do this is to hold the commandant and his staff strictly to account for their actions. I do not agree with my hon. friend from Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that because the boys themselves did not tell the commandant their opinion of the course he had taken, that was any evidence of cowardice on their part, whatever may be said about the conduct of this officer himself; but I feel called upon to say that it is unbecoming, un-British and unsoldierly for a commandant to accuse a cadet, under his charge, of a crime, take upon himself the trial and as commandant bring together the other cadets and examine them in private in order to try and establish the crime. This was not the case of a petty offence but of a charge of theft. It is one of the first principles of the rights of a man, not to speak of a lad, that when he is charged with a crime, those who give evidence against him shall do so in his presence, and he shall have the right to employ counsel.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That was done in this case.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand that counsel was refused.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. TISDALE. At all events no commanding officer of a military college should be allowed to call the lads before him privately and examine them privately in the case of a criminal offence. That is where I consider the commandant seriously abused his authority. Not having the facts before me, I am not prepared either to condemn or condone what the officers did, but I repeat —and the army office in Great Britain will sustain me—that no commanding officer of a military college has the right to hold a private trial in the case of any cadet charged with a criminal offence. If this commandant has that power, it should be taken from him. If he has not, then he is to be condemned, because he ought to be certain of his right before undertaking to act.

Mr. HENRY A. WARD (Durham). If the commandant of the military college has the power to try such cases as these, that power should be taken away from him. But I doubt if he has it. I would ask the hon. the Minister of Militia if his powers are the same as those of the commanding officer of a regiment?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is the presumption and that has been the practice. The college has been conducted according

to that view since it was founded down to the present.

Mr. WARD. Then I would like to read to the House exactly what the powers of an officer commanding a regiment are. I doubt if such an officer has the power to try any such cases as the one in question at all. I need not go through the list of the powers conferred on commanding officers of regiments. In the military law, as laid down for the guidance of officers in Canada, there are eighteen sections, but in none of them do I find any power whatever given the commanding officer to try a case of theft. After enumerating all the ordinary offences which a commanding officer has the power to try, it is provided that any other offences which the commanding officer desires to dispose of summarily will be referred to superior authority. What is that superior authority ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That would be no doubt a court martial.

Mr. TISDALE. Or the civil authority.

Mr. WARD. There is no choice in the matter, I suppose. It is quite true that cadet Lancaster was given the choice by the commandant of a trial before court martial or by the commandant himself, and he chose the latter. But had the commandant of the school any power to sugest to Cadet Lancaster that he might make a selection ? If he had not, he should have referred the case to superior authority at once because this section goes on to say :—

A charge of any other offence which the commandant desires to dispose of summarily will be referred to superior authority by the latter briefly stating the circumstances of the case and accompanied by the prisoner's company default sheet.

I suppose there was no default sheet in this case because, I understand, this cadet had a very high standing in the college. That is the course laid down by military law ; and the commandant of the college, who has only the power of a commanding officer of a regiment, had no right to try the case at all, even if the lad did make a selection. I understand that a question was asked the commandant to this effect :

Did the gentleman cadet who lost the cigarette case make a complaint?

This offence took place two or three months before and no action was taken. But because there was some suspicion that some other offence had been committed by the cadet—not Cadet Lancaster—the endeavour was made to fasten it on Cadet Lancaster. And because this particular offence could not be fastened on Cadet Lancaster, this old affair, which occurred two or three months previously and had never been reported, was brought up against him. Another question was asked :

By whom was the charge made?

The commandant had to acknowledge that he himself it was who made the charge. So that he stood in the position of making a charge against the cadet and trying it himself. Was there any fair-play about that ? If so, I cannot see it. Another question was asked :

Was not Cadet Wanklyn, who lost or was deprived of his cigarette case for a few hours, examined, and did he not swear that he thought Cadet Lancaster had no intention of stealing the case?

And the commandant answered yes. Here is the position. The commandant makes a charge for something which occurred three months ago and tries it himself, and in defiance of the evidence of the man most interested, he brings in a judgment branding Cadet Lancaster as a thief. After having absolutely refused to allow the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) to appear in defence of his young boy, who was charged with a criminal offence, I think there is grave reason to call for an inquiry into the fitness of this commandant to hold the position he does.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). This case strikes different persons in different ways. The way it strikes me, I do not think has been called to the attention of the House so far. It seems to me perfectly clear that if this young man had not been fortunate enough to have a father at his back to fight his battles inasmuch as no report of the evidence was taken, the decision of the minister would depend entirely on what version of the evidence the commandant chose to give. It seems therefore quite clear that had not this youth been fortunate enough to have a father to take up his case, the minister would naturally have acted on the uncontradicted report of the commandant and branded this youth for life as a thief. Now I understand there are 95 to 100 young Canadians in that military college, and it strikes me as a terrible thing that all these bright young Canadian youths should be at the mercy of a man who clearly is unfit to be in that position, and to exercise command of that institution. I would call the attention of the government to the fact that the sooner these young men are protected by having, in the first place the powers of the commandant clearly defined, and in the next place by putting a man into the position who has shown that he is fit to exercise those powers, the better for the college and the better for the Canadian boys.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. May I be allowed a single word in addition. It is fair that the House should be put in full possession of the facts. The very moment the case was referred to me I saw there was no evidence on oath and I found it very difficult indeed to reach a conclusion. One of the results, at any rate, of this inves-

tigation has been that instructions have been issued that in future, although I believe it is not in accordance with the practice in regimental investigations of that kind, evidence must be taken down and forwarded to the minister. Now a word in regard to to the matter brought up by my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Ward). It is only fair to say that the preliminary proceedings consisted in the summoning of a board of inquiry. That board was composed of three officers of the college, and that board proceeded to take evidence, of different cadets and others connected with the college. The charge or charges such as they were which were referred to the commandant, were made the subjects of this inquiry. That is what took place.

Mr. WARD. Were these witnesses who gave evidence before the board called on the trial ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Most of them were called on the trial, and the cadet who was under arrest was given the right of questioning and cross-examining.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I might correct the minister there. The cadet charged was not permitted to ask a question. He dared not ask a question directly of the witness, but he had to put his question through the commandant who took the witness into his own hands.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, he was permitted to ask questions, but the commandant required him to ask the question through him.

Mr. E. G. PORTER (West Hastings). From what has been said by the minister it occurs to me that the usual practice of the college has not been carried out in this case, but was deliberately violated. If I understand the minister correctly, the practice in a charge such as this was to formulate the charge, take evidence upon that, and then refer the case to the minister before the sentence came into force. Now in order to carry that out properly, the evidence upon which the conviction is based, as well as the charge, ought to be forwarded to the minister in order that he might form a proper judgment upon it. It is evident that had that been done in the first instance as it was afterwards done, the sentence would never have been enforced at all against this young man. It seems to me that the course of procedure adopted by the commandant of the college discloses clearly the motive of the commanding officer in acting as he did. If I am correctly informed, and understand what has been said here, evidence of two characters was taken before the board of inquiry. First, there was evidence taken of the young cadets who were not sworn at all, they made statements before the board, and in the absence of the person accused. Then afterwards certain other evidence was taken under oath.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But from the same cadets, or some of them.

Mr. PORTER. Now the whole of that evidence was before the board of inquiry and before the commandant and it must have been in view of the whole evidence that he undertook to form his judgment. Therefore, the whole of that evidence should have been before the minister to enable him to form a correct judgment upon the matter. Now if I am correctly informed, the evidence that was sworn to was not forwarded to the minister.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was not taken down.

Mr. PORTER. But the evidence that was taken, not under oath, a brief of it, was forwarded to the minister; in other words, the commandant asked the minister to form a judgment upon the unsworn testimony which was taken behind the back of the accused; that was sent to the minister and upon that he was asked to form his judgment. It seems to me that discloses a motive. A motive is further disclosed by the fact that the young man was tried before upon two alleged offences, and this was the third one. The case looks to me as if there was a deliberate pursuit of the young man with the fixed intention of getting a conviction against him in some way or other; and in order that the conviction might be sustained the evidence upon which it was professed to be based was suppressed and not submitted to the minister. If I am correct in my conclusion, no one will say that a man guilty of conduct of that kind ought to be continued in the honourable service of the militia of Canada, or in any school in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me impossible that the minister should have exercised his discretion unless all the evidence was forwarded to him. As the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) has just pointed out, the so-called evidence which did come forward was the result of inquiries made, not under oath, but made behind the back of the man who was charged, nor did the accused have an opportunity himself to cross-examine before the commandant. There was not a single trace of that evidence to be found when the matter came to be investigated. This perhaps cannot be made a charge against the commandant, because I think in the course he pursued he had the concurrence of other military men who looked into the matter. But it is an irregularity which urgently demands correction, and I understand from the minister that he has corrected it already.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have done so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am surprised that the correction has not been made before. I suppose it is due to the fact that no circumstance of this kind had arisen in the past ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is the first case of the kind since I have been minister.

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

SUPPLY.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to government steamers and ice-breakers, $535,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the minister goes into this, it might be well for him to give us the explanations which were not finished last night in two or three cases.

Mr. BRODEUR. What cases ?

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will remember there were what seemed to be the extraordinarily large expenses by Commander Spain. Then there was the Lacas case; and there was some confusing matters with reference to the minister's own disbursements which he could not understand himself, and therefore could not make us understand, and with regard to which he was to refresh his memory.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to Commander Spain, a report has been made to me which I will read ;

Commander Spain is the Wreck Commissioner for Canada, and also he is in charge of the marine service and the pilotage services. He has to travel very extensively in connection with these matters, as his instructions are to endeavour to investigate every casualty of any importance which takes place in the Dominion. He is allowed $6 per day by order in council living expenses as wreck commissioner. He was instructed to go to New York to find out the system adopted at that port of transhipping pilots to and from ocean steamers, and also the way in which the pilotage system was conducted there. The information he obtained was very valuable to the department.

This officer is not in possession of a railway pass at the present time, nor has he ever at any time had a pass from any railway company or steamship company in Canada, the United States or elsewhere.

F. GOURDEAU,
Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the expenses which have been charged by Commander Spain are $6 per day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, for living allowance. Then his railway fare has to be added.

Mr. FOSTER. Besides the $6 per day he is paid his travelling expenses of all kinds ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Of all kinds.

Mr. FOSTER. Not his hotel bills ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, his living expenses include the hotel bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, is that indicative of the way in which the minister deals with his officers ? The good old fashioned system was that the man should account for all the moneys given to him, and that he should put in certified accounts of all that he spent. It was not at all the rule to grant certain sums to a man en bloc to cover his living expenses. That was done sometimes when gentlemen were sent from departments across to London on work of the government; then deputy ministers and the like of that were allowed a living allowance at so much, because their mission was considered important in the public interest. But it is a bad practice to single out men from the service of Canada and allow them so much as an allowance for living. They get their salaries, they are in pay of the country, and the country will foot every legitimate bill. But it is not supposed that outside their salary they are going to get living allowance which will enable them to make their salary larger than it otherwise would be. We have a great many men in the service who travel, and where you pick out one and give him that privilege you certainly do not seem to deal equally with the service as a whole, with men equally valuable and with men equally efficient. You will get rid of all the difficulty if you simply say, Whatever you reasonably expend for your travel and your living, put in your bills and they will be paid by the government. That may be a little more difficult for the officers, but that is what the officers are for.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am now informed for the first time that in the case of Commander Spain there was a special order in council passed providing that a fixed sum be allowed him for his living expenses. The deputy minister informs me that this is not a general custom in the department, it is the only case where an order in council has been passed fixing the living expenses.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does that order cover everything except railway fares ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Everything. The general question is certainly important whether we should give to officers of the department a certain fixed allowance according to their salary and position, or whether we should continue the system which has been in existence in the past, by which they are required to submit to the Auditor General a detailed statement of their expenses. I think in the case of deputy ministers it has been the practice for many years to give them a fixed sum for travelling expenses, whether in Canada or outside of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. The old practice was only for outside of Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. If it is a good practice for travelling outside Canada it would be as good for travelling within Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Why ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware of any reason for a distinction.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, if we send the Deputy Minister of Finance across the water to forward some financial transaction, the practice was to give him a certain allowance. There is a difference between outside and inside travel.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know about that, there is room for a difference of opinion. I do not know what the difference would be in regard to the travelling expenses of the deputy minister inside or outside of Canada. When he is sent away it is for some very important work, he has to meet people in a social way and perhaps it is very difficult for him to account for every cent of money he has spent. But, he may be sent away in Canada for the same purpose. Then would it not be advisable that the same principle should be adopted in regard to his travel, not only inside the country but outside as well ? The matter is now engaging the attention of the treasury board but no decision has been reached as to whether we should adopt the principle of giving a fixed sum of money for living allowance or whether we should continue the system which now exists. For myself I have no definite views on the matter although perhaps it would be just as well in the interest of the country if a fixed sum were determined upon according to the social position and nature of the work of the officer.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the practice of the ministers themselves?

Mr. BRODEUR. Ministers present accounts and certify that they have spent so much without giving any details.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the cases of Mr. Lacas and Mr. St. Louis ?

Mr. BRODEUR. As to Mr. Lacas, an arrangement was made in 1903, between Mr. Sutherland and Mr. Préfontaine, Mr. Sutherland being Minister of Public Works and Mr. Préfontaine Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There is a letter dated the 20th April, 1903, sent by Mr. Sutherland in which he stated, in answer to a question of Mr. Préfontaine as to whether the Department of Public Works would be prepared to permit Mr. Lacas to do work required for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that:

I have no objection to granting the desired permission, but of course you will have to make some arrangement for paying the expenses in connection with any work which he may do for your department.

Mr. FOSTER.

There is a letter from Mr. Préfontaine acknowledging that on the 12th May, and saying that the arrangement was agreeable to him. I may say in connection with what the hon. member was referring to in regard to that clause of the Civil Service Act by which a member of the civil service is prohibited from being paid by two departments, that Mr. Lacas is not a member of the civil service, not a permanent officer, and consequently he would not fall under the control of this law. The matter was brought to the attention of the department by the Auditor General, and an order in council was passed ratifying the agreement between the two ministers which has been read.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, but the agreement which has been read by the minister does not provide for the pay of the man. Does Mr. Sutherland say to Mr. Préfontaine : Yes, you may take and use this man 365 days in the year, but you will have to pay him what he wants for his services and I will go on and pay him his salary even though he does not work one day in the year? Evidently what was contemplated was this: If you want my officer for the time that you are using him you will have to account to my department for his pay.

Mr. BRODEUR. Account to the department ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he is being paid by the department. While he was doing work for the minister last year he was paid his regular salary in the other department of $1,550. Just reason it out for yourself. If you can employ him twenty days surely you can employ him 300 days. He will get his salary of $1,550 from his own department, and you will pay him $1,300 or $1,400 for the other work. It does not work out properly and although there is a distinction technically in that he is not a permanent employee, of course, the trouble that was provided against or sought to be provided against is just as much a trouble in the temporary service as it would be in the permanent service.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have here a communication from Mr. Lacas addressed to Mr. Préfontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries under date of November 18, 1902, in which he makes application for the work of executing copies of plans and doing photographic work for the department. This man was in possession of photographic apparatus and we had to have this work done. This work had previously been done outside under the control of the chief engineer of the department, and Mr. Lacas has been simply carrying out the arrangement that we had before that, but with much better results as far as the administration of the department is concerned. The work was not so advantageously done outside as it has been done by this man, he

made application to the minister to do this work, it was given to him and a certain remuneration was paid him.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the work done?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is done when it is required.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the work done for which this amount was paid to this gentleman?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not a statement of the accounts here, but I suppose it was done during the year.

Mr. BERGERON. Does he present an account?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he presents an account to the department for so much and this account is paid on the certificate of the officer for whom this work is done.

Mr. BERGERON. If you had a copy of the account you could find out when the work was done?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not at all satisfactory, I may say to the minister. He dodges entirely the question of taking one man's employee, that employee getting his full salary for the year, using him for a part of the year for his own purposes and paying him extra for it. There is no question as to the economy of it. If this gentleman had the apparatus for the work and if he could do it better, it was better to have it done if he had the time to do it, but he should not have double pay.

Mr. BRODEUR. As far as the department is concerned there is an advantage in having the work done in that way, because we are not obliged to go outside—to go to Montreal or some other place to get it done. We can have the work done here. We had the good fortune to have this man under our direct supervision and we could see that the work was done without any delay, not at a greater cost, but on the contrary, at a less cost. Perhaps this man was working at night; as to that I do not know, but I do know that we have a more satisfactory arrangement than we had before.

Mr. BENNETT. How long was he occupied in earning the $400?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work which he does is the reproduction of plans by photographic apparatus.

Mr. BERGERON. That will have to be done in day time?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy informs me it is not necessary to do it in the daytime as it is an electric process. It is not a question of time but of the value of the work he was performing.

Mr. BLAIN. We find that in the Public Works Department that Mr. Lacas was engaged and paid $750, at the rate of $1,500 a year. The committee wants to know if he was doing any of this work for the Marine Department during the six months he was working for the Public Works Department?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know exactly at what time he did this, whether in the day or at night. The department required that work to be done. Formerly it was done by outside people and we did not have as much satisfaction as we are receiving to-day from this gentleman. We got him to do it and it is done more advantageously as far as we are concerned. I am asked why we did not have this done by the Public Works Department; it is found more satisfactory to have control over a man by giving him the money direct and that induced the department to do the work in this way.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no objection to the same man if competent doing the work for the two departments provided he is doing temporary work in each department; but what we want to find out is whether when he was being paid by the Public Works Department a salary for doing work there, he was also working for the Fisheries Department, during the time he was supposed to devote to the Public Works service. The ministers of the two departments should look into this matter and find out whether they are taking each other's help; we should know whether this man is receiving two salaries or one.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a question if with $1,500 from the Public Works Department and $500 from us, a total of $2,000 a year, this man is being paid too much.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister does not see the point at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may not quite follow what my hon. friend says but I have been trying to tell him that our department is in a better position in this matter than before.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend does not disassociate himself from the government; he talks about his department and says it is all right to steal another minister's man from him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He could not steal him if the two ministers agreed upon it. I understand that Messrs. Préfontaine and Sutherland came to an agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I think the House should take hold of this and find out if a man is being paid a salary in one department and is being allowed to go around by the back door to earn half a year's salary from another department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) state

distinctly that an arrangement had been come to between Messrs. Préfontaine and Sutherland when in charge of the departments under which this gentleman was permitted to do certain work for the Marine Department. It may be that the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine thought that the $1,500 and the $400 or $500 from the Marine Department would be a reasonable salary for the services performed; but I may say to my friend that I will make inquiry, in my department as to this gentleman's work and if on the advice of the officers of my department it is thought that the amount he receives is more than he is entitled to, I will see that the salary he gets in my department is reduced to a reasonable figure.

Mr. FOSTER. That is fair.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked last night what Mr. Lacas was doing and I was told he was on six months' leave of absence.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was so informed.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister should not come to the House and make statements if they are not correct. To-day he is not a member of the civil service. Does the government grant leave of absence to men who are not civil servants ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly there are a number of people not on the civil service list who can get leave of absence.

Mr. TAYLOR. This gentleman has been in the employ of the department for many years and the minister to-day says he is not a member of the civil service. He was not in the House prior to 1906, but the Prime Minister was, when complaint was made by the Liberals, then in opposition, against the government for employing temporary clerks to do copying at their homes at nights, and paying them for it. The Conservative government made the legitimate defence that in this way they could get the work done much cheaper than by putting on additional clerks. Each case, however, was investigated, those who were drawing pay from two departments were given their walking tickets and an order in council was passed saying that this should not continue. In the face of that the Minister of Marine and the new Minister of Public Works justified the course now taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not said anything about it one way or the other except to state the facts.

Mr. TAYLOR. A sacred order in council was passed saying that no man should draw salary from two funds. Can the minister justify giving this man $500 when he is drawing a salary from the Public Works Department ? Although he is on six months leave of absence. I presume his pay is going on. The Liberals made a charge against the government in 1896 for simply giving out a little copying to be done by temporary clerks at their homes, the sums involved being small, $5 and $10; but here is $499 of the people's money thrown away to a civil servant who is drawing $1,500 a year and the minister attempts to justify it.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been stated that this gentleman in the last year has been for months away from his work in Ottawa in the Cobalt; it is now stated that he is in Paris. What he is doing I do not know but it is worth while for the minister to ascertain whether he has been receiving pay and at the same time has been granted extended leave of absence to work out his own projects in Cobalt. The Minister of Public Works might look up that matter in connection with his department as it will come up when we reach his votes. If he was a temporary employee and was doing work in the two departments in this way that would perhaps not come under the strict letter of the order in council. But if at the very time he was supposed to be in the service of the Minister of Public Works he was engaged in doing work for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and was getting pay for it, that would be drawing double pay and would be manifestly unfair.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to get the information for my hon. friend when the estimates of my department are before the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the minister has no objection to furnishing the committee with the account rendered by Mr. Lacas for the payment of $449.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, there is no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister was to look into the question as to whether Potvin got a cheque.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he got a cheque before the 1st of April.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the policy of the minister with reference to giving advances to messengers? Why was an advance given to Potvin?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because he came to England with us.

Mr. FOSTER. And the minister had his private secretary?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And also a messenger?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. A royal progress. A duke could travel all over this country without a messenger. If he wanted his boots blacked, he would not bring a man from the middle of Germany for the purpose; he would pay five cents or a tip to a boot-

black. What in the world did the minister want with a private secretary and a messenger also ? I make this statement, that in less than eighteen months, taking in the last fiscal year and a portion of the current year up to the time the minister came back, he and his private secretary have received these amounts of money: $596.05, $1,400, $2,000, and within a shade of $4,000, making $7,996 for travelling expenses, besides which $892 stands in the accounts against the minister for the expenses of the party across the Atlantic, and $25 for the pullmans down to the sea, making altogether $8,913.05 in less than eighteen months. The minister said last night that he had recovered part of that. He knows how much he recovered, and it would not be unfair to ask him to give that information to the committee now.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to my own expenses I have no objection to state what has been done; quite the reverse. I gave the information yesterday, and the hon. gentleman is still drawing attention to the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I intend to draw attention to it until the abuse is cured, if it takes fifteen years and I am here.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman waits till I give the explanations, he will find there was no abuse. First, he says that $890 was paid for my transportation expenses. I may say that the first question that presented itself was whether the expenditure had been incurred before the end of the last fiscal year or after the beginning of this year. I am informed by the accountant of the department that the order was given before the 31st of March, and that the tickets reached the department before that date, and consequently the account was entered before the end of the fiscal year, and could be paid out of the previous appropriation. Now, the hon. member is somewhat surprised at the amount for tickets, and wishes to know whether it represents the cost of my ticket alone, or covers some others. As a matter of fact, the account showed that there was paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the department not only my own travelling expenses, but the expenses of some others who were with me. Some of those persons were officers of the department going to England on official business, and of course the department was perfectly justified in paying their expenses. The arrangement had been made before I left. In fact, as my hon. friend knows, we were busy with the work of the session, and those details were carried out by my private secretary. My hon. friend says I was in receipt of some $890. I explained yesterday how that was paid, and I am going to read a letter which I sent to the deputy minister in order to show the hon. gentleman that the aspersions he has tried to cast upon my honour and reputation are not at all justified. I may have my failings, but I am just as anxious as my hon. friend himself to see that everything, especially connected with myself, is carried out in the most proper way. I explained to him yesterday that last year, when for the first time I made an inspection of the different works of the department, I had with me some friends who to a certain extent were interested in the works which I was visiting, men connected with the shipping interests; but I thought the country should not pay their expenses, and what did I do? I adopted a policy which I was told by the officer with whom I conferred it was not the habit of the department to act upon, that it was not even done at the time when my hon. friend himself was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not know whether that is the reason why my hon. friend attacks me so bitterly. On the 23rd of April I wrote the following letter to the deputy minister:—

During the crossing I asked my secretary to let me have the amount that was paid for the transportation of my party, and he informed me that the account would be paid by the department. I am writing you immediately so as to give instructions on the subject. There is, of course, no objection in paying for the transportation of Mr. Venning, Mr. Wiallard, my secretary, Potvin, and myself, but as far as the transportation for my wife and the other two ladies is concerned, I will pay that myself, and if this account has been paid when you receive this letter, explain and notify the accountant that I will see to the paying of this on my return to Ottawa when a refund can be made.

There is what I have done. I stated those facts yesterday, on my word as a Minister of the Crown and as a member of this House, and I am extremely sorry that my statement was not accepted as it should have been by the hon. gentleman. For my part I am always willing to accept the word of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend say that when he explained that he proposed paying back the amount and so directed his deputy minister I did not accept his statement? If he does, he is saying something which is entirely outside my recollection.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say whether the hon. gentleman is to be considered as having accepted my word yesterday or not, but I just find from a statement which fell from his lips a few moments ago that he appears as if he wanted the House to believe that I had received so much money despite the facts that I declared yesterday that I had given positive instructions not to pay this amount, and if it had been paid that I would reimburse it on my return. In all fairness to myself the hon. gentleman should have accepted my word.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not go a little further and say that I return to this statement to-day, as I told the minister. I read all the items which I find in the official publication as charged to himself. I stated at the same time that the minister said yesterday he had paid back or was to pay back some of these items. And I asked him to-day if he would state to the House how much he had refunded of those items. What is the use of the hon. minister trying to make a grievance where none exists? The minister is here to be examined with reference to the expenditure of his department and his personal expenses in connection with the department whenever these appear to be outrageously extravagant. On the minister's own admission he has been extravagant. Why should a young man like him take a messenger in addition to a private secretary all over Europe. When I went to England and made loans for the Dominion and made them successfully, and had to spend two months at a time in putting through the transaction, I did not take a messenger and a private secretary, but did the work myself, and my expenses were not over $1,000 all told. Why ? Because I was not born in royal splendour and with immense sums of money always at my disposal. But the minister is so different in that respect that he finds it difficult to retrench.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman seems to think that those I brought with me did not render any services to the country. Let me tell him that I spent several months in London and in Paris, that in those two places I was working in the interests of my country, and I may say that my secretary, whom he sees fit to attack—

Mr. FOSTER. I have not attacked your secretary.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, the hon. gentleman is attacking me for having brought a secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. What I am attacking is the outrageous expenditure.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let me tell my hon. friend that my secretary worked during these six months probably harder than he does in the department every day. Does the hon. gentleman think that when we were over in London and Paris we were doing nothing; that we had no correspondence to attend to, no reports to prepare, no work to do? Take the negotiation of the French treaty. At every meeting we found four deputy ministers attending the French ministers and they had five secretaries besides. All we had was my colleague the Minister of Finance and myself and only two private secretaries, and the secretary of the Minister of Finance had to leave before the work was completed so that we had then only one secretary. And he had plenty to do preparing reports and documents. The French government had a complete staff of officers at work, whereas the Minister of Finance and myself were alone with our two private secretaries, and during part of the time only one secretary. My hon. friend does not understand why we had somebody to work for us. I repeat that the work of my secretary was most useful and necessary. He had to work day and night, and it is not fair to him to say that his services were not required. If we had not our secretaries with us, we would have been obliged to engage a number of persons to do their work. Was it not better to have that work done by Canadians, on whom we could rely for absolute secrecy ? I may tell the hon. gentleman that if I had to do the same thing over again I would bring my secretary again.

Mr. BENNETT. And the messenger, too?

Mr. BRODEUR. The messenger had plenty of work to do. We had work for him and if we had not had him we would have had to engage others. I may say that when the deputy minister received my letter he gave immediate instructions to the accountant, not to pay that amount, but the letter was received the 23rd of April and the amount had been paid the 12th of April. That is why it appears in a blue-book and the Auditor General's Report. That is the reason it appears in the Auditor General's Report. And I think it shows that the charges hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to make against me, that the expenses of unofficial members of my party were paid by the country are absolutely unjust and unfair.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that the refund does not appear in this report if it was made immediately ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that when I came to Ottawa, I sent a cheque to the accountant, but the accountant came to me and told me that the amount of the cheque was too large ; I had included not only the expenses of those who were with me but also expenses of Mr. Venning and my private secretary. That was on December 9th. The matter has not yet been adjusted.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be adjusted ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has talked a good deal, but has diligently abstained from giving the information he promised to give. Notwithstanding all he says, we find charged against him the amount of $8,913.05, and there is nothing in what he has said to show how much has been refunded.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have said that I gave a cheque, but it was too much.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was $915.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says that this refund of $915 is too much. But give him the benefit of the whole of it, and say that he has refunded $915, and we find that there still stands against him $8,000. for eighteen months. The minister made out a clear case to show the need of his secretary accompanying him whilst he was negotiating the treaty with France, but not for the time when he was in London, which was nearly half the time. He did not make out a case for taking the messenger at all. Whenever any criticism of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is attempted, he tries to turn it so as to make it appear a personal attack upon himself or those about him. He says I have attacked his private secretary. Why, I do not know his private secretary from Adam. The minister says he is a good man, and I hope he is the very best of private secretaries. But we are not to be diverted from the main point, and that is that, even allowing for a refund of $915, the minister has spent $8,000 in eighteen months or less. That is absolutely and outrageously extravagant. I had almost gone further than that ; but, at least, it is a way of getting money that a minister should not take.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just said that the accounts were not adjusted, yet the hon. gentleman accuses me of extravagance. Why does he say I have spent $8,000 when he has my statement that the account has not yet been adjusted ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that it had all been adjusted except this $915 proposed refund which was too much.

Mr. BRODEUR. No. There is also a question of $2,000 that was advanced from the vote for the ice-breaking steamer. As I explained yesterday, I required money to travel—I have not the good fortune to be a wealthy man. I was going to England not only on account of the colonial conference, but also on the business of the ice-breaking steamer. Therefore, the advance was made out of the amount for that service. This account has not yet been adjusted. I have my account in the department for my expenses in connection with that service. Lately I have received the amount from the colonial conference vote.

Mr. FOSTER. But the question of adjustment does not touch the vital point. The minister received and spent $596. His secretary received and spent $1,400. The minister received $2,000 from a vote from which he had no authority of parliament to take it. He has not refunded a dollar of that money, and he still has it except what he has spent. He then received within a fraction of $4,000 and none of that money has been refunded. He attempted to make a refund of $915, but his secretary tells him it is too much. But, allowing him the benefit of the whole $915, we find that he has drawn over $8,000, not one dollar of which has been refunded to the Auditor General. Does he propose to take money in April, put it in his pocket and keep it until the succeeding April before he pays any of it back ? Is that the way he runs his account for expenses ? If so, it is no wonder that his officers do the same and that the Auditor General has the time of his life in getting in accounts for advances made. The minister's explanation has not explained any thing. There still remains the sum of $8,000 which he has succeeded in spending———

Mr. BRODEUR. I have told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that I did not spend that sum of money.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the minister has it in his pocket. It is the country's money and not his, and it ought to have been put back in the treasury.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly. And, as I told the hon. gentleman, I will not follow his example and allow the expenses of unofficial persons accompanying me to be charged to the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister be a little plainer ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The system which existed when I became head of the department, and which was always followed, was that when ministers travelled on government steamers all expenses were paid by the department. I changed that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) is the only virtuous minister in the lot. It is a wonderful thing he has done, truly. He went on a tour of inspection on the government steamer, and when he came back he asked for the bill for the tea and coffee and other things that had been used by himself and party, and paid that back. The country does not ask him to do that. I am willing to stand a comparison of travelling expenses with my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) or any minister of this government. The minister cannot get out of such extravagance as spending $8,000 in eighteen months by cavilling over what a minister of any former government may have done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This ought to be a very simple and plain matter. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has given a statement by which it appears that the travelling expenses of the minister and his secretary for eighteen months amount to a little over $8,000. At all events, in respect of the items mentioned there is an expenditure of $8,000 claimed, and it appears in the public accounts and has been paid out of the treasury. The minister says the actual amount is less. All the

committee desires is to know what is the actual amount. The minister should be prepared with that information to-day ; before this item passes the minister should be in a position to give the committee the exact sum in respect to the item referred to by the member for North Toronto.

Mr. BRODEUR. I see they are charging me not only with my own expenses but with those of others, in order to be able to state later on that I have been extravagant. In this amount of $8,000 the hon. member for North Toronto did not include my own expenses only, but also the expenses of the persons who accompanied me.

Mr. FOSTER. By the minister's own statement here to-day he sent in a cheque of $900 to cover all that.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, this amount was not adjusted. The accountant refused to accept the cheque because he said it was more than I should reimburse, saying that it included an amount which had already been charged to another person. I have not got the exact amount which has been spent of this $2,000 which has been charged to me, I think it is $1,320. So there would be the difference between $1,320 and the $2,000.

Mr. BRISTOL. How many months since this payment was made ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The account came to me only a short time ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is mistaken in saying that the member for North Toronto is charging him with these things, it is the Public Accounts that are charging these things against the minister, and he says in effect that the Auditor General does not present a fair statement of the expenses which have been alluded to. There is a very simple mode by which the matter can be put right. Let the minister give us a statement of the exact amount that should be regarded as his expenses during that period, and the committee having received that information, can make any comment upon it they see fit. But it is idle to debate matters in respect of which the minister is not in a position to give us information. He cannot tell us what his expenses were during that period. Let the item stand until he can tell us.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wants a detailed statement of my personal expenses, what he wants to know is the amount which is to be charged to the government on that account. Now it happens that at this particular time there is an amount of $2,000 which appears as being charged to me, and there is also an amount of $900 which appears as charged to me in the Auditor General's Report of last year. I have not got the exact figures, but I think it is $1,320 that has to be charged out of the vote of the $2,000. Consequently there would be $780 which will have to be reimbursed to the department.

Mr. BENNETT. For how long a time were the hon. gentleman's expenses paid by the British government when he was on this mission ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not mean that all the expenses were paid by the British government during the Colonial Conference, but some of them were paid, I suppose for about a month and a half.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the nature of these expenses paid by the British government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know exactly what the British government paid. They were represented in the account.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman and his party stayed at the Hotel Cecil, did they not ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the hon. gentleman pay his bill at the Hotel Cecil ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, accounts were presented to me by the Hotel Cecil which I paid.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the hon. gentleman had to defray out of the expenses mentioned, his hotel bill at the Hotel Cecil ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I say there were some accounts presented to me which I paid, I do not say I paid everything.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman purchased a cigar he did not ask the British government to pay for that when he was heaping up an average of $15 or $20 per day of expenses. It is refreshing to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of all the men in this House. I was in this House in 1892 when the hon. gentleman occupied a seat on the opposition back benches, and every little item of $1 or $2 was debated and the loudest and strongest voice in denunciation of those items was that of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But he has grown so high and so mighty since he has been elevated, that when he was Speaker he would not put his feet under a table unless it was covered with a $50 table cloth bought by the people of Canada. He would not touch a napkin unless it cost $2.50. These are high and mighty times for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. No wonder that his department is known as the most notoriously extravagant department of the government. Look at the way his ice-breakers are fitted out in the most extravagant manner. No wonder that the Auditor General called the attention of the people to the fact that when a boat is to be put on the Canadian waters a hundred dollars has to

be paid for a single table. I am bound to say that before the hon. gentleman came into politics his knees never went under a $50 table, he never wiped his hands daintily with a $2.50 napkin.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one ungenerous thing of which the minister is guilty. Both last night and to-day he has represented the British government in the most niggardly light. He would not be generous and honest enough to say that the British government found them their apartments at the Cecil, paid all their living expenses and treated them with the most generous hospitality. But he cavilled, and twisted, and turned, and wriggled to make this parliament and the country believe that he paid a part of his bills, he would not say how much; the British government did pay some portion, but he would not say how much. If ever men were entertained in a princely way these gentlemen were entertained in a princely way while they were guests of the British government at the Intercolonial Conference. Everything was put at their disposal, palatial apartments, automobiles and everything of that kind, and because the minister happened to pay for a 15 cent cigar now and then for himself, he comes before the House and the country and gives the idea that while the British government may have paid some of their bills they did not go far in that direction. That is the impression the minister gave us.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. He ought to have been the first man, when the opportunity was given to him, to have stated to the committee in what a princely and generous way they were treated by the British government while they were there, and that all their necessities were looked after as if they had been princes and dukes of an empire.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never said what the British government have paid because I do not know what they paid. No accounts were presented to us; they settled them in whatever way they liked. I was asked as to whether I had some expenses in London and I said yes. I had some hotel expenses that I paid in London.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we ought to come down now to the item under discussion. I have spent a great deal of time trying to find out where the money of the people is going to. In 1896 the government then in power ran the country and ran it better than it is being run to-day on less than half what it is costing now. I find, in making a comparison, some pointers which show where this money is going. This vote is for Dominion steamers and ice-breakers. In 1896 we had nine steamers—the 'Aberdeen,' the 'Alert,' the 'Druid,' 'Le Canadien,' the Lansdowne,' the 'Newfield,' the 'Quadra,' the 'Sir James Douglas' and the 'Stanley.' These boats for that year cost $150,000 including every expense in connection with them. The government at the present time have nine Dominion steamers— the 'Aberdeen,' the 'Champlain,' the 'Druid,' the 'Lady Laurier,' the 'Lansdowne,' the 'Minto,' the 'Montcalm,' the 'Quadra' and the 'Stanley' and the expenses for these nine steamers for nine months amount to $457,310. For the full twelve months add twenty-five per cent and you will get $610,080 as the amount which it has cost the country this last year to run these nine steamers, whereas the late government performed this same service for $150,000 showing that there has been an increase in the cost of $459,560. I want to know what has become of the money. I turn up the detailed account and I find that in 1896 the then government carried on the service performed by these steamers, the hydrographic survey and other works and they spent $505 for uniforms while this government spent, last year for uniforms,—and I will give a few details of this expenditure—$9,883.90, or for the full year $13,178.53, or an increase of $12,673.15. Now, we will just show what they are doing.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to give me the page for that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will give you the page for every item and I will give the pages for the corresponding expenditures in 1896. At page K—13 of the Auditor General's Report of 1896 it will be seen that the government purchased uniforms to the amount of $21.20 and at K—18 they expended $184.15, making a total of $505.35. This government purchased last year, for the 'Aberdeen,' as shown at page P—8, the following: From James Halliday, Halifax. officers uniforms, 11 at $25; blue jumpers and trousers, 30 at $7.50; white jumpers and trousers, 30 at $3; flannel shirts, 30 at $1.50; blue collars, 30 at 40 cents; case 50 cents, making a total of $647.50.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that by tender?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, not by tender. They divided the orders up among their political supporters. Then from M. R. Lane, Halifax they purchased officers caps, 11 at $1.50 and sailors' caps, 30 at $1.30, making $55.50. At page P—9 they purchased from W. & C. Silver, Halifax, overcoats, 5 at $28; reefers, 34 at $8.25; white coats, 1½ dozen at $12, and furlined coats, 2 at $50 making $538.50 or a total expenditure for uniforms, for officers and men on this steamer of $1,241.50.

For the steamer 'Champlain,' at page P—10, it will be seen that they paid, on account of uniforms, $595 and for the 'Druid,' page P—12, $536.20. For the 'Lady Laurier' page P—14, they bought of Thomas Brenton, Halifax, officers uniforms, 12 at $25; sailors blue suits, 31 at $7.50; white suits.

31 at $3; flannel shirts, 31 at $1.50; collars, 31 at 40 cents; case 50 cents, making $684.90. At page P—16 it will be seen that they went to W. & C. Silver, Halifax, and bought captain's uniform, $25; furlined coats, 2 at $50; overcoats, 3 at $28; reefers, 4 at $8.25, white coats, 1½ dozen at $12; making $557, or a total of $1,241.90 for the 'Lady Laurier.' Then, for the 'Lansdowne,' page P—17, there was an expenditure of $413.75, for the 'Minto,' page P—17, an expenditure of $138.50 and another of $140, and at page P—18 there was an expenditure of $125 and another one of $112.50. At page P—19 there is an expenditure of $322 and at page P—20 an expenditure of $142, making a total of $980. These expenditures were all divided up amongst certain political supporters some of whom furnished two suits, some three and some half a dozen. Then, we have the 'Montcalm' at page P—21. They bought uniforms, 10 at $25, 10 at $21; overcoat, $30; white coats, 12 at $1.50; blue trousers, 38 at $2.90: blue jumpers, 39 at $2.50; white duck suits, 39 at $2.50; white dickeys, 39 at $1. The idea of going and paying a dollar apiece for dickeys for the sailors! Thirty-nine dollars of the people's money thrown away for white dickeys for the sailors on this steamer 'Montcalm!'

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the ice-breaker?

Mr. TAYLOR. The ice-breaker. These sailors on the ice-breaker had to have white dickeys at a dollar apiece! We have the minister talking economy in the running of his department while allowing his officers to go and pay $39 for thirty-nine dickeys for the sailors on the 'Montcalm.' These purchases amount to a total of $1,131.35.

Mr. FOSTER. All for dickeys?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, for suits for the men, dickeys included. At page P—24 we find that they spent for uniforms on account of the 'Quadra' $342. At page P—26 on account of the 'Stanley' there is one item of $90, another of $145, another of $117.50, on page P—27 another of $117.75 and another of $141.30, making a total of $611.55. These expenditures are made on account of the Dominion steamers, a list of which I have read. But, they bought more than that. We have also the 'Lady Grey.' They supplied the officers on the 'Lady Grey' with uniforms, as shown at page P—28, to the amount of $885.95 and on the 'Arctic,' page P—25, they spent $86 only for uniforms this year, but dear knows they spent enough the year before. Here is another boat—the 'Maisonneuve'—shown at page P—51. The 'Maisonneuve' is the boat that lies down here in the river at Ottawa and which takes the minister down the river once or twice a year. One hundred and thirty-one dollars was spent for uniforms for the men who take the 'Maisonneuve' out once or twice in the year.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. At page P—51.

Duhamel, J. C., Montreal, uniforms, officers 3 at $22; sailors', 2 at $10; overcoats, 3 at $12; caps, officers', 3 at $2; sailors', 2 at $1; freight, $1.70, $131.70.

Mr. FOSTER. You left out the castor oil.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am only dealing with uniforms now.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. A dickey is not a uniform.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not, but I wonder at my hon. friend sitting there and laughing at the extravagant way this government are throwing the people's money out to their political supporters for something that the country has never demanded before.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I was only laughing at your calling a dickey a uniform.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is under that heading in the Auditor General's Report, uniforms for officers and men, 39 dickeys at $1 a piece for the men. At page P—60, maintenance of lights, we have uniforms $240.25 and at page P—74, maintenance of lights, P.E.I., $122.30. At page P—75 for the same service we have uniforms, $145.75. The Conservative governments maintained lights, but we did not buy uniforms for the lighthouse keepers or for the crew of the boat that supplied the lighthouses. At page P—98 we find $82.25 charged in the general accounts. On the hydrographic survey, P—108, $145.20 was paid for uniforms. At page P—111, $236.15. At page P—120 the ship channel is charged with $745 for this purpose, making a total for the year of $13,178 against $505 spent in our time for this purpose, an increase of $12,673. No wonder the expenditure has swollen as it has.

I promised my hon. friend that I would give him in detail the travelling expenses for 1896 as compared with those for 1906 for the minister and officers of the Marine Department. The travelling expenses for the nine months of last year in connection with the minister, his officers and staff in performing the work of the Marine Department, amounted to $45,998.11. Adding the percentage to make the 12 months we find that this comes to $61,330.81. We did the same work in 1895-6 for all the services except the ship channel for $9,769.53, including travelling expenses of the Hon. John Costigan, Mr. William Smith, the deputy and all the officials of the Marine Department. I have the items and pages for every expenditure in each case. There is in this item an increase of $51,661 over 1895-6.

I have given the increase on the nine Dominion steamers; it has cost this government practically half a million dollars more

to maintain the same number of ships. I have taken the 'Lady Laurier' and the 'Aberdeen,' two of our government steamers carrying no passengers. In the nine months the 'Aberdeen' purchased in groceries, simply to feed the men, goods to the value of $9,851. I do not know whether these boats run for the nine months continuously from June 30 to March 31, but I am assuming that they did and that they had a full staff there all the time. That then amounts to over $25 a man for the food of the 40 men on this vessel. I am sure there is not a man on the other side of the House who will say that he could not feed 40 men on a steamer, supplying them with a cook, steward and good service, for $2.50 a week, or $10 a month. Here is $15 a month of a rake-off on each man.

Mr. GALLIHER. What would you feed them on?

Mr. TAYLOR. With the very best provisions. There is not a steamer on the ocean that does not feed its men at $10 or at the outside $12 a month.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend has no experience.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I may say that I have had more experience than my hon. friend in that line, and I say without hesitation that no man can do what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend can make his speech afterwards. When I come to speak of the prices paid it is no wonder the expense is so heavy. The 'Lady Laurier' for the nine months cost for provisions to feed the men $9,315, an average of over $25 a month per man. No wonder our expenditure is running into the hundreds of millions when the administration is carried on this way.

At page P—7 you will find that the 'Aberdeen' bought 10 bushels of potatoes at $1.20 a bushel. At page P—9 the 'Aberdeen bought pots, pans and kettles for the galley costing $116.70; two barrels of apples at $7 a barrel, and they paid for sundry articles, kitchen utensils, $78.80, making $200 for kitchen utensils. To make it easy for the men they got eight cases of Radnor water at $8.35, as will be seen on P—9. To fit out the 'Lady Laurier' and make her comfortable for the sailors they went to a friend in Quebec and got four mahogany cabinet lavatories with desk attachments and tanks complete at $132 a piece, $528 (P—15). There were nine cases of Radnor water there again, and 14 pairs of chickens at $1.40 a pair. We must let some of our country friends know what the government are paying for chickens to feed the sailors. They bought a bag of flour, 50 pounds of brown flour, at 10 cents a pound, $5. To make it comfortable for the men and the officers, five large Morris chairs were bought at $18 each, $90. They also purchased 8 gallons of English body varnish at $7 a gallon, $56 (P—25). Any one knows that the best body varnish that can be obtained in this country can be laid down for about $3.65. We use any quantity of it every year in our business. I have here a price list from one of the largest varnish and japan manufacturers in England, William Schmidt, varnishes for coach builders and decorators, and their finest body varnish is sold at 12s. 6d. and in casks of 50 gallons 1s. per gallon off that price. That makes 11s. 6d. for their best varnish. Adding 12 cents a gallon freight and 50 cents duty we have it laid down here at $3.65. Yet this government pays a friend $7 a gallon for varnish.

To fit out the 'Lady Grey' nicely so that the crew would be perfectly comfortable they got brass cuspidors, two at $3.50, and two at $4; silver coffee pot, $9.40; coffee server, $8.50; entree dishes, two at $10 each, $20; a jardiniere at $8.50; a muffin dish at $9.10, a silver teapot at $8.20, a silver tray to serve the tea at $7.80, a syrup jug at $8, bread trays, three at $2.50, one at $5, two at $6.50, making $25.50; dinner plates, two dozen at $6; tea plates, two dozen at $5; soup plates, two dozen at $5. And so it goes on—sundry cutlery, $150.95; sundry dishes, $117.45. Then to make it handy for the cook to chop up the meat——

Mr. FOSTER. To make hash.

Mr. TAYLOR. They bought the end of a saw-log to use for a butcher's block and paid $18 for it.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of wood—mahogany ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know what kind, but you will find it in the Anditor General's Report at page P—29. Is there a man in this House who would pay $18 for a butcher's block ? Yet that is what this economical minister done, and his officers will certify the account. Charged to the same account, at page P—37, you will find a payment of $150 to the Toronto 'Daily Star' for a publication in the summer resort directory. They wanted to give the Toronto 'Star' something, and they had this charged to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Then, the department undertook to enrich some of the ministers and their friends by changing the system of lights from coal oil to acetylene gas. The minister came down here and promised this House and the country that that would enable him to dispense with the services of many lighthouse keepers, and the saving of their salaries would pay the increased cost ; yet, after having spent between six and eight million dollars, which had been paid to these firms of Brooks, Merwin, Willson and the Fog Signal Company, which was organized by a few friends of the government, we find by the Auditor

General's Report, from page P—39 to page P—46, that the salaries of lighthouse keepers for the nine months of last year amounted to $197,235, and for the year to $262,980. The lighthouse keepers were kept on ; the same list is there that was there before. In 1896 the salaries of lighthouse keepers amounted to $199,348.61, and last year, instead of a decrease, they amounted to $63,632 more than in 1896. I want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get up and justify the promise of a reduction in this expenditure which he made in this House. The only lighthouse keepers he dismissed were three or four in the Thousand Islands. After making these changes so that the department might purchase acetylene gas for the lights and buoys, the minister made the statement that a late Minister of Public Works was a member of the firm that was furnishing acetylene gas to the government.

Mr. BENNETT. Everybody knew that.

Mr. TAYLOR. This thing was done for the purpose of getting these gas buoys and authorizing these new lights. The minister's engineer, Col. Anderson, never recommended the change, but the minister got a clerk in the office appointed as a Commissioner of Lights, and he recommended it. There is a report in his department from his officers, if he will produce it, condemning the acetylene gas buoys and opposing the change. But the government ran the country into millions of dollars of debt to make this change for the benefit of their friends, and after the change was made there was an increase in the expenditure for salaries of lighthouse keepers of $63,000 over the expenditure of 1896. Then, see how the expenditure for the maintenance of lights has grown. At pages P—47 to P—77 of the Auditor General's Report you will find that the expenditure for the nine months amounted to $499,512.72 ; for the year it will amount to $666,016.96. In 1896 the cost of the maintenance of lights was $225,691, showing an increase of $430,325.89, nearly half a million since 1896, and we had as few wrecks on the waters then as we are having now. It is easy to account for the millions of money which this government is squandering. To make things easy for one of their former ministers who is now Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia, this government went to Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière, as is shown at page P—60, and bought cedar spars, 5,026 feet at 19 cents, from him to make buoys for $954.94—nearly a thousand dollars for a few feet of cedar timber. Then they decided to construct a lighthouse at Seven Islands, and at page P—91 you will find that a gentleman who boarded some of the men and who purchased some supplies was paid 10 per cent commission, amounting to $20.71, for the supplies he purchased at high prices. Among the items purchased were two dozen of Bovril at $9 ; 120 pounds of red beans at 7 cents a pound, or $4.20 per bushel. Fearing that these beans would cause a pain in the stomachs of these gentlemen who were working at this lighthouse, they bought 2 dozen of painkiller at $3 and charged it to the construction and maintenance of lights. They then go to the depot at Prescott which is costing the country millions of money to keep a little army of men there to try to convert the county of Grenville from a Tory constituency to a Grit constituency. I read last night the address which these men sent to the minister and the compliments they paid to him for what the President of the Liberal Club had been doing there, when they presented him with a gold-headed cane. They presented him with a gold-headed cane, these poor officers, and to make it easy to sit down on a bench out there, the minister went to one of his supporters and got a cushion 25 inches by 84 inches made of leather and stuffed with hair for which they paid $42.

An hon. MEMBER. How much is it worth ?

Mr. TAYLOR. $18 or $20.

An hon. MEMBER. What kind of leather ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's Report does not say, but the very best leather, such as you put in buggy cushions. A cushion of that size would not cost more than $18 or $20.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the hair ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but when the people begin to think, when they feel the pinch of hard times, and see how their money is thrown away, hon. gentlemen opposite will laugh on the other side. On page 111, Hydrographic Survey, W. J. Stewart is down for a lot of travelling expenses and a suit case besides which cost $11. We not only clothe our officers but we buy suit cases for them to carry their clothes in. Then we come to the St. Lawrence ship channel, page P—120, and there we find R. Charlebois, Montreal, is paid for officers and sailor's suits and caps and collars, &c., $745.80. I wonder how many yards of dirt that would take out of the ship channel between Quebec and Montreal. $745.80 for clothes for the men working on that job. On page 121, I find charge for two cases of Radnor water at $9. Surely there is water enough in the ship channel without purchasing two cases of Radnor. These surely did not deepen the channel to any extent. On page P—122, I find a charge for a decorated soup tureen, $20. I do not believe that there is a member in this House has a $20 soup tureen decorated, of crockery or china, on his table. Yet for these men working in the ship channel, this economical minister goes to I. L. Lafleur and buys a $20 de-

corated soup tureen. They got two tea kettles at $8.64 each. They would not put down a charge of $8.50 or $8.65 but made it $8.64 so as to show how closely they had bargained. Is there a gentleman in this House who has a tea kettle which cost him $8.50, for boiling his hot water.

An hon. MEMBER. A copper tea kettle.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can get the best of copper tea kettles at $2.50 or $3 each. Why should they want these expensive tea kettles down there for deepening the ship channel? There are two brass beds at $25.50 each, which is not out of the way if they are good quality. Six white coats at $6.50 each. Those are, I presume, for the cooks on board these dredges and barges. On page P—124, there is a charge for three seamless cuspidores at $3.55 each, one tea kettle, $7.11. It would not do to charge $7.10; but in order to mislead the people by making a great pretense of economy and of cutting down prices to the smallest item, they make a charge of $7.11. Two tea pots with steel handles, $9.68. These were no doubt to deepen the ship channel. Two water pitchers at $5.92 each. They would not make them $5.90, but were careful to put in the two cents to show how closely they bargained. Then for these sailors on these dredges and barges deepening the channel, they purchased from the James Robertson Company, Limited, Montreal, Twyford cabinet folding lavatories complete, nine at $55, making $315 of the people's money thrown away. Also two white enamelled baths, one at $23.50 and one at $19.60—to deepen the ship channel. Then I find an item for fire extinguishers, and I think I read something in the report about some one having a rake-off on fire extinguishers. These are for the government steamers on the St. Lawrence as well as in the ship channel. I find under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, page P—19, P—23, P—36, P—57, P—100 and P—102, that $729 was paid P. Perrault, Quebec, for fire extinguishers.

Mr. FOSTER. Were those Lemieux's extinguishers ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I fancy they were the same thing. $729 of the people's money thrown away for something that was worth nothing. You might as well have a bottle of vinegar hung up in your closet as one of these fire extinguishers. On page 50 there are some remarkable lighthouse supplies charged. There is an expenditure charged there of $8,755 for these supplies. On page P—57 there is a charge for the same thing of $1,744, on page 68 a similar expenditure of $2,897, and on every page you find expenditures for the same purpose of smaller amounts. Then we come to the fellows who are getting a rake-off. On P—95 I find an expenditure with F. L. Brooks and Company, of Montreal, amounting to $56,679.50. I thought that after the investigation into the transactions of these men in the Public Accounts Committee last session, the government would have done with them. It was proved in that committee, both in the accounts of Merwin and Brooks, that somebody was getting a rake-off, through middle men who purchased for the government, The country lost thousands of dollars by this. We paid Brooks and Company $56,679.

Mr. FOSTER. Any tender?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. On page P—98, George T. Merwin got $50,641.50. Then we had a company organized here. I do not know who was in that company, I do not know whether any of the ministers was in it or not, but I am credibly informed that there is an ex-minister in it. I am referring to the International Marine Signal Co., Ltd., which was formerly Thomas L. Willson. This company was paid $238,-162 for automatic gas and bell buoys. Formerly, it was Thomas L. Willson; now it is a company organized here in Ottawa, and I am credibly informed that the ex-Minister of the Interior is a member of that firm. Altogether they purchased lighthouse supplies last year to the amount of $476,018, and a great share of the amount is purchased from Brooks and Merwin and this new Ottawa Company, formerly Willson.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does Strubbe come in?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not bother with Strubbe. His account is not very heavy this year. I want the minister to expain in detail why these enormous increases have taken place in every branch of his department. Why has he furnished the sailors on these Dominion steamers clothing to the extent of $12,673 last year, when the clothing was furnished at $505 when we were in power? Why has an expenditure of $51,616 been incurred for travelling expenses by the minister and his officials, when that account in 1896 amounted to only $9,769? Why did nine Dominion steamers cost $610,000 last year, while the same number of steamers—not the same steamers, but the same number—cost only $150,519 in 1896?—an increase of $459,560. Then I want him to explain why it costs $25 per month per man to feed the sailors on the 'Lady Laurier' and the 'Aberdeen'? And how does the minister justify himself, as an economic minister, in allowing his officers to make such expenditures as I have read—$8 for a butcher's block, $122 for a lavatory, and all these other expenditures for table cutlery and supplies? I have given the minister the page for every item, and I hope that when the committee resumes after six o'clock, he will give us the explanation.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—Mr. M. S. Schell.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Alberta Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. R. STEWART (Ottawa) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 47) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like some explanation of the nature of this Bill, if the promoter will kindly give it.

Mr. STEWART. The only explanation I have is that the Bill is to provide for an extension of time, and this is made necessary by the fact that no decision has been given by the department that had the matter in hand of examining the papers that were filed with the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. TAYLOR.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to government steamers and ice-breakers, $535,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the statement I made before the House rose at six o'clock, I referred to the acts of the predecessors of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). Of course, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) said, he has to assume responsibility for what was done by his predecessors. But, aside from that, we have a Prime Minister who is responsible, and will be held responsible by the country, for the manner in which the public business has been conducted by the predecessors of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That hon. gentleman fell into the tracks made by a very extravagant minister. He may have tried to curtail expenditure, and even succeeded in some instances. But, in some cases he has even exceeded his predecessor. I stated this afternoon that the minister had promised us that the change in the methods of the lighthouse service would result in a saving to the country. If he will refer to 'Hansard' of 1904, page 5325, he will find the following:—

Mr. BLAIN. The minister stated that when this new system was introduced there would be a great saving in maintenance of the lights. He said there would be a saving of $10,500 a year. Does he expect that saving to take place in the near future?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I stated that the saving for the present would be $1,610 a year.

Mr. BLAIN. I will read what the hon. gentleman said last year when he was giving to the Commons the reasons for changing the old system of lighting to the new system:—

The ten new ranges of gaslights will require no keepers, saving an annual charge of $3,000, and the proposed conversion of the lights from an oil to a gas basis will enable the keepers to be dispensed with as opportunity offers at a saving of $7,000 per year, or a total saving in cost of maintenance of $10,500 per year.

I stated also that the hon. minister gave comparisons, and if hon. members will turn to page 5301 of the same 'Hansard'—1904—they will find that statement:—

The following is a comparative statement of the cost of the lights under the old arrangement and the new:—

Under old system—	
Maintenance 6 lights at $40 each..	$ 240
Keepers' salaries..	1,280
Under present system—	
Maintenance 6 lights at $60 each..	$ 360
Salary of caretaker, Manly Cross..	550
Total..	$ 910
Saving in cost per annum..	610

The carbide purchased for these lights is purchased from the Ottawa Carbide Company

at the wholesale price of $65 per ton. This is the price paid by the wholesale dealers in carbide, including the Canadian Pacific Railway, which uses a very much larger quantity than the government.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the minister include in that comparative statement the cost of the steamer 'Scout,' that is scouting around the lakes with a large crew on board?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The steamer would have to be maintained all the same to look after the buoy service.

Mr. TAYLOR. The lights were there for many years and we had no steamer to look after them; nor did we have to maintain a factory and employ about 100 men up there at Prescott in connection with this carbide which is made here at Ottawa by a company in which some of the cabinet ministers are stockholders.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Well, what if they are?

Thereby proving that there were ministers who were partners in the carbide factory which was started here to manufacture carbide, and this factory was brought here purely for the purpose of buying the product of this carbide company of which ministers of the Crown were stockholders. There is the minister's own word for it, and I have given you the page in the 'Hansard' where it will be found. I also made another statement that we had spent already in changing this system about $6,000,000, but I was away below the mark because I put a question to the minister on the 3rd December, 1906, and it will be found at page 471 of 'Hansard.' It is as follows:—

1. What was the total expenditure in connection with the lighthouse and coast service for the years ending June 30, in each year, for 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896, and what was the amount expended in each year separately?

2. What was the amount expended for the same service for the years ending June 30, for 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906, and what was the amount expended in each year separately?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. 1891-2	$ 503,639 12
1892-3	503,011 66
1893-4	476,635 07
1894-5	475,903 72
1895-6	466,057 55
	$2,425,247 12

Now we come to the five years under the regime of this economical government. In 1901-2 it had jumped from $466,057.55 to $696,311.02. There had been no change brought about with reference to the new lights then but the cost had increased by over $200,000. In 1902-3 the cost was $964,143.74. It had just doubled that of the last year of the late government. In 1903-4 it was $1,275,016.87; in 1904-5 $2,507,307.03, and in 1905-6 $2,688,484.52, making a total of $8,131,263.18. For five years our expenditure was $2,425,247.12, and this statement means that there has been an increase of about $6,000,000 in the five years following. Two years have elapsed since then, and if we had the same proportion it would mean that $10,000,000 of the people's money has been over-expended for making this change in the lighthouse system. There are the minister's own figures and he cannot contradict them. I stated before six that I was pleased to see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) enter the House. I asked him to be back, but I am sorry he is not present now. I see he is going out on the hustings in Stanstead in a few days and I want to ask that hon. gentleman to get on the platform and contradict any statement I have made in reference to the expenditure of this government to-day if he can do so. I am quite sure he will do it because he is prepared to uphold this government in anything that it does as I will prove before I sit down. But, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was present, and if there is a gentleman in the House for whom I have a particular respect it is the hon. Minister of Customs. He is my senior as to age by a few months and he is my senior as a member of this House by a few years. Therefore, it is on this account, not because he is a member of the government and is helping in the mal-administration of the affairs of the country, that I have a respect for him. I believe him to be a fairly honest man—outside of the influence of this government a perfectly honest man—but I will assure the House and the country that the minister who is leaving, I understand, to take part in the election in Huron will not get up and justify this expenditure by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He will not justify it because he has a conscience. He can call to recollection what took place in this House previous to 1892. He can remember one occasion when we sat here until two o'clock in the morning, when he and Sir William Mulock, the hon. Senator McMullen and a few others held this House until two o'clock discussing one item. What was it? to pay for the pay car 'Jamaica'—they called here at that time—which was used by the premier of this country when he went on a trip—an old dilapidated car—nothing like the luxurious cars that these gentlemen are riding about in to-day. I saw in the papers this morning that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), the ambassador to Japan, passed through Winnipeg in his private car, but because we had an old dilapidated car handed over by the railway companies for the use of the premier of this country, and because he made his trips in it, we were held until two o'clock in the morning by these gentlemen. The offence which he had committed was riding in a private car and incurring a small expenditure for cab hire.

The poor old man had spent a few dollars, as the young Minister of Marine and Fisheries does to-day, for cab hire. The Minister of Customs walks. I looked through the Auditor General's Report and I did not find anything charged up by him for travelling expenses or for cab hire.

Mr. BENNETT. But he rides in a private car.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well he may. If some of the other ministers went he might go with them in a private car, but he would not take one on his own account. If after he became a minister he had entered a private car he would have asked himself: Why did I charge Sir John Macdonald with doing something improper in going around in a private car? He has walked ever since because he charged that grand old man with being guilty of an impropriety in travelling in a private car or in expending a small amount of money for cab hire. They kept that poor old man sitting here until two o'clock in the morning at which time he got up and gave them this answer: I am too old to walk, I am too poor to hire a horse and, therefore, as long as I am Prime Minister of this country, I will have to charge my cab hire up to the country. That was his answer, but it did not satisfy the then opposition of this House. To-day the Minister of Customs cannot put an account in the Auditor General's Report for cab hire after having been a party to accusing our late lamented premier with having done something wrong in having used a cab. Look through the accounts to-day and see the charges for cab hire. Every minister except the Minister of Customs appears as having incurred expenditure for cab hire. The Minister of Finance does not figure very largely.

Mr. FIELDING. He is too young.

Mr. TAYLOR. And Sir John Macdonald, when he made that statement, told the truth. He was too poor to buy a horse and when he died his estate proved it. All that he left was simply a little fund collected for him by his friends a few years before his death, and put in such shape that it would be available at his death. He did not have the millions that some of the ministers and ex-ministers have acquired since they came into power. He died poor and the other members of his government either died poor or if still living are not in affluent circumstances. Look at the estates which ministers and ex-ministers have rolled up into the millions. They came in poor men and they are walking around to-day with their millions. How was the money made? These parties were not satisfied then with attacking Sir John on his expenditure, but they made the country ring from one end to the other because some of the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway had made Lady Macdonald a present. Let me read from the 'Globe' of July 10, 1886. This was the mouth-organ of the then opposition—the Liberal party.

It has been rumoured for weeks that the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway presented to Lady Macdonald a diamond necklace and other ornaments of great value. The lowest price stated was £5,000 sterling or $25,000; some put the price as high as $50,000. It was also rumoured that the same gentlemen made a valuable settlement on Sir John Macdonald's daughter. In more than one instance it was stated that this was $250,000 in bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We said nothing of these rumours until they had become so general——

They had been talked over all the platforms in the country by these gentlemen——

—that it became a duty to make such a statement as would enable Sir John Macdonald to contradict them if they were not true or should they prove true would enable the public to understand more fully the character of the premier and the nature of the great transaction in which he has been engaged for some years. Sir John Macdonald's friends have frequently asserted that he has never abused his position to put money in his own purse,——

That was proved when he died; he died a poor man.

—that he disregards pecuniary advantages and that when he helps his supporters to defraud or plunder the public, he never takes any share of the booty for himself. He and his supporters may be a band of Corsairs, but he is, they say, a most generous and unselfish chief.

That is what the 'Globe' said of Sir John Macdonald and it was reiterated on every platform throughout the country and in this House as well. Sir Richard Cartright speaking in 1891 said——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman think that these remarks have any bearing on this item?

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly do. I am showing the extravagance of this government and contrasting it with the expenditure of the late government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman was coming back to the item.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am showing why this item should be reduced 50 per cent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item covers maintenance and repairs of government ice-breakers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Quite so. The hon. member for North Toronto was perhaps not wrong when in speaking of that $2,000, which was put down in the wrong account, he said he thought it ought to be put just where it is, for ice-breaking, because on that trip of the minister to England and

France, he required to break a good deal of ice at night and a good deal more to put on his head in the morning to keep it cool. Sir Richard Cartwright quoting and approving from Mr. Blake, said:

Another case was the gift several years ago to the present First Minister by means of a settlement upon his family of the sum of about $80,000, which was subscribed for and presented to him or to his family while he was First Minister of Canada.

That is the fund his Conservative friends made up for him.

It was so subscribed and presented largely by actual and intending contractors, whose business it was to obtain favourable contracts from the government, and having obtained them, to get the largest prices for the least returns, and the most liberal allowances for extras that they could manage. It was subscribed largely also by public corporations, greatly indebted to the treasury, and dependent upon the executive for favourable settlement of their indebtedness, and favourable adjustments of their financial relations.

That statement was made by a then leading member of the opposition, now a member of this government, and I want him to apply the words there used—because that present was made by Lord Strathcona, Sir William Van Horne and Mr. Stephens—I want the minister to apply that to the Prime Minister of to-day who is responsible for the extravagant expenditure of money in each and every department of this government. Let him apply that statement that he made when in opposition, with the Premier of to-day sitting alongside of him. Lord Strathcona is one of the largest stockholders in the Hill system of railways. He is one of the largest stockholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway and besides that he is an employee of this government. And what did he do? He sent over an automobile costing thousands of dollars to the present Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. What will Sir Richard say to that?

Mr. BENNETT. He will say, give me one too.

Mr. TAYLOR. If there is one man in the country who is ready to justify any and every act of this government, no matter how glaring and how bad it may be, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is prepared to do it. This country is satisfied that one of the biggest frauds ever perpetrated in this country was the expenditure in reference to the steamer 'Arctic.' We have expenditures for the 'Arctic' in the item under discussion. I read a speech made by the Minister of Agriculture a few days ago. He was endeavouring to rally the Reformers and make them believe that this was money well expended, because he knew that the statements made from this side of the House with reference to that great extravagance were having their effect in the country and he said:

Why should any Reformer be ashamed of anything in connection with that incident? We find that in the year 1904-5, the year in which great complaint was made as to the expenditures for the supplies for that steamer, $112,-050 had been expended, but I point out that in the year 1905-6 the expenditure for the supplies for that steamer was only $12,813 and in the year 1906-7 the expenses were only $11,588. And those of us who are as well informed as we ought to be, know of the splendid work the 'Arctic' and her officers have done for Canada since that investigation took place. We know that the 'Arctic' has gone to the northern seas, has taken possession for Britain and for Canada of islands that might otherwise have remained disputed territory; we know that the Union Jack was planted on islands over which it never waved before; we know that the Hudson bay has been marked without any uncertainty as a closed Canadian sea—a matter which will probably prevent very great friction between this country and the United States, and has secured for us undisputed rights in territory that will be of very great value.

Thus the Minister of Agriculture justified that expenditure. Has a Liberal paper in this country attempted to justify it? Let me read a statement made by one of them —and if there ever was a damning statement these statements by this organ in reference to that expenditure are damning statements. This is an editorial published in September, 1907:

Captain Bernier is back from the Arctic regions. He brings with him a cold in the head and a large number of interviews for the reporters. The real treasures he leaves behind in the frozen seas, properly ticketed so that there will be no mistakes about ownership.

For many years now Captain Bernier has cherished the desire of finding the north pole, but the north pole is obdurate, although the world agrees that if ever the pole were going to reveal itself it would be to the indomitable courage of Captain Bernier. Such was the perseverance of this noble man in high endeavour that, until his efforts were placed on a government footing, hardly a year passed that he did not take up a collection. Undaunted was he by wreck and hunger and darkness and horrid cold. He could not pick up a newspaper without reading disaster, but he looked these terrors gaily in the face, and, humming a merry song the while, passed the hat with undismayed zeal. This went on for years, and every year Captain Bernier brought out a new scheme for reaching the pole, enduring the hardships of the dreadful voyage in the most jocund spirit. Presently his explorations brought him to the House of Commons at Ottawa, and there the captain made a great hit as a vote discoverer. It was a sight for sore eyes to see the brave navigator seated in No. 16, his pipe in his hand, and a thrilling sea tale on his lips. To behold him there, surrounded by the dangers he was prepared to encounter—the Arctic silence, broken only by the seals gargling the long Arctic night, so long that a poker game once started has to last six months, the northern lights

with their fierce blinding glare untempered by lamp shades—to behold him thus, girdled with perils, was, we repeat, a heroic spectacle. No. 16 melted to this bold spirit. The captain sailed clean through the ice of reserve which besets most governments and secured an appropriation. With the appropriation was bought and stocked the 'Arctic.' The 'Arctic' was brought across the Atlantic under her own steam, the captain handling her as if to the binnacle born, ably assisted by a crew of French journalists. The voyage was a great success. There were four meals a day, and the main brace was spliced every hour. It was felt that the captain had established his right to take his ship anywhere that a man may go on pemmican, paté-de-foie-gras, truffles, and certain other bare necessaries of life. The pole has not yielded to the captain. It still keeps its secret just as the end of the rainbow still hides its pot of gold.

The captain has not been able to put into effect his ingenious plan of sailing three hundred and fifty miles northwest of the pole, and then drifting back to it. He has never realized his dream of climbing the blamed thing, striking a fine attitude and waving a Union Jack from the top of the world. He has done none of these things, but the Arctic is, nevertheless the wonder of the northern seas. Captain Bernier may not have found the pole, but he can find an island with his eyes shut. Let it disguise itself how it will with wrappings of ice, there is no fooling Captain Bernier. He just scrapes the rind off with his knife, and there's the island underneath, and, sooner than you can say Jack Robinson, swifter than second base can put it on the runner, quicker even than Toronto University can tack an LL.D. on a distinguished visitor, Captain Bernier has the island down on the chart, latitude and longitude noted, and the British flag flying from the highest iceberg on that part of the map. Captain Bernier is the greatest island namer and claimer in the business. With its terrific speed—four knots an hour under forced draught—the 'Arctic' can overhaul any island that was ever made. When the 'Arctic' is seen in the offing, bearing down on an island, the island feels at once that it cannot get away from such a relentless pursuer as Captain Bernier, to say nothing of the fact that islands in those waters are generally weighted down with ice, which interferes even more than barnacles to prevent them showing an enemy a clean pair of heels.

Now, I ask my hon. friends who are prepared to justify that expenditure, as the Minister of Agriculture did, what they think of that article from the leading Grit organ of this country, the Toronto 'Star.' That is the only justification the 'Star' can find for the grossly extravagant expenditure on the 'Arctic'; and yet the Minister of Agriculture defends it. He is prepared to get up and defend anything, no matter how bad. I am sorry that the Minister of Customs was not in the House a little while ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We told him you threw him bouquets.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not throw him boquets; I never do. I said he had a conscience, and therefore when he went to South Huron he would not get up and justify the gross mismanagement and extravagant expenditure of this government. This government are the trustees of the people of this country. What company in this country would retain a president and board of directors who squandered their money as this government is squandering the money of the people of this country? I said that the Minister of Customs had kept this House sitting until two o'clock in the morning while he attacked Sir John Macdonald's expenditure for cab hire, and he has walked ever since because he has a conscience, and I said he would not go into South Huron and justify the squandering of the people's money by this government. But the Minister of Customs is overridden, or he likes office too well to get up and kick, though I think that some credit may be due to him for keeping down some extravagances. When the people find that these gentlemen to whom they have entrusted their money have squandered it as they have been doing, and have more than doubled the expenditure since 1896, when the affairs of this country were managed honestly by the late Conservative government, they will dismiss them from office.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Before the minister makes his reply, which I have no doubt he will, to the observations of my hon. friend from Leeds, I want to call attention to one or two subjects on which the hon. gentleman spoke. In the course of his remarks I think he did injustice to some very honourable tradesmen. Among a great variety of charges he referred to some bills that had been rendered to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for supplies of clothing and other articles at Halifax. I am somewhat familiar with what is done in that locality——

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I made no charge of extravagant prices for clothing. What I did complain of was the quantity of clothing bought by this government as compared with what had been bought previously.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. No doubt my hon. friend is familiar with the outfitting of ships, and I dare say he knows the construction of a ship from the taffrail blocks up to the catharpings. But I would remind my hon. friend that since he has been at sea—and I think he has been a good deal at sea this afternoon—great changes have taken place. In his days the crew could be fed on salt horse, hard tack and three water grog, and if they did not like that they would get the cat-o'-nine-tails for insubordination. But all that has been superseded. Now the scale of victualling is prescribed by the Board of Trade of England, and all ships must conform to that scale. If any ship

does not, the crew can have the captain or owners arrested and fined. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the cost of meats and other supplies used by crews has very much risen.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about beans at seven cents a pound ?

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I do not know about that, but I know that the cost of supplies generally has greatly increased. My hon. friend, with his experience on raging canals and rivers must know that there is a certain scale recognized by ship owners as fit and proper for the victualling of vessels. Now, in the tramp steamers on the Atlantic, which are the lowest class of vessels, and are frequently found by the captain, the regular scale allowed by the owners to the captain for large crews is 60 cents per day per man, and they allow from $1.25 to $1.50 per day for vitualling the captain and officers. If the hon. gentleman would apply that scale to the government ships he would find that the charge actually made is not extravagant. It must be remembered also that a government ship cannot be run as cheaply as a merchant ship. A man aboard a government ship wishes to correspond, as much as possible, with one in the British navy. The government ships are supposed to be better found, the officers better paid, and all the details on a more costly and more efficient scale than in the ordinary merchant ship. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) wished to be fair, but I think that in making the comparison between the cost of ships under the old regime—presumably under the control of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) —he should have allowed for necessary differences and should not merely have compared figures, and at once suggested the conclusion that there must now be extravagance or misappropriation. If a comparison is to be made, it ought to be under similar conditions, with a similar quality of ships and an equal scale of charges. It ought to be on the basis of the same cost for provisions, and of all similar details. Probably my hon. friend knows the ships on the lakes, but I do not think he knows the ships on the coast of the maritime provinces. Under the regime of my hon. friend from North Toronto, there was the old 'Lady Head,' a very small steamer, with old type of engines and a small crew. The best steamer they had was the old 'Newfield.' I believe she had been an old cargo boat, purchased in Sunderland or Newcastle, with engines of about 90 horse-power, and a small crew, very narrowly fitted up, and with everything on a small scale. Now, the government has modern double-screw ships, with modern, compound engines and requiring a large staff of engineers, and capable of going at a great rate of speed. One of the vessels, the 'Canada,' is a man of war, with a crew of 80—probably a larger number than the Marine and Fisheries Department had in all the government vessels under the old regime. She has to be fitted up like a man of war, her crew has to present a uniform appearance and have everything in first-class style. The 'Canada' has to compare with ships of the Royal Navy. She went to the West Indies, and, of course, as being the sole representative of the navy of the government of Canada, she was subject to minute inspection. Everything had to be new and in good style, otherwise it would have been discreditable to Canada. Now, can my hon. friend compare the ships of this class—modern, costly, highly efficient ships, able to do, and actually doing, a great amount of duty day and night on the coast of the maritime provinces—with vessels of the old type ? And could he expect these vessels to go to sea insufficiently provided where so much may result from any temporary lack of what is necessary for efficient service ? And can he make a fair comparison between ships of this kind and ships of the old regime ? He has made that comparison this afternoon, and it is upon this scale of figuring that all his charges of extravagance and his covert insinuations of misappropriation of funds are based. But where are the elements of fair comparison ? I would like my hon. friend to be specific. I do not think it is fair to those whose names have been mentioned to make general statements or general comparisons. Now, on the subject of clothing, for the seamen—would he like the seamen to go to sea without clothing ? Or would he like them to furnish their own clothing ? Or should not the government keep in mind its own reputation as that of a government of a growing nation and send its ships to sea properly fitted out so that the seamen may be given every opportunity to perform in the best possible manner the arduous duties expected of them ? I must say that one of the firms that supply this clothing is that of W. and C. Silver, of Halifax. This was an old and respectable firm when I was a boy, and it is a large and extensive house to-day. These men are merchants of reputation. They would not do anything dishonourable or charge any higher price than would be an adequate price for the articles supplied. The firm of W. and C. Silver, of Halifax, is the equal, for integrity and reputation, of any firm in Canada. They would do nothing disreputable nothing discreditable, nothing for which any man should blush. The hon. gentleman referred also to James Halliday, who is an extensive merchant tailor, and, if he is not so long established in Halifax as Messrs. Silver, he has been an alderman of the city of Halifax, and an alderman of the city of Halifax is equal to a member of the legislature of Ontario anyway. We know that the kind of clothing prescribed by the gov-

ernment is of the best possible character. It has to be selected cloth, well made, and finished in the best manner; for men in seafaring employment must have clothing of the very best kind, otherwise it may fail them at a critical time. The service performed by those who man the ships in our lighthouse service is very arduous. They have to go out, day and night, to visit the lights and perform the other work of the service. They have to be on deck day and night, exposed to snow storms, ice, gales of wind and other discomforts, and anything which the government can provide to make these ships more efficient is money well expended. The merchants, such as those to whom I have referred, would not present extravagant bills, and we may be sure that the articles supplied were of the best possible quality as prescribed by the government. When my hon. friend makes allusions such as he has made, he should be specific, and, if there is anything wrong in these bills, he should show where the wrong is, instead of making general charges of extravagance or misappropriation against respectable firms. I do not think my hon. friend is familiar with the coast of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland, as he is with the waters of his own province. He evidently thinks that the buoys, lighthouses and other services of the government bear comparison with those which existed under the regime of my hon. friend from North Toronto. No such thing. The lights have altogether altered in character. They are ten times more expensive than they used to be.

They are lighted in a different way, they are more powerful, their machinery is more complicated, and all these details ought to enter into a comparison. Then again the buoys are much more numerous and expensive. They are often in danger of going adrift, and must be pursued by one of these ships and captured before they get into deep water, and either towed back again or put upon the decks of one of those vessels, services that cost immensely. The whole shore is now lighted up so that you can go from one end to the other without losing sight of one of these lights. The service is very much more complicated, very much more expensive, very much more arduous, very much more scientific and very much more efficient than ever before, and is equal to any service in any other part of the world. My hon. friend ought to have been better informed on these points when he made this elaborate comparison, he should have given us these details which would have shown that any numerical comparison cannot give us a just idea of the amount required to be expended by the present government to make the lighthouse service effective. And who would grudge to the officers of ships like that, working day and night in most exposed situations, and under a most severe climate, any little comfort they may have after they have stood upon the ship's deck all day and all night in order to do this very arduous and effective work?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. gentleman where the 'Maisonneuve' performs her work?

Mr. WM. ROCHE. That is probably upon the lakes. But I can tell you the names of the vessels down on the coast of Nova Scotia: The 'Aberdeen,' the 'Lady Laurier,' the 'Canada,' and there is one on the coast of New Brunswick. These are all very efficient vessels. The 'Lady Laurier,' the 'Canada' and the 'Aberdeen' are fitted out in most modern style.

Mr. BOYCE. It is regrettable that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Wm. Roche) is not always as charitable as he is to this government in regard to the defects and extravagances which have been pointed out by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). His argument is that in recent years things have changed, and I fancy that we on this side of the House can agree with him in that respect, we agree that things have changed in the past years, and especially with regard to the administration of the Marine and Fisheries Department as well as other departments. But my hon. friend refers to the terrible perils to which the sailors are exposed, and says that the vessels should be thoroughly outfitted. He says that the vessels of to-day are much stauncher than they were years ago, and that therefore it must be more expensive to man them. I might, if I desired, animadvert upon the hon. gentleman's position in this House, and refer to the remarkable nautical skill he has exhibited in avoiding the political reefs and rocks whereon he might have been stranded. I have on one or two occasions referred to that subject before, and it is surprising to see that the hon. gentleman bobs up serenely again at this stage. This is the fourth time he has skillfully avoided, sighted, taken the soundings of and avoided all the political derelicts such as troublous election trials, election subpœnas and examinations for discovery, appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada, and so on. And here he sits session after session while there is piled up against him, as everybody knows, a record of probably the most damning evidence that was ever piled up against any gentleman in the election courts of this country. One might even speak of the hon. gentleman from Halifax himself as being a political derelict, but his concern for others who have to fight the perils of the deep—not the political deep that my hon. friend himself has so sucessfully navigated, but the real deep—it almost brings tears to one's eyes. What an outrage it is, exclaims the hon. gentleman in his eloquent style, to compel seamen on one of our government boats to go to sea without proper equipment. What an outrage it would

be for the sailors on one of these steamers to go to sea without a dickey on, what an outrage if they were to go to sea without having proper table linen, proper table napkins at $2.50 each, proper table cloths at $30 each, proper silver, proper cut glass vessels to drink out of, and Radnor water to be served up with their whisky! That sort of thing would be a great outrage, which would justly be resented by the very generous Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now in dealing with the question, for instance, of finding the men, the hon. member for Leeds has drawn attention to the fact that it costs to-day $25 per man per month to find these men; whereas under the old government it cost infinitely less,, something like $10 or $12 per man per month. Can the hon. gentleman explain the discrepancy except upon the plea the member for Halifax makes, namely, that without mahogany tables, without Radnor water and Laurier cigars——

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Does my hon. friend mean to say that I mentioned any of these things?

Mr. BOYCE. What things?

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Such as Radnor water?

Mr. BOYCE. No, he did not.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Then why intimate that I did mention them?

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chairman, Radnor water, Laurier cigars, and dickeys tied on with strings are some of the things that the hon. member for Halifax left unsaid. I was hoping that possibly we might have some enlightenment from a gentleman of such great experience upon these subjects, but unfortunately the House is left in ignorance. What I was referring to was this, that verily times have changed, and there is now a different measure according to which the wants of our seagoing men are provided for. I wonder whether my hon. friend from Halifax knows the firm of Peter Judge & Son of his city. That firm was paid by this company $1,300.20 for supplying the 'Aberdeen' with water.

An hon. MEMBER. With what?

Mr. BOYCE. With water. They call it water.

Mr. BENNETT. They were launching her.

Mr. BOYCE. Evidently. Anyhow it cost $1,300.20 to supply her with water.

Mr. TAYLOR. And it was not Radnor water either.

Mr. BOYCE. No, the Radnor water is extra. It cost this country the same amount the previous year, and evidently this firm is an annual pensioner of the government to the extent of $1,300.20 for supplying water. Then again we have our old friend Merwin cropping up on the steamer 'Aberdeen,' and he figures in the Underfeed Stoker Company to the extent of $4,360.25. I need not go further into details because my hon. friend from Leeds has given details of various items of gross extravagance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Only a few of them.

Mr. BOYCE. And those he gave are only a few samples, but when an hon. member gets up, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) has done, and disposes of these charges in a general way——

Mr. TAYLOR. He knows he is not coming back again.

Mr. BOYCE. Why, he knows he has no right to be here. That hon. gentleman has tried to throw dust in the eyes of the people and prevent their seeing one of the worst features of the administration of this government in these general expenditures. I had no intention of being personally offensive when I said that the hon. member for Halifax should not be here; and possibly if he were to give the matter the consideration it deserves and which it has deserved these long years, he would possibly not come back any more, but would really take the suggestion which the court has made and resign his seat. As I was pointing out, this extravagance by the departments, especially the Department of Marine and Fisheries, has got to be explained, and such explanations as the general one given by the hon. member for Halifax will not do at all. There has to be some explanation why this tremendous expenditure, in excess of what formerly used to be expended, is fastened on the country; and that explanation will have to be something more definite than the general one given by the hon. member for Halifax as to the difference in cost of clothing and ships, husbandry and so on.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Before this committee rises, I think I am entitled to make an explanation, in view of the attack just made upon me, and it is this. I do not know why my hon friend (Mr. Boyce) takes it upon himself to rise, after I made some observations of a very proper character, and make a personal attack upon me.

Mr. BOYCE. It was not personal.

Mr. ROCHE. Why should he rise and say that I have no business here and that I am charged with crimes of the most heinous character? Why should this gentleman, who has not a particle of knowledge on the subject, make charges of that kind?

Mr. BOYCE. When the hon. gentleman says that I have not a particle of knowledge of the matter, possibly he will reconsider his statement in view of the fact that I have read the evidence given in court. If that does not give me some knowledge of the case, of course I have none.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I believe that the gentleman is a legal gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. W. ROCHE. Why should he take advantage of statements made by one or two witnesses, which could be refuted, when there was no opportunity given on the trial to disprove that evidence. Why should he take advantage of this to charge me with being guilty of the greatest crimes ? I have been twenty years in the legislature ; I have served twice in this parliament ; and I have never insulted any one personally. I came here with a majority of 600 of good electors.

An hon. MEMBER. Noble six hundred.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I received 7,000 votes of the city and county of Halifax, the largest constituency in Canada I have been elected five times to represent that constituency and can be elected five times more if I come forward. I am not afraid of the courts. I have been in the courts. I summoned eighty-five witnesses of the opposite party into court and I went there myself ready for the trial. My lawyers were there and they, the Tories, allowed the case to come up here on the appeal. I had eighty-five witnesses who would have proved conclusively that the opposite party were guilty of all the misdemeanours which they charged against me, and I have in my desk a statement made by the man on whom the opposite party relies, that he was besought by the lawyers and by the Conservative party and promised a situation if he would convict me and turn me out of parliament. I am not afraid of the courts. I have been in them all my life——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. ROCHE. And when I require an attorney to defend me, I shall not call upon my hon. friend opposite. But I am more afraid of him than I am of the courts or anybody else, because when he rises to expound some knotty legal problem and bobs his head, I am afraid his head will come off his body and come over here and assault me. I would give my hon. friend this bit of advice. He has crossed the Atlantic—it may be at the expense of some charity or I do not know how—but he should not come into the Dominion and insult people who are much better than himself or than he ever will be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. W. ROCHE. He has no right to rise and make a personal attack on me when I have said nothing against him. I have made no ungentlemanly attacks on any hon. gentleman opposite. I merely referred to their statements and put the best construction upon them I could. If these gentlemen opposite put up a person like my hon. friend to attack me, I will reply to him, and I have material at hand which will bring shame on any one who makes use of such statements as he has made against me. I have a reputation to maintain and intend to maintain it; but I may say for the satisfaction of the House that what the gentleman has said to-night is entirely deceptive—I shall not call it false—he does not know it is false ; but I have material in my desk, and at the proper time will produce it, and I beg of him not to make insinuations or personal attacks on me. If he cannot answer my arguments, he should not make personal attacks, or if he does I shall reply in a manner that will make him regret he ever entered into this contest.

Mr. BOYCE. Pardon me, that I should attempt in any way to say anything of the hon. gentleman or to the hon. gentleman in the nature of an insult, but when one has upon the records of this House, as we have in reference to himself, the records of a case which commenced on December 13, 1904, in the shape of an election petition charging corrupt practices, many of which, as I see by the evidence, which I have carefully purused——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This question is altogether irrelevant. I allowed personal explanations, but the hon. gentleman will understand that we cannot discuss the Halifax election case under this item. Any personal explanation is permissible. I want to be fair to both sides, but the hon. gentleman will understand that this discussion should not continue.

Mr. BOYCE. I bow in deference to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I am simply making a personal explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If you have any personal explanation to make it is permissible, but otherwise you cannot discuss that election case now.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) has been threatened.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. W. Roche) has threatened that under certain conditions he will bring his fulminations against me. I want to see him do so. I can only remind the committee that the hon. gentleman brought the remarks I had to make upon this occasion upon himself by the attitude he took not very long ago when the appointment of a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was under consideration——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BOYCE. One moment please—and when he said speaking of litigation in Nova Scotia, that he thought that litigation was too easily and too speedily settled. That was the remark which occurred to me when the hon. gentleman was speaking here to-

night and making suggestions and explanations.

Mr. W. ROCHE. Will my hon. friend permit me? I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I think my hon. friend has a mental habit of quoting people as saying things which they never said. I deny his statement distinctly and I will tell you what I did say. I said that there were many people who thought that with respect to litigation; I did not say that I did.

Mr. BOYCE. I think my hon. friend's statement is correct.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Did I understand the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) correctly to say that meats were dearer now than they were during the time of the late Conservative government?

Mr. W. ROCHE. Yes, I think they are.

Mr. W. JACKSON. I understood him to make that statement.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I think they are.

Mr. W. JACKSON. The hon. gentleman accused my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) of being at sea when he was talking about ships. I can apply that same criticism to the hon. member for Halifax. I claim that while he may know something about ships, when it comes to beef and all classes of meats he is absolutely incorrect. As a matter of fact I have here the market reports from the largest meat centre in Canada for 1895 and I find export beef cattle quoted at 5½ cents a pound. During 1907-8 the quotations from the same market show that the price of beef did not exceed 5 cents a pound. We who have been in that business as long as the hon. member for Halifax has been in the shipping business are in a better position to know whether his statement is right or not. I say that meats of all kind are cheaper to-day than they were under the Conservative government.

Mr. W. ROCHE. No.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Yes, from one to two cents a pound cheaper. Compare five years under this government with the last five years of the Conservative government. Is sugar dearer to-day? Is not that one of the things that are greatly used? Is it not a fact that teas and coffees are cheaper to-day than they were ten or twelve years ago? I would not have arisen, Mr. Chairman, to-night had not the hon. member for Halifax undertaken to quote the prices of meat stuffs in Canada. I say that his statements are not borne out by the facts. I have quoted to-night from the Toronto 'Globe,' and if he had looked up the market reports, as I have done, and followed them, as it has been my business during the last 25 years, he would have found that the statements that he has made are not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am very glad to have been given an opportunity to explain the vote that I am asking the House to grant. I am asking this year for $535,000 for the maintenance of and repairs to government steamers and ice-breakers. As compared with the vote of last year there is a decrease of $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is speaking of the total vote of last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. The corresponding vote of last year.

Mr. FOSTER. This is only the main estimate for this year.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there no supplementary estimates?

Mr. BRODEUR. No supplementary estimates because I am making provision in this vote for everything to be expended on the government steamers and I am sure there will be no supplementary estimates in connection with them unless some accident, which is not provided for, should happen. I had thought, before the criticism was made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that I would have been given an opportunity of explaining the nature of this vote. My hon. friend has thought fit to criticise not only the expenditures in connection with this vote, but also in connection with some other votes in the department. I am very willing that we should confine ourselves as far as possible to the items under discussion, because it would be fairer, and if we want to make comparisons we will be in a much better position to judge as to these comparisons. The boats which are included in this vote are the following: 'Minto,' 'Stanley,' 'Champlain,' 'Montcalm,' 'Druid,' 'Quadra,' 'Lady Laurier,' 'Aberdeen' and 'Lansdowne,' making nine ships. My hon. friend, in the course of his remarks, stated that there were in the Auditor General's Report for 1895-6 the accounts for nine ships—the same number of ships—and he tried to make a comparison between the ships of 1895-6 and the ships which are included in this vote. Instead of confining his comparison purely and simply to those nine ships in 1895-6 and those in 1907-8, or 1908-9, in order to criticise the government or to make a comparison he took some expenditures in connection with uniforms, and he took some other expenditures made on other boats. I would ask whether this is a fair way of discussing a question like this, whether it is just and fair to try and make a comparison between the nine boats of 1895-6 and not only the nine boats of 1908-9, but the 32 boats of 1908-9. I am simply asking him this and I am sure that he will realize that the comparison which he has tried to make is not at all a fair one. What were the boats in 1895-6? There were amongst others the 'Alert.'

The sum of $4.25 is given as having been spent during the whole year on that boat. Does my hon. friend want the House to believe that this boat was run on an expenditure of $4.25 ? Does he claim that this boat could be run for this sum ? Evidently not. My hon. friend thought that he was making a big case against the department in stating that there were nine boats then and nine boats to-day and this difference in expenditure. On the 'Druid' the expenditure for that year is given at $251.78. My hon. friend will not pretend that a boat can be run for that sum. There was the 'Sir James Douglas,' a little boat on which the expenditure is given as $115.93. He will not pretend again that this boat could be run for that amount. Thus you see that the comparisons which my hon. friend has tried to make between the nine boats of 1895 and those of to-day are absolutely incorrect. I go further and make this statement—and I defy any contradiction on the part of my hon. friend—that in two of our steamers, the 'Montcalm' and the 'Lady Laurier,' there is more tonnage than in the nine boats mentioned by my hon. friend. In making such a comparison my hon. friend should consider the tonnage of the vessels. He must know that a vessel with large tonnage costs very much more than one with small tonnage. He knows that a boat with 2,000 or 3,000 horse-power consumes much more coal and costs more to run than a smaller boat.

Mr. TAYLOR. What boat of the government has 3,000 horse-power ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Montcalm,' she has 3,400 horse-power, to be very accurate.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is an ice-breaker.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is all the same, it is one of those included in the expenditure. It consumes more coal. Six engineers are required to run this boat. My hon. friend should have taken these facts into consideration and should not have tried to make a comparison between the large and important steamers we have to-day, which are now required for the service of the country, with the small steamers in use in 1895-6. The country has progressed since. We have been obliged to make some further expenditures. Will my hon. friend believe me when I say that the insurance rates—and this is a very important factor—have been reduced by 50 per cent owing to the improvements that we have made in the lighting of the channel, the service of these boats and the improvements in our water route system ?

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister say that insurance rates on the upper lakes have been reduced 50 per cent within ten years ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am speaking of the St. Lawrence route and the Atlantic ocean in which these boats are working. I can produce the exact figures later. We have improved our water system, we have given better lighting, we are establishing fog alarm stations and have been placing buoys. The St. Lawrence is now navigable from Montreal to Belle Isle even during the night. Formerly this was not possible as it was not properly lighted. This improvement alone has saved one-half of the delay that formerly occurred, a delay which is particularly important as the route is open for only a portion of the year. We have adopted a policy of progress, a policy of improving our route.

Perhaps in the case of some small items there may be expenditures which are not absolutely justified ; there may be small items over which the minister, for example, has absolutely no control ; these things are in the hands of officers who certify to them and it may be that in some instances, such as those cited by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor), teapots, for example, a dollar or two dollars too much may be spent. But even on this question of teapots, since it has come up in the discussion of this important vote, my hon. friend has in his speech spoken as if the seamen were called on to use silver teapots, &c. My hon. friend knows very well that on these boats we sometimes receive very important people.

Mr. TAYLOR. Charge it all up to the Governor General.

Mr. BRODEUR. I hope one of these days to have my hon. friend down there and I suppose he would not object to being served with a cup of tea from a teapot that was absolutely good ? It is often economy to get good things; in fact we might lose money by buying goods of inferior quality. I am strongly of opinion that the best way to equip a boat is to put in first-class articles. It is often a saving, because if you put in inferior articles, they will last only a few years, and there is a loss to the country. This is one of the reasons why we supply our boats with articles of first-class quality. As to the prices which have been mentioned, I am not now in a position to state whether the prices of the teapots were too high or too low, but I will investigate the matter and I invite my hon. friend to investigate the matter before the Public Accounts Committee, and if it is found that some officers of the department have been derelict in their duty in connection with these matters, they will have to suffer. My hon. friend knows my generosity with regard to the officers of the department. Most of them were appointed by the old government and of course I had confidence that the old government appointed men who were good officers. If some of them are not good officers, I am as anxious as my hon. friend to discover that and I invite him to make an inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee. If it is shown that officers have been derelict in their duty in certifying to accounts in a proper way I will make it my business to have them properly punished. My hon. friend has been making

comparisons between the expenditures on some boats in 1895 and on some boats in 1907. Now, it happens that we have one boat, the 'Lansdowne,' which was in existence in 1895-6. In that year the expenditure for maintenance of that boat was $26,546.94, as shown by the Auditor General's Report of 1896, at page K—6, whereas the expenditure last year for the same boat, with the same tonnage and the same crew, was $22,277.40, or over $4,000 less than was spent by the economical government to which the hon. gentleman referred a few minutes ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the hon. gentleman giving the expenditure for nine months or for a full year?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am giving the expenditure of last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was only for nine months.

Mr. BRODEUR. The season is always the same.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, no, it was only to the 31st of March; but my hon. friend heard me give the expenditure to the 30th of June last year.

Mr. BRODEUR. Now, these things happened ten or twelve years ago, when living expenses were very much less than they are to-day, and when we had to pay less for the crew than we pay to-day. Taking these facts into consideration, I ask my hon. friend, who is a fair-minded man, if he will repeat the comparison which he made in regard to the nine boats mentioned in the Auditor General's Report of 1895-96?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will answer the hon. gentleman. I made the statement that in 1896 the government owned nine boats; I gave the names of the boats and the total expenditure for the full year. Then I gave the names of nine boats which the hon. gentleman is controlling, and the expenditure on them for nine months. And now the hon. gentleman is trying to make out that I made an unfair comparison.

Mr. BRODEUR. Now take the question of food. My hon. friend has been finding fault with the department because we have paid in some instances seventy-five cents a day for food for the men. He does not seem to have much respect or consideration for the poor sailors.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the hon. minister to be fair.

Mr. BRODEUR. I hope my hon. friend will allow me to make my statement, as I allowed him to make his statement without interrupting him. If he had waited until I had made my explanation, he would not have made the statements he has made. I ask the hon. gentleman, is it fair to try to diminish the consideration which is due to the poor sailors who are working on these boats? Is it because these men are poor working men that they should not have any consideration from members of this House? Is it because they have not the good fortune of being wealthy that they should be dealt with as they have been in the remarks of the hon. gentleman, who accused the government of being extravagant because it was treating these men fairly and paying seventy-five cents a day to feed them?

Mr. TAYLOR. I never said a word of the kind, and the minister knows it. I never said a word about the sailors' wages or anything of the kind.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then my hon. friend agrees that it is not too much that we pay for the sailors. My hon. friend must have some respect and consideration for these poor men.

Mr. TAYLOR. So I have.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that my hon. friend has shown that he has. He does not wish to see them properly fed. But we are going to feed them all right, and we are going to give them good wages, in spite of the criticism of my hon. friend. He spoke of elections. I am speaking of elections now—I do not know whether he made his speech for Stanstead or for South Huron, and that is why he did not wait for my explanation. But he will not go into some constituencies where there are sailors and repeat the statements he made here about sailors.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask the hon. gentleman to name the place and I will go at any time he likes.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend found fault also with the cost of the dickeys. Does he know exactly what a dickey is? I am afraid he does not. I may give him the definition: it is the correct term for the white flannel front that is part of the uniform of a sailor. He does not want those sailors to be fed or properly clothed, but the government is going to properly feed and clothe them; and whether we be charged by my hon. friend with extravagance or not, we shall do our duty to these men.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the hon. minister in what way he disposes of the condemned stores of the various vessels. I believe that the practice of the Royal Navy is to have them condemned by a board and then sold at auction, but I understand that the mode followed in the Marine Department is to allow the masters of the government steamers to condemn them on their own motion and then sell them to any one to whom they are instructed to go. I understand they are not sold at public auction at all and are not condemned by a regular board. I am not making any

charge of irregularities in the system, but I say that it is a system which is provocative of irregularity and which might much better be changed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am told by the officers of my department that the stores are sold by auction, after they are condemned on the authority of the master of the vessel.

Mr. DANIEL. I may tell the hon. minister that they are not so disposed of in the port of St. John.

Mr. BRODEUR. On the 'Lansdowne.'

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, or any other vessel that may happen to be there. So I have been informed by those interested in that business and who ought to know.

Mr. BRODEUR. The instructions of the department are that these condemned stores should be sold by auction, but in view of the statement by my hon. friend I shall have inquiry made and find out whether these instructions have been in any case disregarded.

Mr. DANIEL. With regard to the steamer 'Lansdowne,' she is an old wooden boat, too small to do the business for which she is used at present. That is not the expression of my own opinion but the opinion of those who are experienced in these matters and it is also the opinion of the commissioner of lights. In the minister's report he will find this statement:

In the New Brunswick agency, the 'Lansdowne' has not sufficient power and is too small for the amount of work to be carried out, and it is necessary that some steps should be taken by the department to provide a new steamer for this work. If this is done, it will be possible to sell the 'Lansdowne' out of the service.

The work which the 'Lansdowne' has to do is very important. The Bay of Fundy is becoming more and more a highway for an increasing number of steamers and vessels, and in the winter time we are subject of course to bad weather and heavy seas. I would like therefore to have the minister say what he proposes to do and whether he intends to replace the 'Lansdowne' by a larger and more suitable boat, and if so, when?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am very glad to find that the hon. gentleman is discussing this important question in so practical a manner. He has been following the discussion which has taken place since five o'clock this afternoon and must be aware that I was charged with all sorts of extravagance in connection with these boats. I am glad therefore to find that he has taken a more sensible view of the situation as regards the 'Lansdowne.' Time and again the agent at St. John has reported that this boat is not large enough for the work and has been urging on the department to the construction of a new one. This matter is engaging the most serious attention of the department.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask one more question and that is with regard to the 'Lurcher' lightship. I believe that a relief lightship was promised down there. Is that relief light up ready to go out to service?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was intended to send the 'Anticosti' there for the winter to take the place of the 'Lurcher.' But that was found impossible because some repairs had to be made to the 'Anticosti.' We have been making in the harbour and bay of Anticosti very important improvements lately in order to ensure the safety of navigation. We are doing our best for that habrour, but it will not be possible to send the 'Anticosti' there for the reason I have given.

Mr. DANIEL. When will the relief lightship be ready to sail? I understand that the present 'Lurcher' lightship has had to be taken off once or twice lately.

Mr. BRODEUR. Only because she broke her anchor. In a few days that will be made right.

Mr. BENNETT. On page P—49 I find this item:

MacKay, R. O. and A. B., charter of steamer 'Golspie' for 1906, $7,500.

What is this for? What is the nature of the duties which the 'Golspie' performs? and what arrangement was made?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Golspie' was a supply boat for the great lakes. We have no supply boat there. We have a vote for the construction of a boat there, which is absolutely needed, and in the meantime we have to charter a boat to go on the great lakes and supply all the light stations.

Mr. BENNETT. How long was she employed and how was the arrangement made? Were tenders called for?

Mr. BRODEUR. My deputy tells me that he is under the impression that tenders were called for, and that the 'Golspie' was the only tender we got.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the size of the boat and how long was she employed? Does the minister say she was employed for the whole season of navigation?

Mr. BRODEUR. For the delivery of supplies on the great lakes.

Mr. BENNETT. How long was that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose it would take two or three months.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely somebody alongside the minister can tell, within a month, how long the vessel was employed.

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy minister informs me that it was about two months.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, that is not three months.

Mr. BRODEUR. About two months and a half.

Mr. BENNETT. Now we have it two months and a half. Is the minister aware that these lighthouse supply boats usually carry passengers ? They do not carry passengers around the lakes for two months and a half.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the first I have heard of their carrying passengers, and I should be surprised to learn that during the time she was employed for us she carried passengers unless some special agreement were made to that effect.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not say that the 'Golspie' carried passengers. I say it is the usual thing for these lighthouse supply vessels to advertise to take passengers for the trip. But people are not making a trip of two and a half months on the lakes. Now, let us have another guess. We had it three months, then two months, then two and a half months. What was it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy minister informs me that it was two and a half months.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister will tell me the size of the vessel, we should have some idea of the value of the services paid for.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will get the information in a few minutes.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). After all the minister has said, we have not the information to which the committee is entitled. It seems to me the first question is what these boats are doing, and, so far as I know, these facts have not been given. Another point is this : the minister says he is going to decrease this vote by $50,000, but he does not tell us in what way he is going to retrench. Is this retrenchment a mere matter of guess work ? Is he going to retrench on the price of teapots and these other articles mentioned here ? I would like to ask also if the seamen on all these vessels are furnished with clothing. I find in the Auditor General's Report large expenditures for outfits and uniforms for the men on the 'Montcalm.' These have already been referred to. But when I come to the 'Stanley,' the Prince Edward Island winter boat, I see only two uniforms charged. The minister tells us that he wants these men to be well clothed, but what is the explanation of the apparent difference in treatment of the employees on the 'Stanley' and those on the 'Montcalm?' I see also that the supplies for these vessels are not on the same basis. The 'Montcalm' is supplied as if for sailor gentlemen, while the 'Stanley' is supplied as if for sailors. I wish the minister would explain these matters, and how he expects to retrench to the extent of $50,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman wants to know where the vessels are to be employed. The 'Minto' and 'Stanley' are engaged in the winter ferry service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The 'Champlain' is used for ice-breaking service between Riviere Ouelle and Murray Bay. The 'Montcalm' is used for breaking the ice in the St. Lawrence. In the spring and fall she accompanies the sea-going vessels down the St. Lawrence to make sure that they do not take any route that may be detrimental to them. The 'Druid' is in the lighthouse service in the Quebec district down to the strait of Belle Isle. The 'Quadra' is in the lighthouse service in British Columbia. The 'Lady Laurier' and the 'Aberdeen' are engaged in the lighthouse and buoy service at Halifax, and the 'Lansdowne' is in a similar service at St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not quite understand the summer service of the 'Montcalm.'

Mr. BRODEUR. She is generally in the lighthouse and buoy service in the St. Lawrence, down to the strait of Belle Isle. In the spring she goes down into the Gulf, learns where the icebergs are and notifies vessels, by Marconi messages, what course to take to avoid them.

Mr. FOSTER. And do the vessels rely on her ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They rely upon the 'Montcalm' because she is an ice-breaker and can pass through the channel more easily than the other boats. She clears the way for the other boats.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). What is the difference in horse power between the 'Montcalm' and the 'Minto ?'

Mr. BRODEUR. 3,400; the 'Minto,' I think is 2,300.

Mr. A. MARTIN. How does the minister explain the fact that the expenditure of running the 'Montcalm' is $85,000, and the 'Minto' the small sum of $45,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Montcalm' is an ice-breaker of 1,433 tons, and requires a much larger number of seamen and engineers and uses more coal than the other boat.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is the same allowance of clothing, man for man, allowed to the 'Stanley' and the 'Montcalm'?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. The price to be paid for the clothing of the officers is $25 each. I do not think that is a high price.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men on the 'Stanley' and the 'Montcalm'?

Mr. BRODEUR. Thirty-four on the 'Stanley,' and fifty-nine, exclusive of officers, on the 'Montcalm.'

Mr. BENNETT. Can the minister tell me the tonnage of the 'Golspie'?

Mr. BRODEUR. About 1,200 tons.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems rather odd that the minister cannot tell us for certain whether tenders were called for. During the summer months he must have been paying $100 a day for that vessel. Who paid for the coaling of the vessel?

Mr. BRODEUR. The owners did the coaling.

Mr. BENNETT. Is 1,200 tons her registered tonnage? I think she is a much smaller craft than that.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman can find her tonnage in the register.

Mr. BENNETT. Is she a passenger vessel, a grain carrier or a freighter? I understood this was a small steamer plying somewhere around Port Arthur, which came into prominence last year through a shipwreck, and a number of sailors were frozen.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether she is a passenger boat or a freight boat. She suits the department very well, and was used for that service the year before. It was the only boat we could secure.

Mr. BENNETT. Were tenders called for the work?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy informs me that tenders were called for two years ago. Tenders were not called for last year, because the boat was under the same commission.

Mr. BENNETT. Now the minister is pretty accurate as a rule. He says this vessel is about 1,200 tons; would he be surprised to know that she was not half that tonnage?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am surprised that my hon. friend thinks I can keep all this information in my head.

Mr. BENNETT. It is over half of 1,200; but it is not by any means 1,200. From the debate that took place last year, I understood it was about 800 or 900 tons. It is extraordinary that this department cannot secure a vessel of that style for less than $100 a day.

Mr. PARDEE. Does the hon. gentleman think that for a vessel of the 'Golspie' size $100 a day is an overcharge for men, supplies, coaling, furnishing, and so forth?

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is an enormous price. The hon. gentleman, living at Sarnia, knows that vessels carrying 100,000 bushels in the summer months do not earn $100 a day on their trips when grain rates are low. No vessel of this class can earn $100 when vessels nearly double the size cannot earn that much.

Mr. PARDEE. It is not a question of what the vessel earns. No boat of that size would charter for less than $100 a day. You cannot get the smallest tug boat for less than $25 to $30 an hour.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman has run away with himself. A tug boat cannot be hired for less than $25 an hour?

Mr. PARDEE. Not when she is chartered in the way of making a special trip.

Mr. BENNETT. It depends on the size of the tug. There are large wrecking tugs and small harbour tugs. My hon. friend must have in his eye tugs that can be hired for less than $600 a day. Surely the hon. gentleman will not stake his reputation for a knowledge of shipping matters on the statement that you cannot get vessels for less than $600 a day on a charter for 45 days. The hon. gentleman said $25 per hour. They pay for night work as well as for day work, I assume, and that is $600 per day. I think this year the minister had better call for tenders. Now the minister must know that he has a lot of political friends in the province of Ontario who own tugs, and these tugs are not confined to members of parliament. All these matters do not leak out simply through myself and other gentlemen scanning these books. It is on the same principle that other hon. gentlemen from Ontario who have seats in this House can be fortified with information. If I were to read to the House the names of some of the members of the Libral party in Ontario who give me information in regard to scandals as to dredging, the ministers would sit up in their seats. Attention is called to these matters by the hon. gentleman's own friends who know how friends of the government are favoured in this particular and in other particulars. I do not profess to be conversant with all the dredging operations from one end of the province to the other, but my attention is called to them from time to time by rival companies who are not able to get in on the ground floor, who have not the advantage of being backed up and fortified by the presence among their stockholders of members of parliament, and it is these gentlemen who call my attention to such matters as the one I have pointed out. Information does not come by inspiration. Information does not come to myself, or others on this side, by reading thousands and thousands of pages of these blue books. It comes to us by means of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite who are not getting a fair deal, as they consider, on the question of contracts awarded for vessels, or dredging, or whatever it may be. Perhaps now, the minister having seen where he is at with the 'Golspie,' will call for tenders.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should criticise the action of the government in connection with the 'Golspie.' We called for tenders and a contract was given to that vessel. Now, he claims that some friends of the government have been complaining about that. When they had a chance to tender I do not know why they should not have tendered. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to give me the names of those friends and I shall ask them to submit tenders?

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask what the 'Seguin' was paid for a similar service the year before?

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to give me the names of those friends ?

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend knows very well that certain friends of the Liberal party who are not now within that narrow circle in which all these contracts are being given do not wish to have their names disclosed, because although they have been excluded they do not wish for further exclusion.

Mr. BRODEUR. I promise the hon. gentleman that if he will be kind enough to give me their names I will ask for prices from them. That is fair.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the 'Seguin' paid for a similar service a year or so before?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was not employed on the great lakes, I understand, last year.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the 'Seguin' employed for? She belongs to the Parry Sound Lumber Company. I thought she was employed as a lighthouse boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. She was employed on the lower part of the St. Lawrence conveying material for lighthouses.

Mr. BENNETT. It is all very well for the minister to talk about giving names, remembering as we do the way he has of calling for tenders. This is a little like calling for tenders at Port Arthur when it was provided that no person could tender for the work unless he had his dredges in there when the harbour was frozen up. The reason for that was that the only dredges in the harbour of Port Arthur belonged to the son-in-law of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), and in that way they excluded all others from tendering.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the minister will bring down this advertisement calling for tenders for a lighthouse supply boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. With pleasure.

Mr. BENNETT. We will see what it was and how long tenders were asked for.

Mr. BRODEUR. With pleasure. I hope my hon. friend will also give the names of those friends whom he mentioned.

Mr. BENNETT. These gentlemen are sufficiently boycotted already.

Mr. TALBOT. The question of feeding the sailors has been brought up this evening and in connection with that point I would like to offer the minister a suggestion. I think that the Department of Marine and Fisheries has continued a somewhat vicious system in the way of providing food for the sailors.

Mr. BERGERON. They must have liked it as they have continued it for eleven years.

Mr. TALBOT. I think the same individuals are there. I think it is a bad system and one which should be remedied. It has been the system in connection with the majority of the steamers and dredges both under the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Public Works that the captain gets so much a day per head and furnishes the food. I think this is a most important matter, because I am aware that in many cases complaint has been made, and I think it would be far better for the department to at least try the experiment of purchasing the food and serving it to the sailors in proper proportion and in proper condition. I think the department would find it more economical and everybody concerned would be the better for it. I merely make the suggestion. I think it is worth while trying the experiment, because we know that human nature is such that some of these old captains who were accustomed to be very lavish ten or twelve years ago have retained their old habits. Therefore, I think the department should try the experiment and find if everybody would not be better satisfied—the department as well as the sailors.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have been following, in most of the cases, the system which my hon. friend has just described; that is to say, the captain feeds the men and we pay him a certain amount of money. He has to follow a certain bill of fare which has been prepared by the department.

Mr. TALBOT. But he does not do it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, if he does not fulfil his contract it will be cancelled right away. We have provided for him a bill of fare which he is obliged to follow for each meal during the day and if he does not do it his contract will be cancelled. I must say also that the other system was very much more expensive than this one. It has been found that this system is giving better satisfaction than the other one.

Mr. FOSTER. How far is that system adopted?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is adopted on the St. Lawrence ship channel, on all the boats which are employed in dredging there and on the 'Druid' and 'Montcalm.'

Mr. BERGERON. I think that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) must have some other idea in bringing up that question than that of the public good. The system which is followed to-day is the same as that which was followed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries years ago and it is the same system which is adopted by navigation companies.

Mr. TALBOT. There it is the company who gets the benefit and not the captain.

Mr. BERGERON. I am talking about the system. I know that in my district the captains are charged with buying all the food for the crews. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) sitting behind my hon. friend will corroborate what I am saying. All the barge companies' captains buy the food for the crews.

Mr. HARTY. That is right.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. The Department of Marine and Fisheries following that system are adopting the most economical method of feeding the crews of these boats. There may be abuses in that just as well as anything else. The hon. member for Bellechasse has heard the discussion and he knows we are paying about half a million dollars more for the same number of vessels than we were paying eleven years ago.

Mr. TALBOT. That has nothing to do with the system.

Mr. BERGERON. It has nothing to do with the system? I can give the hon. gentleman an example. I see in the Auditor General's Report the name of Mr. Alfred Arcand, of Quebec.

Mr. TALBOT. What about Arcand?

Mr. BRODEUR. What page?

Mr. BERGERON. Page P—91.

Arcand, A. Alfred, board of labourers, 695½ days at 75 cents; hauling materials, $27.65. There are no details at all. Sundry grocery and hardware supplies, $207.03; 10 per cent commission on supplies, $20.71.

Mr. TALBOT. In connection with what?

Mr. BERGERON. Buying supplies.

Mr. TALBOT. For what department?

Mr. BERGERON. It does not say. I am reading the Auditor General's Report. This man Arcand not only furnished the goods, but he charged a commission of $20.71. The remarks made by the hon. member for Bellechasse would not apply to that at all. He says that the system is bad.

Mr. TALBOT. I am speaking about the purchase of supplies and the feeding of the sailors by the captain. I am not discussing the quantities that are given. The bill of fare means that they get so much food, meat, bread, butter, &c. It is not so much the quantity as the quality and the captain, when he knows he can make a profit out of the sailor, does it nearly every time. That is what I say and I stand by it.

Mr. BERGERON. The lamentations of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries over the poor sailors will come in line. We on this side contend that all these immense sums of money spent on those boats do not give any benefit to the sailors.

Mr. TALBOT. That is not the fault of the department if the captain is a thief.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not saying where the fault lies. There is something wrong here. We have to add one-third of this amount, which is the expenditure for nine months, to get the expenditure for the year. That would make one-half million dollars.

Mr. BUREAU. There is the report for the year.

Mr. BERGERON. We have to go by something and the Auditor General's Report says that for these nine vessels in 1895-6 the cost of maintenance for the year was $150,519.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend include in that the 'Alert' which apparently spent only $4.25 ?

Mr. BERGERON. I shall grant that to my hon. friend later on.

Mr. BRODEUR. He should deduct immediately three-fourths of that.

Mr. BERGERON. I am talking now in a broad way. We spent for the same number of steamers in 1896, $150,000. In 1907, for nine steamers, we spent over half a million dollars.

Mr. TALBOT. Is my hon. friend aware that the tonnage and size of the present steamer is greater than that of the steamers in 1896 ?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend is in too great a hurry. Where is the difference in the steamers ? We had the 'Aberdeen' in 1896 and we have her in 1907.

Mr. TALBOT. Not doing the same service.

Mr. BERGERON. Wait a moment.

Mr. TALBOT. Not doing the same service.

Mr. BERGERON. It does not make any difference ; she ran on water then, not on land. She is the same boat to-day. In 1896 she cost the country $22,134. She was on water at that time.

Mr. BUREAU. Not running.

Mr. BERGERON. How do you know? That is no argument. The same boat to-day cost over $50,000.

Mr. TALBOT. Nothing allowed for repairs?

Mr. BERGERON. That will come in another place, not here.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is my hon. friend sure that it is the same boat?

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to know.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed this is not the same boat; it is another boat under the same name.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to be informed. I want the minister to be sure of that before we carry the vote; we want to know the tonnage of the 'Aberdeen' of 1896 and the 'Aberdeen' of 1907. Is the 'Druid' the same boat?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that is not the same boat either.

Mr. BERGERON. How many 'Druids' have we had? We had one about 40 years ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. We had the old 'Druid' which has been replaced by the new one.

Mr. BERGERON. We had the old 'Druid,' the younger 'Druid,' and the baby 'Druid.' Will my hon. friend give the tonnage of the old 'Druid' of 1896 and the 'Druid' of 1907?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the information for 1896; the existing one is 503 tons.

Mr. BERGERON. If I am not mistaken the 'Aberdeen' is a steamer of 1894?

Mr. BRODEUR. 1895.

Mr. BERGERON. It must be the same one. Let us be straight about that.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a new boat which has been in commission since 1896.

Mr. BERGERON. What I read in the Auditor General's Report of 1897 with reference to the 'Aberdeen' refers to the same boat as we have to-day. She cost $22,000 in 1896 and $50,000 last year. Take the 'Druid.' I do not know the tonnage. In 1896 she cost $15,000 and last year she cost about $40,000. These are two of the same vessels that they had in 1896.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no, the 'Druid' of 1896 was a different vessel.

Mr. TALBOT. She was a side-wheeler and this is a twin screw.

Mr. BERGERON. The side-wheeler is the old, old one. The one we have to-day is the one that followed the side-wheeler. This must be the one we had in 1896.

Mr. BUREAU. Oh, no.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am answering my hon friend, it is not the same boat at all; the one of 1896 is a different vessel from the one of to-day. We bought the present boat from Fleming & Ferguson about five years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the 'Lansdowne' the same one?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. There is not so much difference there. She cost $26,000 in 1896 and last year, adding one-third, about $29,000. She is only $3,000 more; that is not so much as the others.

Mr. DEVLIN. Why add one-third?

Mr. BERGERON. Because this is for only nine months and we have to take one-third of the amount mentioned to get the whole year. The 'Stanley' is the same boat, is she not?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. She cost $29,000 in 1896 and last year she cost over $50,000 if you add one-third. What has become of the old boats? Where is the 'Alert'?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was sold for junk about 1895.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is 'La Canadienne?'

Mr. BRODEUR. She is engaged in the hydrographic survey, but she is an old boat and will have to be replaced very soon.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the 'Newfield'?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was lost, and became a total wreck.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there another boat called the 'Alert?'

Mr. BRODEUR. Not in the department.

Mr. BERGERON. I find one called the 'Alert' belonging to the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is another boat.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the 'Sir James Douglas?'

Mr. BRODEUR. She was an old tug in British Columbia and was sold many years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. How many boats are there belonging to the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think thirty-two.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the minister give their names and the purposes for which they are being used?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Aberdeen,' in lighthouse and buoy service; the 'Arctic,' for service in northern Hudson bay.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the 'Arctic' now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the St. Louis basin.

Mr. BERGERON. Being prepared for another expedition ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. The 'Bayfield,' in the hydrographic service ; the 'Brant,' in lighthouse and buoy service; the 'Canada,' in fisheries protection service; the 'Champlain,' in the River Ouelle, Murray bay ferry; the 'Constance,' in Customs Department work under the control of the Marine Department; the 'Curlew,' in fisheries protection service in New Brunswick, the 'Druid' in lighthouse and buoy service ; the 'Eureka,' a pilot tender at Father Point ; the 'Falcon,' in fisheries protection service at Vancouver ; the 'Frontenac,' in the St. Lawrence ship channel service; the 'Galveston,' a dredge; the 'Gulnare,' in tidal survey work on the Atlantic coast and in the River St. Lawrence; the 'James Howden,' in the St. Lawrence ship channel; the 'Kestrel,' in fisheries protection service; 'La Canadienne,' in hydrographic work; the 'Lady Grey,' in the St. Lawrence ship channel; the 'Lady Laurier,' in lighthouse and buoy service; the 'Lansdowne,' in lighthouse and buoy service; the 'Maisonneuve,' in patrolling the ship channel from Quebec to Kingston; the 'Minto,' in winter mail service to Prince Edward Island ; the 'Montcalm,' steel ice-breaker ; the 'Osprey,' in fisheries protection service; the 'Petrel,' in fisheries protection service ; the 'Princess,' in fisheries protection service, the 'Quadra,' in lighthouse and buoy service; the 'Reserve,' in lighthouse and buoy service from Montreal to Kingston; the 'Scout,' in the same service; the 'Shamrock,' in buoy service from Quebec to Montreal; the 'Stanley,' in the winter mail service to Prince Edward Island; and the 'Vigilant,' in fisheries protection service.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the boat called the 'Lady Evelyn'?

Mr. BRODEUR. She belongs to the Post Office Department.

Mr. BERGERON. At page P—12 of the Auditor General's Report I find the name of Thos. McConkey. Who is he and what is his occupation ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He is an officer of the department. He inspects the hulls of government boats.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want to make any reflection upon the gentleman; I do not know him at all; but his travelling and living expenses for two trips from Halifax to Quebec and return appear to be pretty high amounting to $114.81. Who checks these expenditures in the department ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant of the department, Mr. Owen.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he certify the account ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is certified first by the agent under whom the officer works, and then it is sent to the department here, and the cheque issued on the certificate of the accountant.

Mr. TALBOT. How long has this been done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Twenty-six years.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say, in answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), that so far as the ship channel was concerned, an arrangement had been made with the captains of vessels there to board the men, the government furnishing the cooks and making out a good substantial bill of fare for the men, with which the captains had to comply, and that he had adopted the same system on the 'Montcalm.' I would like the minister, when he makes replies, to make them correctly. I find by the Auditor General's Report, beginning at page P—21, that thousands of dollars are charged for provisions for the 'Montcalm,' so that it cannot be under that system.

Mr. BRODEUR. Those expenditures were for 1906-7. The arrangement was made last fall.

Mr. TAYLOR. And on the same terms as the other boats in the ship channel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The other boats in the ship channel—Yes ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the minister and his deputy confirm my statement as to the proper charges for the 'Lady Laurier' and the 'Aberdeen.' I gave the statement of the total cost of provisions for these boats, and divided the total by the number of the crew, showing that it amounted to $25 per month per man. And here we find the captains of the 'Montcalm' and other vessels taking the contract at very much less, the government merely furnishing the cooks. For instance, there is the 'Camelia,' on which board is allowed for at $12 per month, $456 and at $14 per month, $14—this latter amount, I suppose, for the captain. I made the statement that $12.50 was a good price. And when I made that statement the minister and others on that side laughed. Yet the minister had in his hand the information that the captain of the 'Montcalm' had taken the contract at $12 and $14 per month. Then we have the 'Cartier' at the same rate, the 'Champlain' at the same rate, the 'Jessie Hume' at the same rate. We have the 'Lac St. Pierre' at $10.50 and $12. These figures show that the charges for the supplies for these other vessels were enormously extravagant.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did the difference go ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what I would like to know—who gets this difference between $12 and $14 a month for which these captains are ready to take the contract and the $25 a month which is paid for the 'Lady Laurier' and the 'Aberdeen' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the dredges we are paying a little less than on the other boats, because the work is not the same. As to the boats, we paid 50 cents and 60 cents.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked the minister, and he answered me correctly, after inquiring of his officials, that the same prices prevailed on the 'Montcalm' as for the other boats.

Mr. BRODEUR. I said the same as the 'Druid.'

Mr. TAYLOR. Nothing was said about the 'Druid.'

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure I said it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked the minister to give us information with reference to the detailed statements laid before the House, every one of them verified by the Auditor General's Report. He did not come down with any facts, but simply abused me for making a political speech.

Mr. BERGERON. And he talked about 'Those poor sailors.'

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, and said that I wanted to have them badly fed. I did not say a word about the feeding of the sailors, but about the extravagant manner in which these purchases of supplies were made.

Mr. BERGERON. The sailors do not get it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister said that I named nine boats, some of which did very little work. I gave the names of the boats and the expenditures, pointing out that on these nine boats $505 was paid for the uniforms in 1896-7, that last year the amount paid for uniforms was over $12,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman say that $505 was paid for the uniforms for these nine boats?

Mr. TAYLOR. I gave the detailed expenditures.

Mr. BRODEUR. There were boats that were not, properly speaking, employed. There was the 'Alert,' for instance, on which $4.25 was spent ; on another boat $115 and on another $254.25. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) undertake to say that $4.25 was paid for the uniforms on one of these boats for a year. If he says that, I can only say it is the worst administration that I have ever known.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister wants to get the thing crooked—he could not do otherwise if he tried. Put these three boats out of the question, and assume that $505 was spent for uniforms on the six boats. As against that, we have expenditures for uniforms on the present to government steamers amounting to $12,673.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) wishes to stand by that statement, I can only say that he supported a government in the old days that was not doing its duty to the country. It is no wonder that so many wrecks happened.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman must expect me to apply the same rule to him that he applied to me. He has tried to make it appear that I was opposed to having these seamen fed properly. That statement is made merely for effect, and he will go down into his own section of the country, and, in campaign speeches, will say that Taylor did not want to have these men properly fed. He knows that that was not the point, but that I was showing that the expenditures for supplies were extravagant, and I gave the official figures for every one of my statements. Then, as to travelling expenses, I have asked him to explain how it is, that whereas in 1896 the minister and all the officials of the department ran up bills for travel of $9,769, last year travelling expenses for himself and the officers of his department amounted to $51,-661.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will allow me to ask him a question : How many uniforms were purchased for these boats mentioned by the hon. gentleman in the total he gave for 1896 ?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) will turn to the Auditor General's Report of that year, page K-13 and K-18, he will learn the total number.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how much is paid for these uniforms ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The amount was $505.35.

Mr. DEVLIN. I mean for each uniform. I want to be able to compare the prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have given the hon. gentleman the pages in the Auditor General's Report, and he can look up the figures and make a speech about them. My hon. friend wanted to know if I knew what dickeys were. Well, I have been in the mercantile business and sold many a dickey, but not at a dollar apiece. Then I gave a lot of other items, about which the minister has not vouchsafed a word of explanation. He did not say a word about the increase of the salaries of the light keepers, although the government promised when they went into these expenditures, which have reached $10,-000,000, that the result would be a large reduction in the salaries. Instead of this reduction we have an increase of over $6,000 as compared with 1895-6. I spoke about the extravagant prices paid for fire extinguish-

ers and the minister did not say a word about them. All he did was charge me with not wanting to have the poor sailors properly fed, although I never said a word about that. Every figure I mentioned I took from the Auditor General's Report or from the minister's statements to this House. Just fancy paying $18 for a butcher's block for one of these steamers, in order that they might cut up their meat on it. I am entitled to have from the minister an explanation of these expenditures, none of which he ventured to explain, but simply confined himself to making the statement that I was drawing attention to these extravagances for the purpose of making political issue and influencing the people of the province of Quebec.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). A remark was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about the yearly expenses of the 'Alert' in 1895, but the 'Alert' was not in service in 1895 at all. I find in last year's report that she was taken out of commission on the 10th of December, 1894.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right and his statement just shows how unfair he has been. He has been trying for hours to show that the 'Alert' was still in commission in 1895-6.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). The hon. minister has told us what the expenditures of these boats are. Is there any revenue derived from any of them ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, from the 'Minto,' the 'Stanley' and the 'Champlain.' I shall get the information for the hon. gentleman. A few minutes ago the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said I was trying to deceive the House concerning the tonnage of the 'Golspie.' I find that its tonnage was 1,122 gross. I said 1,200.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the minister's attention to page P—21, in order to see whether we cannot go a little more closely into this matter of costs and some of the arguments founded upon it. The minister has told us that the 'Montcalm' is one of the vessels in which the system was changed of boarding the men and that the men are now boarded by the captain. On page P—21 we see the operation of both systems. The board of the officers and crew at 60 cents or 50 cents per day, $5.813.90 less inventory of stores on board September 1, 1906, $400, making net $5,413.90. Am I right in supposing that the system of boarding by the captain commenced the 1st of September, 1906, and that from that date to the end of the fiscal year the board bill was $5,413 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose that would be right.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the rest of the items under the heading 'Montcalm,' and we find the amount of provisions bought under the old system for that steamer or, as it really is, for the first part of the fiscal year. I have added them up and they made a total of about $5,187. That is, the minister paid for two months of the fiscal year for food for the crew and officers of the 'Montcalm' $5,187 and had $400 worth of that in store on December 1, which was taken over by the captain and for which he was paid its value of $400. If I am correct, the account stands this way. Under the board system, where the captain does it and is paid 50 cents or 60 cents per day, seven months cost $5,413, and two months, under the old system, cost $5,100, less $400, which is $4,700. That is under the wasteful, the extravagant, the over-priced system, two months costing the government $4,700 ; whilst under the other system at fifty or sixty cents, for seven months, costing $4,513. Now there is where the comparison is absolutely correct —the same vessel, the same men, the same mouths to feed, and you have the contrast. There cannot be anything else included in the fiscal year but what was bought in the fiscal year.

Mr. BRODEUR. There have been some accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. If there were, it would be rather to the advantage of the comparison I am making.

Mr. BRODEUR. Would the hon. gentleman give me the details?

Mr. FOSTER. You will find them scattered all through the two pages. Without pretending to be absolutely accurate, they are just about $5,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor), in the first place is absolutely vindicated in his calculations by the facts developed in the case of the 'Montcalm,' where it is done for 50 to 60 cents per day, which amounts to about $14 or $15 per month. When that statement was made some gentleman on the other side of the House at once declared that it was impossible, that $25 was as little as it could be done for. Yet the minister's own experiment on one of his best vessels, the 'Montcalm,' shows that it is being done for about $15 per man per month. There is no doubt that with any fair method of economy the best of food can be given to men for that amount of money. Statistics are in evidence everywhere showing that men can be fed and well taken care of from 10 to 12 cents per meal or less.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Volunteers for 25 to 30 cents per day.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the King's navy, or the navy of the United States, and you will find that the average cost for food under the best conditions runs somewhere around 25 to 30 cents per man per day. It is all very well for the hon. member for Belle-

chasse (Mr. Talbot) to pretend that somebody did not want the poor man to get enough to eat, and I was sorry to see the minister greedily grasp that device to justify himself. The minister cannot justify the high prices that have been paid for material put on board of these ships. Is that in the interest of the poor sailor. Does the sailor get his coffee out of these urns chased in solid silver? Does the sailor put his legs under mahogany tables which cost from $50 to $100? Does he drink his tea and coffee out of cups and saucers which cost $2 each? Not at all. What you are doing is to give the sailor on the ship, I hope, plenty of good, nourishing food, but all this extravagant equipment is one in which the sailor gets no benefit at all. Now the minister must not think that the opposition are attacking the sailor when they bring out these things. It seems to be absolutely necessary to take hours, or perhaps days, in order to impress upon the House and the country the extravagance in what may be called small ways as in large ways in which this department is being run. What does the minister say about the Merwin transaction? He sat in the committee, heard the evidence, and knows that the people of this country were absolutely robbed, robbed to the advantage of Merwin and whoever had a coadvantage with him. The hon. gentleman knows that he can get on the streets of Montreal or Toronto engines for $500 less than was paid for these. The minister knows that the very men who got Merwin paid for these engines more than the current price are the very men who certified that that was a true and reasonable price. The very men that certified to this have certified to the accounts to-day. The very men that certified that the tobacco was purchased at a reasonable price when it could be bought for less than half of what it cost, the very men who certified that the pemmican was purchased at a reasonable price at a sum three or four times as much as it could be got for, of the same quantity and quality, these men are to-day in that department. When the minister cannot find men in the department who will certify to what he wants to certify he has a habit of creating them and of getting men in positions who will certify to what he wants. He has a man there to-day that I warn him is not working in the best interests of the people of this country whether he may be working in his own best interest or not. The existence of this system is due very largely, I believe, through the minister's own good will, and the work of some of his officers. What confidence can we have that the country is not being cheated in the purchases of to-day when the same men who certified to double prices a few years ago are the certifying officers of the present time? Has the minister taken any steps at all to recover from Merwin what was taken from the coffers of the people through the negligence or collusion of his own department? It makes no matter which in so far as the people are concerned; the people lose in either case. Is the minister putting any system into practice of public tenders and of purchasing articles at fair current prices obtained by means of public tender? Is he doing it to-day? Two years ago he answered question after question of mine touching purchases running up into millions of dollars, Merwin's amongst them for $500,000 or so and Brook's for a very large amount, acknowledging that these purchases were not made by tender and when we were able to get eighteen articles out of the thousands that were bought from Merwin we found that on these eighteen articles $7,000 of a rake-off—nearly 50 per cent, if not more—had gone into Merwin's pocket, that might have been saved. If, in regard to these eighteen articles, there was a rake-off of $7,000 and if the same proportion, or anything like the same proportion obtained with respect to the purchase of millions of dollars worth of articles how much have the people been robbed of? Yet the minister has never taken the least step to cause Mr. Merwin to give back to the people the inordinate profit or rake-off that he made on supplies to his own advantage some way or another. My hon. friend is dealing with him to-day. He dealt with him within the last fiscal year, he is dealing with him during this present year, he is dealing with him without contract, without tender and in so far as we know under the same officers he is dealing to the same disadvantage to the people. I rose particularly to show the minister and the House that by his own books and his own work, detailed in the Auditor General's Report, he has convicted his department of paying two prices for the keep of the sailors and giving them no better than the sailors got under the proper provision in my mind as regards the captains victualling the crews. I think that is the proper system. Make your bill of fare, your general menu, what you think it ought to be, adopt the system, keep the proper officer up to it and you get rid of a vast amount of trouble and annoyance for the department itself and, what is better still, you get back to a basis where the people are not paying two prices. If all of the departments were under the system that now prevails on the 'Montcalm' you would feed all your men for fifty cents a day while to-day it is costing you at least $25 per month for each man. Spread it over all the boats and you waste a large sum of money.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I notice that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is present. Perhaps he can tell us what it costs to ration the soldiers. I remember that in the old days in our military camps the contractor for pro-

viding the rations for the men got 25 cents a day where the rations had to be drawn a long distance and kept in very expensive storage, and I notice in the Auditor General's Report here that the rations are charged for at the rate of 20 cents a day.

An hon. MEMBER. How long ago?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. To-day. This year's Auditor General's Report. I think that is about the figure.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the volunteers starved?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the Russell House in Ottawa and at the King Edward in Toronto it does not cost them $1 a day for rations. If you take the attendance and extra service into account there is no hotel in the city of Ottawa which begins to expend a dollar a day per man for rations.

Mr. TALBOT. The proprietor of the Russell House told me that it cost $1.18 a day.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is nonsense.

Mr. TALBOT. You had better settle that with him.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister should be a little more careful when he quotes from books. I gave the minister credit for making a candid statement when he said the 'Golspie' had a registered tonnage of 900 tons? She has only 709 tons.

An hon. MEMBER. That is a big steamer.

Mr. BENNETT. Some hon. gentleman says that she is a big steamer. If he will come to the upper lakes he will see what a big boat is.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is that the registered or gross tonnage?

Mr. BENNETT. The registered tonnage.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the gross tonnage?

Mr. BENNETT. 1,122 tons. The registered tonnage is what tells. I have in my mind a vessel which has double the registered tonnage of this vessel and consequently if we take the figures that the hon. gentleman was giving us that vessel should be making $200 a day. I think the owners would be tickled to death to run the vessel for $200 a day during the summer months when trade is dull. Perhaps we will see if the minister will call for tenders for this service.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the system which is in force now in regard to the maintenance of these vessels? We have been talking to-night about captains buying the food for the sailors and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has suggested another plan. What is really the system? I have been reading over some of these items and as my hon. friend will see this cannot be carried on very much longer because the people will not stand it. At page P—10 of the Auditor General's Report, I find one item which seems to require some explanation.

Derome, H., Quebec, potatoes, fish, eggs and onions, $51.86.

There is no price given, you do not know whether they got two dozen eggs, two or three bushels of onions or a bag of potatoes but all you do know is that they paid $51.86. I do not want to blame anybody, but I say the system is bad.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. The Auditor General does not give the exact details of these accounts. There is one thing in regard to the Auditor General's Report. There are too many details and there are not enough. There are too many in this respect that sometimes the statements which are made may be misleading. If the hon. gentleman undertakes to publish the accounts I think they should be published in full. It would make a very big volume, but it would give us a correct idea of how matters stand. In regard to that account to which my hon. friend refers I am pretty sure that on the voucher which is presented to the department, the details, the absence of which my hon. friend has noticed, must have been given.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the system? Are the captains in charge of everything in connection with the boats as the hon. member for Bellechasse suggested a few moments ago? I understand that these captains are charged with the buying of all that is necessary for the feeding of their men. If so are they told where to buy their provisions and how much to pay for them?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Cowie succeeded, on the St. Lawrence ship channel, in establishing this system of giving the feeding of the men by contract to the captain or some other officer on the boat. We have been trying to establish it on some of the boats. I myself, when making my first inspection in 1906 tried to induce the captain of the 'Montcalm' and tried to induce him to accept it at 50 cents or 60 cents. At last he yielded and was willing to undertake it. We can get all the men to agree to that. A comparison has been made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with regard to the expenses of the 'Montcalm' and he finds that for two months we have been spending much more than for five months. I am not in a position to state whether or not the comparison is right. We might be able to see that by the accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. I was going to ask the minister to have such a comparison by months made as it would be one that we

could not gainsay. Some of the expenditures might have been given to a previous year and some not. Might I ask the minister what his policy in this matter is going to be? According to the Auditor General's Report the cost of provisions is about $25 a man and the captain of the 'Montcalm' feeds his men for about 60 cents a day, showing a saving of about $10 per month per man.

Mr. BRODEUR. My policy would be to extend this system.

Mr. FOSTER. I would support the minister most heartily.

Mr. BRODEUR. I myself induced the captain of the 'Montcalm' to make a contract. I may say there is an objection which might or might not be serious in some case to having the captain the contractor. He is the absolute master on the boat; he may feed the men well or he may not, there might be ground for complaint in that respect. Would it then be advisable that the contract should be made with the captain? It might be made with the steward as the steward would be under the captain and if there was ground for a complaint the men could complain to the captain. There are of course difficulties in the way but I for my part believe in that system. It has been put in force on the St. Lawrence ship channel and I have been trying to put it in force on other boats. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) was speaking a few minutes ago against the province of Quebec but it is in Quebec that this is done.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say a word against the province of Quebec. I would like the minister when he makes statements to make them in accordance with the facts.

Mr BRODEUR. I thought he would like to know——

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman made that statement on purpose in order to have it go through the French press to-morrow.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would not charge my hon. friend with bringing in the province of Quebec——

Mr. TAYLOR. You have done it half a dozen times to-day.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would not charge my hon. friend with bringing in the province of Quebec as he did a minute ago for the Ontario papers. For that reason I think it is better not to mention the provinces in these matters.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister has fed the Quebec people on half what he does the others; he is starving the poor people of Quebec?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have pointed out one of the defects in regard to these contracts that when the captain is the contractor the men have no one to whom to complain.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister could easily consult the Minister of Militia and ascertain how the rationing of the permanent corps is done. They are fed all over the country for 20 cents per day per man, and there is no complaint.

Mr. TALBOT. I maintain that the system of giving a contract to the captain, the steward or any one else in connection with the crew is a vicious one and I am perpared to prove it in every case. I do not care what bill of fare you have if there is no one on the steamer to see that that bill of fare is properly lived up to. It is left to the men to complain but sometimes the ships are out for three or four months and they could not make a complaint until their return and then the season is over.

Mr. TAYLOR. What steamer is out three or four months?

Mr. TALBOT. The steamer that starts from Quebec to supply the lighthouses down to the Straits of Belle Isle is out for three or four months. When a captain is given so much to feed the men he is there on business, he is there to make as much as he can. He may give the quantity but who is to control the quality? No department has a man to supervise all these things The officials of the department know how much a man will consume in a month and they can purchase the necessary supplies, store them on the ship and they can be distributed to the cook as required. The cook is paid by the department, but not by the captain, and everything can be checked and controlled. I am quite satisfied that with the same amount of money the sailors will be better fed without the contract. I live in a shipping district and I am in touch with nearly all the crews of the government boats and I know what is said. Almost every captain who has a contract with the government to feed his men does not feed them properly. I understand that it is easier for the department to control the returns when there is a contract, but the captain is there to see that he makes as much money as he can and I know that in a majority of cases the captain makes from $10 to $15 a day in the quality of the food he gives the men.

Mr. BERGERON. What would my hon. friend propose?

Mr. TALBOT. What I said a minute ago, that it is easy to know the quantity of food required for a crew of twelve or fifteen men for a cruise of two or three months. That can be bought, stored in the ship and distributed as required for cooking or anything else. I am satisfied that with that system not only will the department save money but they will give the crews better satisfaction than they have now.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the hon. member to say that where the captains took

contracts at the prices stated, they made a profit of $10 or $12 per month per man.

Mr. TALBOT. Not per man, for the whole crew. With a crew of 20 men if there is only 6 cents a day profit on each man he will make a substantial profit.

Mr. TAYLOR. What my hon. friend says confirms my estimate.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend hear any complaints about the 'Montcalm'?

Mr. TALBOT. No, I have not heard any complaints about the 'Montcalm' in particular.

Mr. BRODEUR. Because this and the 'Druid' are the only boats in Quebec on which the system has been tried. We are going to make a comparison to see which system is the best. My hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I., asked me a few minutes ago the revenue of the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley.' The revenue of the 'Minto' is $12,000, and that of the 'Stanley', $9,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the minister where he got those figures?

Mr. BRODEUR. They were given to me by the accountant of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's Report shows the revenue of the 'Stanley' to have been $7,000 and the revenue of the 'Minto' $9,000. If the minister's statement is right, the Auditor General's Report is wrong.

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor's statement is for the nine months. Perhaps the minister's is for the year.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will call the attention of the accountant to the matter.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister of Finance give me any idea as to when the Insurance Bill will be taken up?

Mr. FIELDING. At the first reading of the Bill I offered the suggestion that we should pass the second reading 'pro forma' without discussion, and that the Bill should then go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I do not know how far that suggestion is acceptable. I shall be glad to move the second reading at any moment for that purpose; but if there is likely to be a protracted debate, I would have to delay it. I am advised that the companies wish to get together and make their representations. Is my hon. friend aware whether the suggestion I made is acceptable?

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to pledge this side of the House without speaking to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. FIELDING. Very well, I will let it stand until that is ascertained.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the budget debate will not be brought on until after the French treaty is taken up?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 13, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Copp.

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 52) respecting a certain patent issued to Eugene François Giraud.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 53) respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 54) incorporating the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—Mr. Sloan.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Peter Douglas McLean, Esquire, member elect for the electoral division of Centre York; introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. G. P. Graham.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire about some returns that I moved for early in the session. There were two immigration agents in my riding and I asked for a report as to what they had done. Then there were the reports of the commercial agents sent to the old country—twenty-five of them. Their reports were promised to be brought down. There was also a report about the expenditure at government house which was promised. I would like to know when we may expect these.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The report in regard to the agents sent to Great Britain is being prepared and will be brought down very shortly.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) desires to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, being withdrawal of the winter steamers from Charlottetown. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman has permission to do so ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Will my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) postpone that until to-morrow. I understood that the hon. gentleman wanted simply to ask a question but I see that he wants to discuss the matter of the transfer of the boats from Charlottetown to Georgetown. Will he be kind enough to postpone the discussion until to-morrow ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. The only objection is that time is passing. These boats have been taken from Charlottetown and there are no facilities for the transportation of passengers and goods at that point. It is a serious matter but if it will not entail delay I will consent to the postponement that the hon. gentleman asks for.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter will stand until to-morrow.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Monk.

QUESTIONS.

APPLICATIONS TO BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. BARR asked :

1. What was the number of applications made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the privilege of crossing railway tracks with water mains or water pipes, covering the period from February 1, 1904, to December 1, 1907?

2. What was the number of applications granted, and the number refused?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The total number of applications made to the board under section 196, of the Railway Act, 1903, and section 250, of the Rail- Act, is 215.

2. The total number of applications granted is 215, and no applications were refused.

Note.—Under the above section would also be included a certain number of applications to carry gas mains under the railway tracks.

Mr. BARR asked :

1. What was the number of applications made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the privilege to cross railway tracks with telegraph wires, covering the period from February 1, 1904, to December 1, 1907?

2. What was the number of applications granted, and the number refused?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The total number of applications made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the privilege to cross railway tracks, with telegraph wires, covering the period from February 1, 1904, to December 1, 1907, is 65.

2. Sixty-five applications have been granted and none refused.

MEDALS FOR THIRD SOUTH AFRICAN CONTINGENT.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. During the past year, has the government sought to have medals issued to the members of the third South African contingent, who sailed from Canada and arrived within the three-mile limit in South African territory before the conclusion of the war?

2. Is it the intention of the government to further endeavour to secure medals for the men concerned?

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

1. The government has not taken any steps in the direction indicated, during the past year.

2. On November 11, 1902, a despatch was received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to a memorandum from the Dominion government, dated August 22, 1902, making application for the South African war medal on behalf of the members of the Third South African Contingent, to the effect that the Secretary of State for War had, after careful consideration, decided that no relaxation could be made of the date limiting the grant of the medal. A further despatch was received on April 4, 1906, in reply to an application forwarded by the Dominion government on February 24, 1906, from certain officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the 3rd Regiment who had previously served in South Africa, that they might be granted the South African clasp, 1902, to the effect that as these officers and men had not disembarked on a date prior to June 1, 1902, they were not entitled to the clasp.

It is not the intention of the government to take any further steps in the matter.

SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS—LAND SCRIP.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government, this year, to issue scrip to each volunteer who enlisted for South Africa from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

2. Is one who enlisted from the Yukon or other Canadian territory, beyond the three provinces named, eligible for the scrip?

3. Is it the intention of the government to issue scrip to each volunteer from any part of Canada who went to South Africa?

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

1. A Bill is at present being prepared in order to set apart lands in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, in accordance with the terms of the resolution of parliament passed last session, as a grant to those who were resident in the above named provinces at the time of their enlistment, and served during the South African War.

2 and 3. The resolution did not propose to provide for the issue of scrip to other than those who were resident in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta at the time of their enlistment, and the Bill will not do so.

PEACE RIVER VALLEY LANDS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What lands have been sold, leased, given as homesteads, transferred or set apart in any way by the government to each, individuals, companies, syndicates, or other organizations in the Peace River valley, or along or near tributaries thereof, in the Northwest of Canada?
2. When was each area allotted?
3. What are the terms between the government and the various parties or organizations concerned?
4. What prices per acre have been realized from these transactions?
5. With whom did the government conduct negotiations in each case?
6. What are the regulations governing the securing of land in the Peace River valley?
7. How far is it from Edmonton to Dunvegan?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask the question to stand as a motion for a return; the answer is voluminous.

LINDSAY RIFLE RANGE AND DRILL SHED.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to construct a drill shed in Lindsay at an early date?
2. Is it the intention of the government to secure a site for and establish a rifle range at Lindsay, to be ready for practice the coming summer?

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

1. There is a lump sum for the construction of armouries generally, in the Public Works' estimates; but the disposal of this vote has not yet been fully determined. The claims of Lindsay will be considered.

2. Steps have recently been taken with a view to securing a site for a rifle range at Lindsay.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

REBATES—AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What amounts have been paid in rebate to manufacturers of agricultural implements under item 1002 customs tariff, and on what quantity of materials imported?
2. Whence was the material exported?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The names are not specifically asked for, but I fancy the hon. gentleman desires to have names as well as amounts:

1. To Messrs. M. T. Brennan & Co., Ingersoll, Ont., $22.20—on 6,407 pound of rolled steel.

To the Sylvester Manufacturing Co., Limited, Lindsay, Ont., $268.57—on 58,106 pounds of rolled steel.

To the Massey-Harris Co., Limited, Toronto, Ont., $18,694.08—on 3,259,363 pounds of pig iron and 4,622,922 pounds of rolled steel.

2. All the above materials were exported from the United States, with the exception of 399,253 pounds of pig iron used by the Massey-Harris Co., Limited, which was imported from Great Britain.

Mr. SHEPLEY, K.C.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What are the various services on which Mr. Shepley, K.C., has been engaged by the government since 1896, and what amount has been paid him for salary and expenses for each?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The information required by this question covers so long a period of time and would require reference to so many departments that it had better be the subject of a notice of motion for a return.

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

CONTRACTORS' SECURITIES.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

What amount of contractors' securities were in the hands of the government on December 31, 1907?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Amount of contractors' securities in the hands of the government on December 31, 1907, $2,606,075.35.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

What was the value of imports of merchandise for home consumption and of exports of home products, respectively, for the twelve months ending June 30, 1907, and for the six months ending December 31, 1907, distinguishing between Great Britain, the United States and other countries; also the imports and exports of coin and bullion for the same periods?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

Imports of merchandise for home consumption, twelve months ending June 30, 1907, from :—

Great Britain	$ 88,901,819
United States	206,715,914
Other countries	49,673,918
Total	$345,291,651

Imports of coin and bullion, twelve months ending June 30, 1907, from :—

Great Britain	$ 185,983
United States	9,016,734
Other countries	6,626
Total	$ 9,209,343

Exports of Canadian products, twelve months ending June 30, 1907, to :—

Great Britain	$119,843,374
United States	82,194,661
Other countries	24,474,028
Total	$226,512,063

Exports of coin and bullion, twelve months ending June 30, 1907, to :—

Great Britain	$ 6,200
United States	17,369,506
Other countries	920
Total	$ 17,376,626

In the following answers the statistics for December will not be available for a week or so, and the information is given for five months. The hon. gentleman can have information for December later.

Imports of merchandise for home consumption, five months ending November 30, 1907, from :—

Great Britain	$ 42,224,336
United States	91,829,585
Other countries	24,461,395
Total	$158,515,316

Imports of coin and bullion, five months ending November 30, 1907, from :—

Great Britain	$ 1,487,034
United States	2,246,177
Other countries	645
Total	$ 3,733,856

Exports of Canadian products, five months, ending November 30, 1907, to :—

Great Britain	$ 65,773,618
United States	46,877,140
Other countries	13,816,164
Total	$126,466,922

Exports of coin and bullion, five months, ending November 30, 1907, to :—

Great Britain	$ 7,032
United States	4,048,338
Other countries	28,980
Total	$ 4,084,350

THE SENATE IN 1896 AND 1907.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

What was the number of senators, the cost of the Senate for the session, and the number of days during which the Senate sat in the year 1895 and the year 1896-7 ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance :

	1895.	1906-7.
Total days of session	97	157
" sittings of Senate	54	62
" No. of senators	72	87
" Indemnity paid	$76,528.20	$210,140.10

YUKON REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

What was the total Dominion revenue and consolidated fund expenditure, and capital expenditure in the Yukon from March 31 to June 30, 1907?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would ask the hon. member to let this stand as a notice of motion as the information can be more conveniently brought down in that form.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion.

MAINTENANCE OF TRENT CANAL WORKS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr Sproule—asked:

1. Will the government observe the terms of agreement between the province of Ontario and Canada *re* maintaining in proper condition the works already existing, and constructing such necessary new ones as the needs of the localities require upon the tributary waters of the Trent canal in Victoria and Haliburton?

2. When will the new locks and dam at Lindsay be (a) begun, and (b) completed?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. It is the intention of the government to maintain all the necessary works required for the Trent canal.

2. (a) It is hoped that next session the work will be let.

(b) Should be completed in one season.

BOBCAYGEON DAM.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. In the new dam at Bobcaygeon has the government made provision for placing in position the power plant and machinery of the corporation now installed in the old dam?

2. Under the custom in other similar circumstances will the government, and not the municipality, bear the expense of the transfer of the plant and machinery?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The government is putting in three sluices in the dam, so that the municipality

of Bobcaygeon can get the water for their power, through them. The government has no agreement or understanding with the municipality as to what kind of power house they are going to build or how they are going to equip it.

2. It is not the custom of the government to bear any expense in connection with power plant in any manner whatsoever.

WORKS ON TRENT CANAL TRIBUTARIES.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What works have been undertaken and completed by the Federal government on the waters tributary to the Trent canal, in Victoria and Haliburton, under the agreement with the Ontario provincial government, since the taking over of those waters by Canada?
2. What sums have been expended thereon, (a) for repairs to former works, (b) for construction of new works?
3. What works are planned for the ensuing year, and what is the proposed cost of each such work?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. A new bridge at Lindsay, across the Scugog river, at a cost of $3,856.45—twelve floating lighthouses, on Scugog river, between Lindsay and Sturgeon lake—$1,000. Hawk Lake dam has been rebuilt and raised at a cost of $4,154.24. Eagle dam has been rebuilt at a cost of $922.85. Norland dam was rebuilt at a cost of $481.90. Burnt river, old dam at Pine lake has been replaced by a concrete dam at a cost of $1,770.40. Mississauga river, Bottle creek dam has been rebuilt at a cost of $810. Noggie's creek, Townsend dam has been rebuilt at a cost of $590.55. General minor repairs to sluices, dams, slides, &c., on the several rivers, have been carried on to the extent of $2,361.70.

2. (a) Repairs to former works, $15,948.09, have been expended. (b) No new works have been undertaken.

3. Rebuilding Horse Shoe lake dam on Gull river, $3,000; rebuilding Otter lake dam on Burnt river, $2,000; minor repairs to Redstone and Workman's lake, $1,000; minor repairs to sluices, slides and other dams on the several rivers, $2,000.

PAY-LISTS FOR ST. FULGENCE PIER.

Mr. BERGEON asked:

On March 1, 1898, the Auditor General sent the following letter to the secretary of the Public Works Department:—

Office of the Auditor General,
Ottawa, March 1, 1898.

Sir,—The paymaster of Chicoutimi, Doctor Edmond Savard, seems to have written at least fourteen of the twenty-four signatures in the receipt column of pay-list 26359 for work on the St. Fulgence pier in September, 1897.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Please send me a copy of the instructions that you may have given the paymaster regarding the validity of the receipts.

The pay-lists in question should be replaced.

I am, dear sir, your obedient servant,
J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

Were the pay-lists in question replaced? If so, when?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The pay-list in question bears the declaration signed by Alphonse Pedenault, foreman of the work, that all the persons on the list were paid in his presence. In the case of an employee who is unable to write, it is customary for the paymaster to write the name for him in the receipt column of the pay-list and for the employee himself to make his mark with a cross. In this instance, the crosses had been omitted, but, as the foreman had attested to the actual fact of payment, it was not thought necessary to have a fresh pay-list executed.

IMPORTS OF BUTTER.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked:

1. What quantity of butter was entered for home consumption in Canada during the six months ending December 31, 1907?
2. What were the countries of origin?
3. What were the ports of entry?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). For five months ending 30th November, 1907 (as books for December are not yet complete):—

Por.	Countries.	Lbs.	$
Amherstburg	United States.	25	4
Bridgeburg	United States.	124	35
Sault Ste. Marie	United States.	1,250	288
Windsor	United States.	1,277	320
Montreal	United States.	25	6
	Great Britain.	160,768	24,849
Sydney, N.S	United States.	300	60
	Norway.	800	160
	Newfoundland	18	3
Winnipeg	United States.	120	18
Grand Forks	United States.	2,134	528
Kaslo	United States.	450	129
Nelson	United States.	1,278	366
New Westminster	United States.	126	45
Rossland	United States.	832	228
Vancouver	United States.	650	158
	Australia.	5,600	1,400
Victoria	United States.	5,802	1,632
Greenwood	United States.	933	254
Dawson	United States.	4,004	1,076
Whitehorse	United States.	11,559	3,244
Total		198,075	34,804

DUTIES ON MATERIALS, DETROIT RIVER TUNNEL.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

1. Has the Department of Customs made arrangements whereby the duty on all or any

part of the material, &c., used in the construction of the new caisson-tunnel under the Detroit river from the water's edge to the international boundary line is to be waived or remitted?

2. If so, to whom are the special concessions made?

3. What would be the probable loss to the department by such waiver or remission if made?

4. Has any correspondence on this matter passed between the department and the Michigan Central Railway, or Butler Bros. & Hoff, contractors, or between the department and any other persons or corporations.

5. What is the exact situation with respect to the collection or remission of customs duties on the said material and other dutiable articles required and used in connection with the work on the said tunnel?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs).

1, 2, 3, 4. There is no waiver or remission of duty on materials used in the construction of the new caisson-tunnel under the Detroit river.

5. Item 596 of the Customs Tariff, 1907, provides for free entry of 'materials to be used in Canada for the construction of bridges and tunnels crossing the boundary between the United States and Canada, when similar materials are admitted free under similar circumstances into the United States, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.' Under this provision of the law materials to be used in Canada for the construction of the tunnel under the Detroit river from the tunnel entrance on the Canadian side to the international boundary line are entered free of customs duty.

MAINTENANCE OF ESQUIMALT NAVAL STATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What action, if any, has the government taken to secure the continued maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt, B.C.?

2. What is the situation with regard to the present maintenance of that naval station and what is the expectation of the government as to its continued future maintenance?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. As the correspondence between the British and the Canadian government is confidential, it is not possible to answer these questions at the present time.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN NAVAL STATIONS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. Does the arrangement between the government of Great Britain and Canada as to the transfer of the dockyards and other property recently occupied by the British government as naval bases at Esquimalt and Halifax to the Canadian government include a condition that Canada shall maintain these dockyards and naval stations in a state of efficiency so that the same may be available for use by the British fleet in the event of war or other necessity?

2. If so, what moneys have been expended for this purpose since these stations have been so taken over?

3. What sums have been included in the estimates for the coming year for a like purpose?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The correspondence between the British government and the Canadian government being confidential, it is not possible to answer this question at the present time. The imperial government has given us, pending negotiations, the use of the Halifax dockyard on the first of January, 1907.

2. $24,069.35 in Halifax dockyard.

3. $40,000 have been put in the estimates for the maintenance and upkeep of dockyards.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

Having regard to the increase of size in vessels, both naval and mercantile, is it the intention of the government to increase the docking facilities on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts either by adding to the number of the present docks or by increasing the size of those already in existence?

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

The matter is under consideration.

IMPERIAL NAVAL DEFENCE.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

Does the Canadian government intend to adhere to the policy laid down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he said at the recent Colonial Conference in connection with the part taken by Canada in imperial naval defence, on page 542 of the reported proceedings, 'We could not contribute or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way'?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

FISHERIES PROTECTION.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. Is the statement, as it appears in the Colonial Conference proceedings, at page 139 of the report, by the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, to the effect that since the year 1885, the date of the abrogation of the Washington treaty, Canada has spent $3,147,990 in connection with the protection of the Canadian fisheries, correct?

2. If so, what are the details of the said expenditure, showing how much was spent each year?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes, it is practically correct; but the statement includes, however, an amount of the $323,786 expended on the fisheries protection vessel employed in the Lower Gulf Division from 1867 to 1885, which was er-

roneously embraced in the cablegram conveyed by the department to the minister.

2.

1886	$ 130,112 18
1887	104,593 90
1888	77,102 98
1889	66,414 44
1890	68,552 88
1891	99,831 74
1892	103,393 40
1893	107,899 22
1894	116,169 18
1895	100,207 29
1896	102,021 72
1897	99,357 41
1898	107,034 06
1899	105,133 27
1900	97,370 11
1901	124,211 21
1902	152,825 07
1903	145,137 99
1904	204,654 66
1905	462,082 12
1906	250,099 37
	$2,824,204 80

NAVAL INSTRUCTION.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Is the statement as it appears in the Colonial Conference proceedings at page 140 of the report, by the Hon. Mr. Brodeur to the effect that the government of Canada claimed credit for drilling Canadian seamen on a Canadian cruiser, correct?

2. If so, where were such Canadian seamen taking exercises and being drilled?

3. How many men were thus drilled and exercised, and how many are being so drilled and exercised at the present time, giving the stations and places at which such exercises or drill takes place?

4. What qualifications do their instructors possess?

5. How much money has been expended during the past five years, in each year, in this connection by the Canadian government?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR, (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. On board all the Canadian cruisers during the summer and on board the cruiser 'Canada' and in Halifax dockyard during the winter.

3. Approximately 200 each year. During time ships are in commission on board the various cruisers. The 'Canada' is kept in commission all the year around, and her crew are under drill instruction during the whole period.

4. On board the 'Canada' there is a gunnery instructor, who was a seaman gunner in the Royal Navy. On board the other ships the instructors have received certificates from the school of instruction at the citadel in Quebec.

5. No special account for the drill has been kept, but it is included in the annual cost of the cruisers, which is as follows :

1902	$ 152,825 07
1903	145,137 99
1904	204,654 66
1905	462,082 12
1906	250,099 37

The amount in 1905 includes the cost of building the 'Canada.'

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC SUPPLIES.

Mr. WHITE asked :

1. Who has the contract for furnishing supplies for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, to be delivered via Grand lake, on the Du Moine river?

2. What section does this contract cover?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Mr. Thomas E. McCool, of Fort William P.Q., has the contract for the transport of ten tons of supplies from Moore Lake or McKay's Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Grand Lake Victoria.

2. These supplies are for the use of engineering parties in District Number Three.

PARTRIDGE ISLAND STORES.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

Who is employed to carry or ferry government stores from the city of St. John to Partridge island, in the harbour of St. John, N.B., and at what rate per round trip?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR, (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

Mr. John Abbott, of St. John, N.B. is employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, when a boatman is required to convey stores from the city of St. John to Partridge Island. He receives $1.40 per round trip.

MR. VICTOR GAUDETTE.

Mr. R. N. WALSH—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Has Mr. Victor Gaudette, barrister, of Montreal, been employed during this parliament in any manner by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Sorel or elsewhere?

2. If so, what is the nature of his work?

3. Is he still in the employ of the government?

4. Has he made any reports to the government?

5. What amount of money has been paid for his services by the government?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Mr. Gaudette was appointed to investigate alleged irregularities on the part of a foreman of works on Lake St. Peter.

2. His duties were as indicated.

3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

4. No report has yet been received.

5. Two advances amounting to $600 have been made to him.

MR. GONZALVE DESAULNIERS.

Mr. R. N. WALSH—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Has Mr. Gonzalve Desaulniers, barrister, of the city of Montreal, been employed as translator or in any other position or work by the government during the present parliament, or since 1896?
2. Has the said Gonzalve Desaulniers during the present parliament or at any time since 1896 been employed by the government to represent them as counsel in any court of justice, or in any other capacity?
3. In how many of these cases have his services been required?
4. What amounts of money have been paid him by the government, at what time were they paid, and for what services, since the year 1896?
5. How much was paid him for the work of translation, and how much for his professional services?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I can answer the second paragraph of this question. Mr. Gonzalve Desaulniers has been employed by the Post Office Department in two cases. One was an action taken by the Postmaster General against the postmaster of Chambly for some irregularities in the postal service. Another was a case of assault committed on a letter carrier in Montreal. The amount paid to him I have not yet been able to ascertain, as I understand from the Department of Justice that the account has not yet been adjusted.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, I suppose, the other part of the question may stand?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The whole had better stand.

Question allowed to stand.

ST. LAURENT WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. How much money was voted for the enlargement of the wharf at St. Laurent, Island of Orleans?
2. How much of that sum has been expended?
3. Were the works done by contract after tender, or by day work?
4. How many overseers and timekeepers were employed, and what are their names?
5. What was the salary paid to overseers, timekeepers, carters and labourers?

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

1. $10,150 in 1907-8.
2. Amount expended, $10,260.34.
3. Day labour.
4. Mr. Napoleon Pouliot was overseer. Mr. Joseph Bouthilette, an assistant in the office of the resident engineer at Quebec, was also superintending the work for a considerable portion of the time. The time was kept by the foreman.
5. Mr. Pouliot was paid $2.50 per day and Mr. Bouthilette $3. The wages paid to carters was $2.50 and to labourers $1.50 per day.

THE PEAT INDUSTRY.

Mr. DESJARDINS—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Did the government send Mr. Erik Nystrom, a mining engineer, or any other person, to Europe to study the peat industry?
2. If so, has a report been made thereon and will such report be distributed to the members?
3. If so, when will such distribution take place?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes. Mr. Nystrom last summer investigated the peat industries of Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Germany, Holland and Ireland.
2. The report is now in course of preparation.
3. It is hoped that it will be ready for distribution in about two months.

CLAIM OF FRANK MARCOUN.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

Has a commission been issued by the Department of Inland Revenue to Dr. John A. Smith, collector of customs, Windsor, to deal with the settlement of the claim of Frank Marcoun, formerly a clerk in the Walkerville inland revenue office?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN. No.

RUSCOMB RIVER WORKS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Has the Department of Public Works entered into the project or contract of deepening the Ruscomb river for the purpose of navigation?
2. What is the estimated cost of the work?
3. What was the engineer's report on the project, and who was the engineer?

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

1. No contract has yet been entered into.
2. Work will probably cost $6,000.
3. Mr. Lamb, engineer in charge, reports that if the river from its mouth to St. Joachim was dredged to a depth sufficient to permit navigation with large draught scows, a large amount of materials would be brought in, principally lumber, stone, fuel and different building materials, and that owing to St. Joachim being off the railway line, such an improvement would also be of particular benefit to the shipping of the products of the surrounding districts. The engineer in charge suggests that the dredging at the mouth of the river be not begun until the clearing of the river be-

tween its mouth and St. Joachim is proceeded with, as otherwise the channel would be practically of no service.

PURCHASE OF RIFLES, OTHER THAN ROSS RIFLES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked :

1. How many rifles of military pattern, other than the Ross rifle, have been purchased by the Department of Militia and Defence since the signing of the contract with the Ross Rifle Company?

2. Where were these rifles purchased and at what cost?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

1. Lee-Enfield rifles.

2. (a) From the war department, made in the Royal Small Arms factory. (b) These rifles (short Lee-Enfield) cost, approximately, $24 each, laid down in the department here, duty free. Ordnance factory cost does not include rent of land, interest on capital, or other trade charges and risks, not incurred in government manufacture.

Rifles purchased from the trade would cost, according to an estimate of the British government, about 44 per cent more in England than those made in the Royal Small Arms factory. About half the rifles for the War Department and India are purchased from the trade.

P. E. I. RAILWAY—COMPLAINTS MADE.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked :

1. What demands were made upon the Department of Railways and Canals by a conference of the Board of Trade of Prince Edward Island last spring at which Deputy Minister Butler and the Intercolonial officials assisted?

2. Was any encouragement given by the Deputy Minister of redress from excessive charges and conditions on the Prince Edward Island Railway and its outlets and inlets?

3. Has anything been done to remedy the grievances exposed and admitted?

4. If so, what?

5. If not, why not?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. A memorial was submitted setting forth a number of things which the board of trade desired.

2. The deputy minister promised to report the facts to the government and this was done.

3. A number of the difficulties complained of have been remedied.

4. Too voluminous to answer in the form of a question.

5. Answered by No. 4.

P. E. I. RAILWAY—TIME-TABLE.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked :

1. Does the Minister of Railways and Canals know that a time-table, against which the whole province of Prince Edward Island has protested, and which is considered entirely unsatisfactory, was operated last winter in that province and is advertised to be operated again this winter?

2. Does the minister intend, in the face of this general opposition, to force such winter time-table on the province, or remove it as was asked for last winter by an indignation meeting at the capital?

3. How does any such treatment of an isolated province of the confederation square with the recently announced policy of the minister, promising efficiency of public service, as well as economic administration?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). My hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin, Queens) can hardly expect me to answer this question in the form in which it is—a mass of allegations and arguments rather than a plain question.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Well, leave the argument out.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is for the hon. gentleman to do in asking the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is really out of order in its present form.

IMPORTS FROM FRANCE.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. What is the value of imports from France for each year during the past five years?

2. Of this amount, what proportion has been imported direct from France to Canada?

3. What proportion has been brought to Canada through British or continental ports?

4. What proportion has been brought to Canada through United States ports?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The value of imports (for consumption) from France to Canada is :

$6,580,029 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903 ; $6,206,525 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1904 ; $7,059,139 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905 ; $7,667,987 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906 ; $6,699,412 for nine months ended March 31, 1907.

2. These imports have all been consigned direct from France to Canada as through shipments, but a portion of them has been carried 'in transitu' through other countries.

3 and 4. The tables of trade and navigation do not show what proportion of these imports have been brought into Canada through British, Continental or United States ports. We could not get this information without going back to the original documents, which would involve a large amount of labour, which, I think, perhaps, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) would not ask us to undertake. But, if he feels that the information is really necessary, we will try to get it for him, but it will take time.

Mr. DANIEL. Could the minister furnish the amounts brought in each year directly by the Canadian-France line, since that line went into operation ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

TOWN SITE PROPERTY, SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 10, RANGE 4, EAST OF FIRST.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Has the government had any application from, or negotiation with, any person or persons respecting the construction of a post office or other public buildings at a town site in section 32, township 10, range 4, east of the first meridian, province of Manitoba?
2. If so, who are such persons?
3. Has there been correspondence on such subject, and with whom?
4. Has there been application to the government to do any drainage or other work at such town site? If so, by whom, and what was the nature of the work?
5. Has the government made any inquiry as to the probable cost of such drainage, or other work and with what result?
6. Has the government given any and what answer or promise, on the subject or is it still under the government's consideration?
7. So far as the government is aware, who are the persons interested in the town site property?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The subject-matter of this question would properly belong to the Public Works Department, but there are no applications or correspondence relating thereto in the department.

RIFLE ACCIDENT AT EASTMAN, QUEBEC.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Crocket—asked :

1. Did an accident occur at Eastman, Quebec, in October, 1907, during a rifle match between exponents of the Lee-Enfield and the Ross rifles?
2. If so, what was the nature of the accident?
3. By what rifle was the accident caused, and who was the party injured?
4. Was a board of inquiry held? If so, what was the finding of the board?

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

1. Yes, on the 2nd October, 1907. The evidence does not say anything about a comparison between Lee-Enfield and Ross rifles.
2. Firing of the cartridge on closing of breech and explosion of receiver.
3. Mark 1, No. E. 923 (Ross rifle). Mr. Peabody and Captain J. T. Scale.
4. Yes. The board reports that, from the evidence so far adduced, it is impossible to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the immediate cause of the accident, and recommends that all the broken parts, exhibits and proceedings be sent to experts for their examination and report.

Since this answer was prepared, the Master General of Ordnance, Brig. General Cotton, has informed me that the rifle to which the accident occurred had undoubtedly been tampered with by filing the cocking piece, &c. He also handed me a telegram just received from Major Pym, inspector of small arms, which reads as follows :—

Quebec, January 11, 1908.

Master General of the Ordnance,
Militia Department, Ottawa, Ontario.

Investigation by Mr. Barnes and myself in the Eastman accident shows that the cooking piece has been rendered defective and could have fired the cartridge on closing the bolt. This has been repeated in other rifles using the same bolt. There is not a sign of obstruction in barrel having caused the explosion. Experiments to test strength of material not yet complete. Hope in a week.

MAJOR PYM.

SHIPMENTS OF DOG-FISH SCRAP.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Did the government make any shipments of 'Dog-fish scrap' from their works at Canso to parties in the United States? If so, when and to whom?
2. Was the shipment sold by the ton or by the proportion of fertilizing matter, or how otherwise?
3. What amount was received by the government from the shipment?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes. To Messrs. Harvey & Outerbridge, 11 Broadway, New York, in September and October, 1907, who make the best offer which the department could obtain at the time from either the United States or Canada.
2. On the proportion of fertilizing matter.
3. $9,587.43 net.

MR. W. A. TEMPLE.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What appointment is held by W. A. Temple, Yukon, when was he appointed, what is his salary and expenses yearly, and what are the duties he is supposed to perform?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. W. A. Temple is not an employee of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Temple entered the service of the department in August, 1903, being placed in charge of certain machinery, including diamond drills, acquired for the purpose of encouraging prospecting operations in the Yukon Territory. Up to the first of July, 1904, he received a salary of $350 per month, which included living allowance. From the first of July, 1904, to the 17th of December following, he received a salary of the rate of $200 per month and $1,000 a year living allowance. From the first of January, 1905, to the 30th of June following, when

his services terminated, he received a salary at the rate of $200 per month and a living allowance of $100 per month.

YUKON—WHISKY PERMIT AGENTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Who are the whisky permit agents for the various districts of the Yukon, and what is the salary attached in each case?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Section 6 of an ordinance enacted by His Excellency in Council dated the 22nd of June, 1904, provides that the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory may appoint, prescribe the duties, and fix the salary of a chief preventive officer, and of such other officers and assistants as he considers necessary for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the ordinance, but the salaries and expenses of such chief preventive officer and other officers and assistants shall be paid from the local revenue of the said territory. As the agents referred to are employees of the territorial government the information asked for is not of record in the Department of the Interior, but the Commissioner of the Territory has been asked to furnish this information at an early date.

MR. W. C. YOUNG.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What were the charges preferred against W. C. Young, mining inspector, of Clear Creek, Yukon?
2. What inquiry was made therein, and with what result?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Mr. W. C. Young was charged with having, while mining inspector for the Clear Creek mining district in the Yukon Territory, acquired large mining interests in that district.

2. An investigation into the charges preferred against Mr. Young was held by Mr. F. X. Gosselin, assistant gold commissioner, under instructions from the Minister of the Interior, and the conclusion arrived at was these charges must be dismissed and Mr. Young reinstated in his office of mining recorder for the district mentioned. Mr. Young subsequently tendered his resignation which was accepted.

TIMBER LICENSES IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. How many timber licenses are in force now in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?
2. How many of the current licenses are renewals of licenses issued originally prior to July, 1896?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 367.
2. 56.

Mr. OLIVER.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

How much money has been expended by the Canadian government up to the present time in connection with hydrographic surveys, and the amounts so spent each year, with details?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The last part of the hon. gentleman's question would require a notice of motion, but I am ready to give information as to the first part.

Mr. MACDONELL. Answer the question as far as you can.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount expended up to the present time is $1,154,352.

EXPENDITURES IN THE YUKON.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. When this question was asked:

What was the total Dominion revenue and consolidated fund expenses, and capital expenses in the Yukon, from March 31, to June 30, 1907——

I was not in the House, but I understood the question stood as a notice of motion. That would not serve my purpose. I only ask for information down to the 30th of June, just three sets of figures.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am informed that the information would probably have to be obtained from several departments; therefore, it will be more convenient if the hon. gentleman will allow the question to stand at present, and I will make further inquiry.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the names of Mr. P. D. McLean and Mr. Stanfield be added to the following committees: Public Accounts, Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and Agriculture.

Motion agreed to.

NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and papers since January 1, 1900, touching the continued maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt, B.C., or relating to any efforts of the government of Canada to secure the continued maintenance of that naval station?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have no objection to this motion passing; but as I said a few minutes ago, this may be the subject of confidential negotiations for correspondence between the British government and the Canadian government. But it is probable that the contract will soon pass, and then the correspondence will be brought down. I may say to the hon. gentleman that it

will not be possible to bring down this correspondence before the contract is signed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract between the imperial government and the Canadian government for taking over these dock yards.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will of course use his own judgment with regard to that. This motion, as well as the question stated on the Order Paper, relate to the British North America Act as amended by the conditions and stipulations under which British Columbia came into the union. That is the reason I am asking the question.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing a list of the names of immigration agents appointed by the government in each county of the province of Ontario, the county in which each such agent is employed, the number of immigrants placed by each such agent, and the amounts paid to each such agent for his services and expenses. —Mr. Clements.

For a copy of all papers, accounts and correspondence, in connection with the seizure of the M. J. Wilson Cordage Company, of the city of Chatham, Ontario, by the Dominion government, in the year 1904.—Mr. Clements.

For a return showing what contracts for dredging in the St. Mary's river, Kaministiquia river, Mission river, Port Arthur harbour, Fort William harbour, and in Thunder bay, or of any of the inlets or rivers thereof, have been let during the years 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, showing also (a) the names, addresses and calling of all the tenderers in each case, (b) the amount of each tender, (c) the nature and extent of the work to be let in each case, (d) the names, addresses and calling of the successful tenderer in each case, (e) the prices at which each contract was let, (f) the nature or form of security for the due performance of the work in each case, and (g) the disposition of or change in the form of any such security after it was originally given or disposed; also, for a copy of all tenders, contracts, bonds or other securities, and of all correspondence relating or incident to all or any such tenders or contracts, including all correspondence relating to such contracts, or incident thereto, before and during the performance of the work and on file up to the date of the order for such return.—Mr. Boyce.

For a return showing all sums of money paid by the government, or any department or official thereof, during the years 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, for advertising, printing, or for any other purpose, or on any other account whatever, to the 'Sault Express,' a newspaper published at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, or to any person or persons, firm or company, for or in respect of any work done by said newspaper for the government, or any department or official thereof; also, showing what amounts, if any, are disputed and unpaid, and showing for what purposes such moneys were paid, and accounts were incurred, respectively, and by what departments, or officials of the government.—Mr. Boyce.

For a return showing the number of men and the quantity of supplies, material and mails transported on government account over the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, and the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway, with the cost of the same at current transport rates, since the beginning of the contract arrangements made with each, up to date.—Mr. Foster.

For the production of the following:—

1. A copy of the appointment of Doctor Edmond Savard, of Chicoutimi, as paymaster for the county of Chicoutimi.
2. A copy of the instructions given to him as such regarding the validity of the receipts.
3. A copy of all correspondence that took place between Doctor Edmond Savard and the Department of Public Works of Canada in regard of the St. Fulgence pier, in the county of Chicoutimi.
4. A copy of all correspondence that took place between the Auditor General and the Department of Public Works regarding the said Doctor Edmond Savard, paymaster, concerning the St. Fulgence pier.
5. A copy of all the pay-lists in connection with the said St. Fulgence pier during the period of time that the said Doctor Savard was paymaster.
6. A copy of all the pay-lists for works done to the wharfs of Chicoutimi and St. Alexis during the time that the said Doctor Savard was paymaster.—Mr. Bergeron.

For a return showing the total amount of bounties paid by the government since 1896, and the amount for each year on each article. —Mr. Clements.

For a return showing the names and residences of all fishermen in the county of Cape Breton to whom fishing bounties were paid between December 31, 1905, and January 1, 1908, together with a statement of the amount paid to each person, the date on which it was paid and the name of the officer or person by whom the sum was paid.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing all wharfs, piers, breakwaters and other public works of a similar character which have been constructed at the expense of Canada, since January 1, 1897, or for which public money has been voted or appropriated since that date, giving the amount expended or appropriated in each instance, the total cost of each such work, the estimated total cost in each case where the work has not yet been completed, the name of the place where the work is situated, the cost of annual maintenance and upkeep of each such work, and the amount of annual revenue derived therefrom in each instance.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing the population of each town, village or other place in Canada in which any public building has been erected at the expense of Canada since January 1,

1897, or for a public building in which any public money has been voted, expended or appropriated since that date, together with a statement of the amount voted, expended or appropriated in each case, the total cost of each such building, the estimated total cost of any such building not yet completed, the purpose of each such building in each instance, the cost of the annual maintenance and upkeep thereof; and so that the said statement shall show the information aforesaid by division of the said towns, villages or other places in the following classes: Those having a population not exceeding 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, 5,000, 6,000, 7,000, 8,000, 9,000, 10,000; also giving the names of all other towns and villages in Canada of each of the said classes in which no such public buildings have been erected up to the present time.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of the lease, conditions, &c., passed between the government of Canada and a company for the use of the Beauharnois canal. —Mr. Bergeron.

For a copy of all the correspondence between Mayor E. S. Wigle, of Windsor, Hon. R. F. Sutherland, A. H. Clarke and the Minister of Inland Revenue, respecting the extension of the franchise of the Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Company.—Mr. Clements.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and reports, and all leases, agreements and other documents on file in the Department of Militia and Defence relating to the leasing and the subsequent negotiations for purchase by the department of the building used for the purpose of an armoury by the 18th Field Battery at Antigonish, N.S.—Mr. W. Chisholm.

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and evidence, in respect of the trial for criminal conspiracy against certain persons in the Yukon in connection with the Dominion elections of 1904.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing all correspondence, petitions, statements, reports and papers having any relation to the claim of Mrs. Louise F. Wiley, and her infant daughter, concerning certain mining claims held by her husband in the Yukon, and which on his death without will are allowed to have come into the possession or trusteeship of Frederick Tennyson Congdon, then public administrator in the Yukon, under appointment of the Dominion government, and all correspondence, reports and papers, bearing upon Mr. Congdon's examination, defence and connection therewith. —Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all telegrams, affidavits, papers sent by and all correspondence had with Rev. John Pringle, presently of the Yukon, in connection with the condition of public matters therein and with public officials thereof, and especially in reference to one Frederick Tennyson Congdon, at one time Commissioner of the Yukon, and one Girouard, Registrar, and one Lithgow, Controller and member of the Yukon Council; and in particular letters sent by Rev. John Pringle, on or about January, 1902, and in or about January, 1905, and on or about July 31, 1907, to the premier of Canada and other ministers, detailing the condition of public matters in the Yukon and the replies thereto. Also showing what action, if any, was taken by the government in relation to the matters dealt with therein, and the reports of any commissioner appointed to investigate the charges or any part of them.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of the report made by Mr. Beddoe upon the condition of the books, accounts, &c., of the financial administration of the Yukon, and especially with reference to the condition in the public administrator's office.—Mr. Foster.

ACCESS TO ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved :

For a return laying upon the table of this House the original applications and tenders in respect of timber berths 1107, 1108 and 1171.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that any objection whatever should be raised to the passage of this resolution, the subject of which has been referred to on frequent occasions in this House. The principle involved is a very simple one. It is simply that we contend that there are certain occasions when we are entitled to access to original documents. I think it is an accepted principle of parliamentary practice that members are entitled to the fullest information upon matters which are of public concern. We who wish to investigate matters are dependent upon the government for this information. A typewritten copy of a document does not always carry the information that is desired. There are occasions, such as have occurred several times in bringing down documents to this House, where the documents do not contain all the information which we are entitled to have. Now, I think that the government can hardly take the ground that they are entitled to withhold certain documents without assuming that there is some state interest which can be invoked as a justification for denying us the privilege of access to these documents. In this case it therefore seems to me that if the government wish to refuse to members of the opposition the opportunity of examining these documents that I mention they must allege that there are grave interests at stake which make it inadvisable that these documents should be seen by members of the opposition. Last year, when a debate was about to take place in this House, a return was laid on the table of the House and several members of the opposition had an opportunity of examining it. There were certain features about that return that led them to think that it would be advisable to see the original. I, for one, called at the Department of the Interior and was shown, without the slightest hesitation by the deputy minister, the originals of the returns which had been copied. By having access to these originals I obtained certain information which was of great value in discussing the question in the House. Since that time I understand that strict orders have been given that no

member of this House shall be permitted by the Deputy Minister of the Interior to see any original documents. Therefore, the only method open to us is to ask that these original documents be laid on the table of the House in order that we may see them in that way. The members of the opposition have introduced some four or five resolutions asking for information regarding certain leases of timber areas in the Canadian Northwest. We could not secure the passing of these orders until all reference to original documents was struck out of them. We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question, because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to timber berths Nos. 1107, 1108 and 1171.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). As my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) who has just sat down, mentioned at an earlier stage of the session there appeared on the order paper certain notices for the production of original documents. When I saw those notices on the paper I referred the matter to the deputy of the department as to the practice in such cases and I beg to read to the House a report that he made to me:

Ottawa, December 6, 1907.

Memorandum.

I beg to call your attention to the fact that in the order papers of the House of Commons of the 4th instant notices of motion appear from Messrs. Lake, White and Boyce, for returns of papers respecting the granting of certain timber berths, including the original applications and tenders received and of record in the department. A notice also is given in the order paper of the 5th instant of a motion by Mr. Ames for a return of the papers respecting timber berth No. 1279, including memoranda of any description. As the production of official papers appears to be a departure from the practice which has been generally followed in the past I took occasion to make a very careful inquiry throughout the records of the department and find that original files have never been produced in the House, except on one occasion, during last session, when some of our original documents were sent over to the House and were never returned. I presume that the same have now become a part of the record of the House, instead of this department. I also consulted on the subject some of the older deputy ministers of other departments including Mr. Newcombe, the deputy minister of Justice, who has held that office since the year 1893, Mr. Parmalee, the deputy minister of Trade and Commerce, who has also held his office for the same length of time, Lieut.-Col. White, the comptroller of the Northwest Mounted Police, who has been in office since 1883, and Mr. W. J. Gerald, whose connection with the government dates back to before confederation. I may say that they none of them remember a single instance where parliament has ordered the production of original official records, and all of them expressed a strong objection to such a precedent being established.

While it has been customary in some cases, in answer to an order from special or standing committees of the House, to submit original documents for examination, such documents have never been left with committees of the House, except in the case of this department, when on one or two occasions original files were left with committees of the House, and were not returned until after considerable delay, which caused great inconvenience to the officers of the department dealing with the matter to which these papers related.

In the case of other departments I learned that while in some cases they have been required to produce original documents, such documents, as a matter of fact, never left the hands of the officers of the department submitting the same, and under the circumstances I am strongly of the opinion that this practice should be followed in future. I need not point out that, if in answer to an order of this kind, original papers were submitted to the House they would therefore become a part of its own official record, and would for ever after remain in its custody. This, in so far as the general transaction of public business is concerned, would lead to serious complications, and if the practice of calling for original documents were thereafter indulged in the result would be that the records of the department would soon be depleted.

As regards the production of memoranda or statements of facts passing between the heads of branches and the minister or deputy minister of a department, the deputy ministers whom I consulted have expresed the opinion, in which I fully concur, that these do not as a matter of fact form part of the official record, but are merely written communications which otherwise if time permitted could be conveyed verbally as between the officers concerned, and that the same can have no direct bearing upon the consideration or settlement of the cases to which they may refer. With regard to these papers, therefore, I would strongly urge that any attempt to compel the department to produce the same should be resisted.

In my opinion these notices of motion should be amended by providing for returns of copies of the documents which constitute the official record of the transaction under notice.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is that signed by?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. W. W. Cory. My hon. friend and his colleagues on the other side have seen fit to attempt to establish a precedent, which, on the best evidence I can offer to the House would absolutely prevent the proper transaction of the public business which the department concerned exists for the purpose of transacting. Under these circumstances it seems to me necessary in the public interest—the very public interest that my hon. friend alluded to; the interest of the State—that this request should not be granted. If it is necessary and in the public interest that this document should be produced in the original, as this memorandum says, what has been done

in the past may be done again. The files may be called for by a special committee, an officer of the department may bring these files before the committee, they may be examined by members of the committee in the custody and under the responsibility of the officers of the department and then be returned to the department. But to transfer the original documents from the department whose business they form an essential part of, to this House where they will only constitute a record, as has been set out very fully in this memorandum, is an infringement upon business methods which it is impossible for the department to consent to. I may say that the matter became urgent because of the fact alluded to in this memorandum, that without regard to precedent, during last session certain original documents were brought into the House and we find the department and the business of the country suffering because of the absence of these papers to-day. That was done to satisfy to the fullest extent the demand for the fullest information in regard to the matters in question. It would seem to me that when that precedent was being used to practically deplete the department of its original documents it was necessary to place the matter before the House as I have done.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The question that has been brought up in this resolution is a rather important one and the way it has been met by the Minister of the Interior does not at all take away from the importance which it has intrinsically. I suppose after all, the business of the country is the concern of the people's representatives who are the only workable mechanism that the people have at hand to transact their business. A million of voters scattered among six millions of people throughout Canada is a machinery which is too complex, too much scattered, and altogether unfitted to transact public business in an effective way. In order to get over that difficulty the machinery of elections is introduced and instead of one million or more of electors being here to transact business, it is done by 214 or 215 members. So that when we come down to this House of Commons, there is really the body that is governing this country, there is the body which votes every dollar, there is the body which directs how it is to be expended, there is the body which must know in the last analysis how every dollar has been expended and how its business has been conducted. And when the representatives of the people of this country ask to know even to the minutest detail what business has been done and how it has been done and to make examination into it, it seems to me that that, in the last analysis, must over-ride any theory or any convenience of an employee of the 214 representatives who carry on the business of the people in this House of Commons.

Mr. OLIVER.

Therefore when the minister says point blank that on the recommendation of his deputy he has come to the conclusion to refuse the demand of this House, to refuse the demands of the representatives of the people in this House for the original documents, I think he has taken a position, in which, as a minor part of the system, he throws himself athwart the real governing and determining body of the country. So that if it is the wish of the parliament or the wish of the House of Commons, to see just exactly how a document stands which came into the hands of a department by way of tender which went through by way of contract, to see the name that wrote it, to see the amount that was put within it, to scan the paper to know whether the amount of money that was stated there was ever changed in the matter of the colouring of the ink or in the matter of the figures, to see exactly what was there as it originally came in and what may have been placed there after it came in by way of interpolation or the like of that ; it seems to me that when the people demand that, the convenience of a deputy minister must step aside and he must in some way or other find means of obviating a little inconvenience or else of submitting to it in order that the people's wish should be complied with. Now, an hon. gentleman may rise and say : That is all very well but you have not yet demonstrated that the representatives of the people in parliament want it ; there are two parties in this House and you may not get this voted, and if you cannot get a majority you cannot say the House of Commons has demanded it, and therefore your reasoning falls to the ground. But if my reasoning is right on the question of principle, any one representative of the people has the right to go as far as all the representatives of the people in this House have with reference to a view of, and an examination of the documents. If not you will have an intolerable tyranny. A body of men by being in the majority might repress all examination and keep from the people every document in all the departments. It has always been recognized in this House that unless there are reasons of state that intervene the information is brought down on the call and the wish of any member of parliament who has a reasonable claim and makes it known to this House.

Now, as to the inconveniences, mountains may be easily made out of mole-hills, and I think the deputy minister has constructed such a mountain in this case. He cited one or two instances where important papers have been brought down in the original and in some way or other have been lost. But how many hundreds of thousands of original documents have passed through the hands of deputy ministers, have been used in the way of business by the House and its committees and how infinitesimally small a proportion of them have been lost. It

has even happened that in the departments themselves parts of documents have been lost, frequently important parts. Thus I think the objection urged is not an insuperable one. All proper care should be taken to see that the original documents brought down should be returned; you might even go so far as to demand that when original documents are brought to the House and laid on the table they should be inspected on the table or under the supervision of the clerk. If there is danger of loss then every precaution to prevent it should be taken. But the minister gave away the whole claim of a principle when he admitted that the committees appointed by the House have had from the time that we have had government, the undoubted right to the original documents; have exercised that right, and have carried on their investigations under the exercise of that right almost without cavil. Since I have been a member of the Public Accounts Committee, I have never heard the question raised; I have never yet seen that committee refuse to pass a motion for an order for the original documents. That is the practice, and hon. gentlemen will see in a moment that if it were not the practice it would be almost impossible for that committee to carry on its work. Unfortunately we live under a system of vicious patronage under which clerks often get and keep their offices by taking off their hats and by being sweet to those who are the dispensers of offices, and think that their future promotion and increase in salary depends on their making themselves agreeable to the people in power. It may always have been the case, it is undoubtedly so now, that many civil servants feel that the royal path to promotion and increased salary is to see that nothing is allowed to get out which would be at all a danger or menace or disagreeable to their party. Under such a system it becomes doubly necessary that the people's representatives should see the departmental files in their original form if this becomes necessary to the transaction of public business. On what ground has the minister the right to step in at this late day and say to the parliament of Canada: My deputy will be somewhat inconvenienced if these papers are brought down in the original form, and he asked me to refuse and I say to the House that I do refuse, and that the members shall not have these papers. Surely the Prime Minister will never subscribe to such a doctrine.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry to have to say that not only have I no hesitation in endorsing the doctrine laid down by my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), but if the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) permits me to say so, I am very much scandalized by the argument he has just put forward. There is no doubt whatever that every member of this House is entitled to reasonable information as to every transaction which goes on in the government offices. But, Sir, this is not a right which can be exercised simply at the caprice of any hon. member; there must be some reason for that, and the authorities in this matter are perfectly clear. I have only to quote that standard authority, recognized not only in this parliament but in every parliament where British institutions prevail, Dr. Todd, who, in his 'Parliamentary Government in England,' says:

> It is 'the rule of parliament that no papers shall be laid on the table of either House unless some sufficient reasons have been stated for their production.'

In this House members have always been given the latitude to move for papers without being asked for their reasons, it being assumed that since members move for papers they have good reason for doing so and the information is always brought down; it is never refused except upon very good reasons, which reasons it is the duty of the government to state to the House. Such a motion is never refused when it is made in the manner recognized in every parliament, that is to say that copies and not the originals are asked for. I have only again on this point to cite the authority I have just quoted. Dr. Todd says:

> When 'copies' of correspondence, &c., are moved for by private members it is customary to add 'or extracts'; leaving to ministers a discretion as to despatches which it may be advisable to lay before parliament and as to those which it may be expedient, in whole or in part, to withhold.

My hon. friend is, like myself, an old parliamentarian, and I appeal to his memory that such a motion as has been made today by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) is absolutely unprecedented. I have no recollection in my experience, until last year, of original documents ever being asked for. The hon. gentleman has stated that a contingency might arise which would call for the production of an original, but surely a reason for such a motion should be stated. The hon. gentleman said that if a document had been tampered with, if a signature had been altered or an erasure and substitution made, the original would be required. If the hon. gentleman were to allege that he has reason to believe, as a member of this House, and alleges that a certain document has been tampered with that would be a very different proposition. That is not the position of the hon. gentleman, he simply asks that the original be moved for. Why? There is an implication that something wrong has been done under such circumstances. The government is not prepared to admit that there has been anything

wrong or to presume that a fraud has been committed in any department of the government or by any party who has dealings with the government. Therefore the hon. gentleman is entitled in this, as in every other question, to have the information in the form that has always been followed in parliament. My hon. friend says that the inconvenience or convenience of any officers of the departments of the government should not stand in the way of information being given. I agree to that entirely; the convenience or inconvenience of any department is not to stand in the way of any legitimate information that is asked for being supplied. But the hon. gentleman realizes that although the inconvenience of any department is not an argument against any motion, after all there are rules and regulations that have been followed in this House as in every other public body. The departments are the custodians of the records of the government, and the hon. gentleman realizes fully that if it is competent for the hon. member for St. Antoine Division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) to move for an original document without advancing any substantial reason, it is competent for any other member to do so, and in this way the records of the department might be transferred from the departments to this House. The hon. gentleman will realize that under such circumstances it would not be possible to carry on the business of the country as it must be carried on.

The hon. gentleman realizes that under such circumstances it would not be possible to carry on the business of the country as it must be carried on. The hon. gentleman cited examples from the committees. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no parity whatever between what takes place in committees of this House and what takes place here. In committees of the House, which are appointed to investigate, the Public Accounts Committee especially, it may become necessary to have the original documents produced; it may be impossible to carry on the investigation without them. Under such circumstances it is for the committee to decide whether or not the original records should be produced. A motion for them has to be made, and the gentleman seeking information may very properly say to the committee, I cannot get the information I am seeking unless I have the original records. Under such circumstances they are not denied; but under the rule, the committee would have the same power as this House to deny such an application It is not denied, because generally the committee perceive that it is advisable in order to obtain the full information which the hon. member making the motion desires, to have the original records brought before it. But the practice is, whenever original records are moved for in a committee and are ordered to be brought down, to have them brought down by an officer of the department, who remains the custodian of them, and who takes them back to the department when the committee is done with them. But the hon. gentleman must agree with me that it is advisable—nay, it is necessary to the proper discharge of the duties which are entrusted to the departments of the government—that each department should be the custodian of its own records. These seem to me to be peremptory reasons why the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal should not be allowed, and why we should adhere to the practice which has been invariable in this House, as my hon. friend knows, that copies of documents are brought down and not original documents, unless cause is shown for bringing them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that information is always afforded to any member of this House who moves for a return, upon the theory that there is some good reason for the motion, although it need not be stated. A legitimate extension of that principle would entitle any member of this House who moves for original documents to have them. I see no distinction between the one case and the other. No reasons are required to be assigned in the one case; why should reasons be required to be assigned in the other case? The Prime Minister is taking an entirely different ground, in the first instance at least, from that taken by the Minister of the Interior. The Minister of the Interior puts the refusal of original documents entirely on the ground of inconvenience and danger of loss. The inconvenience and danger of loss can be entirely minimized by providing that these documents, when they come into the possession of the clerk of the House, shall not leave his possession until they are returned to the department.

Mr. OLIVER. I think I was explicit in saying that we could not carry on the business of the department if there were a general demand made for original documents and that demand were complied with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many of the demand for original documents.

Mr. OLIVER. It seems to me that the demand was becoming general, from the number of motions made for them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many of the files of the department have been asked for? I venture to say not one-tenth of one per cent, and if you look at the circumstances for one moment, you will see that there is no ground whatever for the minister's suggestion of inconvenience or danger of loss. A file is asked for by a member of this House on his responsibility as a member of this House; and, on the principle acceded to by the Prime Minister, that re-

quest should be granted unless there is some good reason set forth by the Minister of the Interior to the contrary. So far as danger or loss is concerned, that can be obviated by providing that an original document shall not leave the possession of the clerk of this House, that any member of this House who is desirous to inspect it can go to the clerk and examine it, but that neither he nor any other person shall be permitted to take that file from the possession of the clerk of this House, and at the conclusion of the session or at some earlier convenient time, it may be sent back to the department. So much for the supposed danger of loss. So far as inconvenience is concerned, if there were a general demand for all the files of the department, I could understand that it might be inconvenient, just as a general demand for copies of all the files of the department would be. The absolute impossibility of complying with such a demand would be a sufficient answer to it. But no such demand is made. The only thing asked for is that some half dozen documents from the files of the department should be brought to this House, in order that hon. members who believe that they have a perfect right to examine those documents should have an opportunity of doing so. What is the present position of affairs ? Every member on the other side of the House is permitted by the Minister of the Interior and the officers of the department to examine these files, while members on this side are refused that opportunity. Therefore one-half or two-thirds of the members of parliament have a right to inspect the public records of this country, while those who are not in sympathy with the government of the day have no such opportunity, either by having the documents brought here and placed in the possession of the clerk of the House, or by going to the department and examining the files.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him ? I wish to say that the order applies to all members of this House, whether on one side or the other

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. Minister of the Interior must regard us as extremely credulous if he expects us to believe that any such practice as that is carried out. Why, even the man Lazarus, or Leopold, or whatever his name is, had the right to go into the immigration offices in London and examine the files of this country which members of parliament, under the ruling of the Prime Minister, are not allowed to examine.

Mr. OLIVER. Since when ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was stated in evidence in 1905 or 1906, before one of the committees of this House that Mr. Lazarus not only had his office in the same building as the immigration offices in the city of London, but had the run of the files of those offices and used frequently to examine those files for the purpose of ascertaining what demands there were for immigrants to this country. That evidence was given, either orally or in a letter, I do not at present member which, before a committee of this House.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend know whether Mr. Lazarus is able to examine these files now or not ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether the minister has been constrained into making a change in that regard or not. I do know that the man who permitted that to be done, and whose conduct the Minister of the Interior promised to investigate—promised to one of his supporters in this House—has been retained in the service of this government and promoted to another department, although the evidence was plain and distinct and clear, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that he had been carrying on a propaganda in the city of London against the express public orders of this government, although we do not know how far it may have had the sanction of this government by private instructions. The result is that under the practice, which at one time at least was carried on in the immigration offices in the city of London, this man conducting a private business enterprise, with the assent of Mr. Preston, although against the public policy of the government as expressed over and over again in this country, was permitted to examine the original public files of this government, which no member of parliament is permitted to do, under the ruling of the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior. And it seems a remarkable condition of affairs, under a Liberal administration, that to this man Lazarus is conceded greater power than the representatives of the people of Canada in parliament assembled. For that is the real issue that has been placed before the House by the Prime Minister. There is no inconvenience in carrying out what has been advocated by the hon. member for St. Antoine—no more inconvenience than is entailed by the demand upon the government for the production of copies of documents. There is no danger of loss under the conditions to which I have alluded. The action of the government in refusing the motion can be attributed to only one reason, that there are upon the orginal files of the public documents of this country entries which these gentlemen do not wish disclosed. There is no doubt about that. It would never have been known to the parliament of this country that a certain report had been altered by one of the departments of this government, that clauses not very favourable to the administration had been deliberately struck out of that report, unless we had

happened to procure, before a committee of the House, the production of one of the original files of the department. When the Prime Minister declares that before these original documents can be produced it must be stated, upon the knowledge of some member, that there is good reason to suspect something wrong, does not he understand the position which he is taking? He is taking the position that we ought to know that which we cannot possibly know until these files are brought down. If there is nothing to withhold, why is there any reluctance to produce these files? It can only be attributed to one reason—that there are on the public files of this country and in the public documents entries which the Prime Minister, the Minister of the Interior and the cabinet as a whole do not want disclosed to the people. I for one do not for a moment subscribe to the doctrine enunciated by the Prime Minister. He declares that a committee of this House should and does possess greater powers than this House as a whole—that a committee may send to any department and ask for the production of the original documents in any particular case, but that this House may not do so. The committee derives the only authority it possesses from this House, and it is a new doctrine to me that the agent, the delegate, the servant of this House—which that committee is, subject at all times to the jurisdiction and superintendence of the House—possesses powers in this regard that are not possessed by the House itself. There can be no good reason assigned for that, and I venture to think that the right hon. gentleman is departing from the principles of our government, departing altogether from the principle of affording to the people's representatives in parliament every possible information respecting public affairs, when he sees fit to assent, as he has done, to the doctrine laid down by the Minister of the Interior. His action will bring suspicion into the minds of all classes of people in this country and into the minds of the people's representatives in parliament that this department, the administration of which has excited a good deal of criticism of recent years, is connected with matters which the right hon. gentleman, for reasons best known to himself, desires to conceal from the people. For my part, I think the motion of my hon. friend from St. Antoine is a proper motion, and one which, within a reasonable limit, should be conceded by the government. And this motion is so far within reasonable limits that I am prepared for my part, to give it my support.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). One would think from the address of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that he was discussing some resolution asking for papers in regard to which there was some suspicion or charge of wrong doing. But, as I understand the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), he moved this resolution as an academic resolution pure and simple. He made no charges of suspicion ; he did not say that he had any suspicion in regard to the documents—

Mr. BERGERON. Why should he ?

Mr. LANCASTER. How could he tell until he sees the documents?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Suspicions are roused, charges are made, and if it were not for that there would be no trials in courts of justice and no call for documents, which, frequently, are not seen before you go into the trial in the court. And to speak of the action of this man Lazarus is merely to attempt to draw a red herring across the scent; it is an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the people. What have we to do in relation to this matter with what a man named Lazarus in London may or may not have done? The question is not whether Lazarus did right or did wrong. The question is a mere academic discussion whether original state papers should be placed on the table of the House of Commons. Surely the leader of the opposition does not mean—

Mr. FOSTER. Are these state papers?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I certainly say they are.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Undoubtedly so. Everything in the possession of the government is a state paper.

Some hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Hon. gentlemen opposite may shake their heads as much as they like. They will find if ever they go into a court of justice and ask for the production of documents in charge of the government, and a minister of the Crown chooses to say I refuse to produce these papers for state reasons, no court of justice will order those documents to be produced.

Mr. SPROULE. It is different with the high court of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no such general rule as the hon. gentleman (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) has laid down.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I say there is. I have heard that rule laid down by eminent judges.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It must be grounded upon reasons of state, and not merely upon the fact that these are state papers.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Exactly what I said, and the hon. gentleman knows it full well. And again he is trying to draw a red herring across the scent, or else he did not listen to my words. I said that if in court a minister of the Crown states

that he refuses to produce papers for State reasons——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman did not listen, or he would have heard what I said. My words are on record in 'Hansard.' I said that if in a court a minister of the Crown says that for State reasons he refuses to produce public documents called for, no court would order him to produce them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understoood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) to state that the mere fact that these were papers in charge of a department of government was sufficient reason for withholding them.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) misunderstood me. He did not catch my words.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the argument has no relevancy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to like what I am saying. I quite understand that, because my argument is a complete answer to the position they are taking here to-day. Now, as I was saying, what a man named Lazarus, in London, may or may not have done, and whether he had or had not the right to do what he did, has nothing to do with the resolution before the House, and can only have been introduced into the argument for the purpose of throwing dust into the eyes of the people, and blinding the real issue involved in this motion. It is said that this resolution asks for only three, or four, or five, or six, files of the department, an infinitesimal number as compared with those in the possession of the department. But admit the principle that these papers, upon a resolution—a mere academic discussion—are to be placed upon the table of this House, and what is to prevent any member from asking for a dozen or a hundred files from various departments? And if the argument of the hon. gentleman is correct, how could such a demand be refused? There would be no right to refuse it. Grant the principle and the conclusion is so obvious that it is not necessary to argue it. Unless some suspicion is alleged to exist that documents have been altered, or that there is something wrong, there is no reason for asking for original documents. Surely the copies should be sufficient. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) alleges that by allowing these documents to be produced in committee we concede to the committee power to do that which the House cannot do. Why, that occurs frequently. The House, for instance, never thinks of taking up the trial of matters pertaining to elections—that is referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SPROULE. By what authority ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The House of Commons gives the authority, it delegates the committee to summon witnesses to bring documents. The House has done it and the House does it, deeming it a more convenient mode and a better system for getting original documents. Take almost any committee, take the Public Accounts Committee ; there this House has created a certain machinery, power is given by this House to that committee. It does not order those original papers to be produced, but it orders and subpœnas witnesses with those original papers, the depositary of the papers generally being a deputy head. I suppose the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has been a member of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I have, and if you take the motions as there recorded you will find that in five cases out of ten the orders for papers are not accompanied with subpœnas to witnesses to produce them.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I think the hon. gentleman will find that my experience is correct until, possibly, up to this session, at all events, that the motions have been for copies, that if you want to see the originals you order direct or summon the deputy head or some member of the department to bring the originals. I know one or two instances where that was done. Anyway, that is the machinery adopted, and I submit to this House that it is the practice that ought to be adopted. It has reason in it and sound common sense. If you want original documents, subpœna the officer having custody of these documens, and he brings them here, lets you inspect them. You have the fullest right of inspection, and that officer is responsible for those documents and must take care of them. I say that is the machinery this House has created, and it is the practice that has been adopted. If that is so, why should we reverse the practice ? No doubt, originals of State papers are not produced as a rule. The originals can be refused production by the minister simply stating that for State reasons he will not produce them. Now are we going to reverse that practice in an academic discussion of this question ? The hon. gentleman says he has no charges to make in regard to those documents but he wants a test question decided whether we should order the production of original documents in all cases or not. If you pass this resolution you would give the right to any member to ask for the production of as many files as he pleases.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Suppose you brought all thr files from the various departments and laid them on the table—why the notion is ridiculous, it is absurd, and only needs to be stated to refute itself. You could not carry on the business of the country if that practice prevailed.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is evident that the hon. member (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) has not been as long in this House as some other members of it, or else his memory of the recent past is very poor. If he had been here longer or had been a reader of the public press he would be aware of the fact that an almost similar question was debated at great length by supporters of the party whom the hon. gentleman supports to-day. In the long inquiry in 1891 over the Connolly-McGreevy case, a refusal was made to bring documents and put them in possession of the committee because they were personal to the witness, and every decision of that committee was that they be produced. When that committee required more authority they applied to the House of Commons and got it. I remember seeing these accounts being brought in to the committee, they were in a strong box bound with a logging chain. The answer of the witness was, I am advised by my solicitor that these things are private matters and cannot be put before the Committee. What was Sir John Thompson's reply? The order of the House is that these documents be placed before this committee—and they were immediately placed before that committee. There was no refusal after that. Now, whenever the committee wanted authority, from what source did it get its authority? it got it from this House. Therefore the authority of this House must be greater than that of any committee. Then by the same reasoning, when you go into that Public Accounts Committee you order these documents, not by subpœna, but by the mere order of the committee that the officials be ordered to appear before that committee and bring with them the original documents. These are placed in the possession of the committee, and any member has a right to examine them. Is there any objection to that? The documents remain in possession of that committee sometimes for months. It is true, they are under the care of the clerk of the committee, but any member of this House has access to them at any time. Now would it not be a very inconvenient practice if, as we have found it to be the case, some of the members of this House can go into the department here and examine original documents while members of the other side of the House, when they go there, are refused by the officials? That has happened over and over again. It is not only inconvenient but is improper. What is available to one member of this House ought to be available to every member. All parliamentary procedure and practice support that contention. That has been the practice from time immemorial, as long as I have had any remembrance of what has taken place in this House. In Bourinot there are certain things stated that members of this House cannot expect to see. Here are some of them: When an investigation is going on, or State negotiations are going on, these may be kept private until they are completed, or for State reasons they may be refused. But the responsible minister of the Crown who answers the questions says that for state reasons, not for private reasons, he cannot produce them. Another answer is that they are confidential, and when a minister of the Crown declares they are confidential then the House has no right to inspect those documents. Another case is in regard to engineers' estimates; it is not considered desirable that they should be made public because other parties may desire to tender on the same contract, and the government does not wish to give out the information in its possession with regard to the cost until the contract is made. Or there may be considerations of public policy. The government may regard the production an interference with public policy, and for State reasons may refuse the documents. In that case they are bound to assume the responsibility of the refusal, and every member of this House must accept the refusal, so far as it is not inconsistent with the practice of this House or of the British parliament. But on the other hand, after a contract is given, the original tenders may be produced, and any letters in connection therewith. The correspondence or the originals thereof are always produced, and so far as I remember the House has never refused to produce them. All accounts are produced from year to year before the Public Accounts Committee and other committees, not copies of the accounts, but the originals themselves, and the original correspondence in connection with them. We have found in some cases that accounts were mutilated, and how could we know that unless we had a right to examine the originals? Now, Mr. Bourinot has set out certain things that should be refused. He goes on to say:

> The right of a member to obtain every information from the government within the limits previously described, is so undoubted that it seems almost beyond the power of a minister to keep the practice within narrow bounds

It is so undoubted it is accepted by common consent by the English parliament and by the parliament of Canada, that if a minister refuses he gives grounds for his refusal and these grounds must be not his own mere whim but they must be in accordance with the practice in the British or Canadian parliament and he must justify

it on these grounds. Every member of this House, in the interest of his country and for the purpose of discharging the duty he owes to his country and to the constituents that sent him here, has the right to see all these documents if they are not refused him for the reasons that I have given as well as others which are set forth at length and if they are not refused on these grounds the government has the right to produce the originals of all documents for the perusal of any member of this House, because, unless this is done, he cannot discharge his duty to his constituents and his duty to the country as it was expected he would do when he was elected a member of this parliament.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR, (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, the question which is now before the House is certainly a very important one and deserves a great deal of consideration because the proposal involves a departure from the practice which has been followed so far not only by this parliament, but by the British parliament also. It has always been the practice here that members of the House had the right to ask for papers and documents in connection with the public administration. In England as well as here the practice has been that copies of these papers and documents in connection with public administration should be brought down before the House, but I think this is the first time the question has been brought before parliament as to whether not only the copies, but also the originals should be brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I can point to several instances where the original documents were produced and not copies.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before the House

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware of any such documents having been brought down. I know that the parliamentary practice which has always been followed here and in England is that all copies of papers concerning the public administration have to be brought down. What is the reason for that? It is a question not only of convenience, but it is a question of public interest. The administration of a department requires that all papers in connection with the administration should be in the hands of the department. Once you depart from that rule you are exposed to having your papers which you require in the administration of the department in the hands of some other party over whom you have no control. It has been stated by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that these papers could be returned. Of course, if that were correct it would be a very strong argument, but these papers cannot be returned. Once papers have been brought before parliament they become part of the records of the House. There are the records of the department and there are the records of the House. The records of the House are composed mostly of documents of which the originals are in the department. Once these papers are brought before the House, what becomes of them? I have the right to-day to go to the clerk of the House and ask him what papers have been brought before parliament since 1867. He has no right to part with those records or files.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think there is a very simple answer to my hon. friend's argument and it is that the House which has power to order the papers has also power to send them back.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, once the papers are brought down here they are in possession of the clerk and they are parts of our records. You could not depart from that principle. I do not say that there are not exceptional cases where papers could not be brought down. Suppose a copy of a document has been brought before the House; it is alleged that the document is not correct, it is alleged that the signature or the certificate which is at the bottom of this document is not correct. Then, what would happen. It would be a question for the Privileges and Election Committee to inquire into. It would be an infringement of one of the privileges of the House if it were found that a paper produced were not a true copy of a document which lies in the department. In that case the matter could be referred to the Privileges and Elections Committee and there it could be properly investigated. Now, reference has been made to the fact that in the Public Accounts Committee the originals of documents have been brought down. It is true. But, how are they brought down? They are brought down by officers of the department who come with the documents and lay them before the Public Accounts Committee. The regular procedure would be that they would take back these documents with them and simply leave copies. If these copies were not genuine then the originals might be ordered to be brought down. In order to expedite business the originals are sometimes brought down by a clerk or the deputy minister of the department who is responsible for the safe-keeping of these documents. He might leave them in the hands of the committee, but he does not dispossess himself of the documents. The great objection that there is to the proposal which is made is that the department could dispossess itself of these documents and it would be a very serious difficulty in the administration of the department. I remember some years ago, that a file connected with my department was placed before the Public Accounts Com-

mittee. One of these documents was lost and we have not been able so far to find that document. It is a very serious thing in the administration of the department to be deprived of a file in regard to which the policy of the department has been established. It is the right of the House to have copies of documents in connection with the public administration and if it is alleged in some cases or if it is suspected that the copies are not proper copies of the originals the matter can be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in order to be investigated and in order that witnesses may be summoned to produce those documents before that committee. The same thing is being done before the Public Accounts Committee. I think, for these reasons, it would be a very serious departure from the practice which has been followed so far if we were to take upon ourselves to order that the originals should be brought down before the House and be handed over to the clerk of the House instead of being kept in the hands of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the motion in the Public Accounts Committee usually that the originals be placed before the committee and they are placed before the committee ? They remain there sometimes for weeks.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend fairly stated the case a few minutes ago when he said that an officer of the department was ordered to bring down these documents.

Mr. SPROULE. No, no.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the way the hon. gentleman stated the case a few minutes ago and that is the way it is generally done. But, I say it is a very dangerous practice and if it is dangerous in the Public Accounts Committee when the papers are simply placed in the hands of one person, it is still more dangerous that these papers should be handed over to a person who is obliged to keep these records not only for one month, not only for one year, but for all time.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding the danger it is done all the same.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Were this a question where the expenditure of public moneys was involved there might perhaps not be any necessity for the motion, because where it is a question of the expenditure of public moneys we have the Public Accounts Committee to go to: But, this is a case where you have not that opportunity. There is no public expenditure of money here at all. For that reason you can never ask for the production of these documents before such committee. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) just now said: Take this case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. What in the name of all that is good has this got to do with the Committee on Privileges and Elections? If the Minister of Marine can explain even to his own satisfaction how such a matter as this could be brought before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I will give him an opportunity to do so at once, but I think I am right in saying that this question has nothing whatever to do with that committee. This matter arises in connection with a department, which on the theory that a burned child dreads the fire, is anxious to suppress everything. I am not speaking personally of the present minister. He came into the department and found it reeking with wrong doing; it has not quite ceased perhaps since he has been there. When anything has been stirred up with regard to that department, what has been the result? Had not the original papers been seen in the case of the H. P. Brown lease it would have gone to the country that that was a perfectly straight deal, that a man named Brown had a lease and that he got it renewed year in and year out. But my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) saw from the original papers that the signature was not that of H. P. Brown at all, but that of the friend and old business partner of the ex-Minister of the Interior, McGregor, an ex-livery stable keeper from Brandon. The minister (Mr. Oliver) will admit that.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the return as brought down showed the signature, 'H. P. Brown, per J.D.M.'

Mr. BENNETT. But it did not say that 'J.D.M.' was the friend of the ex-Minister of the Interior, the ex-livery stable keeper from Brandon, and anyway how many 'J.D. Macs.' are there in Canada? No one would think, that clever and skilled as Mr. McGregor was in the machinations and internal workings of the Interior Department, he had gone to work and signed, without authority, I will be bound to say were the truth known, the name of H. P. Brown. But the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has been a sinner in this respect. I remember that one night I was discussing a question in reference to the Indian Department, and the political head 'pro tem' of that department, Mr. Pedley, resurrected a communication of mine which was nearly twenty years old, and with a great flourish of trumpets the minister produced the original in this House and wanted to know if I would dare deny my signature. When it suits the minister he can produce original documents. And again, when there was a question of liquor permits going into the Northwest, his predecessor in office flourished some original applications before the House from members of parliament who had asked for some trifling liquor permits where large bodies of men were going into the Yukon. The minister now tells us that in future he will not allow

any gentleman on his side of the House to see original papers.

Mr. FOSTER. On that side?

Mr. BENNETT. Or on this side either. The public will take the statement of the minister for what it is worth and some will believe it but some will not. Why, the very essence of a trial is the production of original papers. Who is to know that the clerk makes an honest copy; often the very dates are important in the chain of evidence, and let advice be given to a clerk to change a date and the whole chain of evidence would be interrupted. As was pointed out, by the leader of the opposition, if this House has the power to have a document produced, it has the power to order its return. Why, I have seen plans laid on the table and specifications and all sorts of things and they have never been placed in the custody of the House; the minister has displayed them on the table, and when the House was done with them the minister took them away. There is another case that might be suggested and that is with reference to the North Atlantic Trading Company. There was an expenditure of public money in that case and we were able to get the original papers before the Public Accounts Committee, and we saw that the signatures to a certain document had been torn off and we were able to show to the people of the country that this was a fact. But if a faithful political henchman were asked to make a copy of that document he could have added names on the copies as well. The trouble with the Minister of the Interior is that he is commencing to find out the slumbering lions of that department; he knows he cannot get them out of the road. Look at what has been done in that department to suppress the truth and keep the public from knowing what is going on. There was a deputy minister in that department who was paid a salary of $3,500 a year by by the people of the country, and with a promise of superannuation ahead of him at the end of ten years of office. And in the case of books bought by the people of Canada, in the case of letter books owned by the people of Canada, when these letter books containing information valuable to the public were asked for, Mr. Smart blandly told the committee that he destroyed them before he left the office.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he destroy State papers?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, State papers as the member for North Simcoe would say. He burned up the State papers of the country, and I have no doubt that when Mr. Smart came outside hon. gentlemen opposite congratulated him and said: That was clever of you to burn up the documents so that the opposition cannot see what may have happened. Look at the dilemma the Minister of the Interior is in. Suppose we ask for letter books from that department it will never do to burn up these letter books now because they may contain a number of other letters as well as those we want, and letters cannot be torn out because the pages are numbered, and the crime would be detected at once. The minister can only tackle the bull by the horns; he cannot repeat what Mr. Smart did, it won't do to burn up letter books because these books contain other letters, and it won't do to tear out sheets because that would be detected and be prima facie evidence of wrong doing. And so the only thing left to do is to call on the majority to vote down this resolution and prevent inquiry. I hope my hon. friend will divide the House on this question. The government may call on its majority to vote it down, but the people of Canada will take these gentlemen at their own measure and they will award just punishment to those who refuse information to the representatives of the people. I believe that in the Department of the Interior, from some little things I have known, there are many cases more infamous than the so-called Brown lease case. These gentlemen opposite know full well that we cannot get these papers before the Public Accounts Committee because there has been no expenditure of money in connection therewith.

We are asking no favours in the Public Accounts Committee; we want none, we have rights there. In that committee we can go into every dollar of expenditure. Talk about original bills being brought there as a matter of favour! they are brought there as a matter of right Only last session, in an inquiry about the Collingwood dry docks, one of the most important documents was an innocent little half sheet of note paper which was placed in between two other communications and I believe that had its presence been known it would have been torn off the file as many other documents had been. It was evident that letters had been removed from the file as the corner through which the brad had gone had not been removed with the body of the letter. This is the case in all the committees. The government can only suppress or refuse the production of documents where the expenditure of public money is not involved, by means of a vote in this House, and that a vote in this House will prevent it in this instance I am perfectly sure. Had the minister known that H. P. Brown had never signed that document, but that it had been signed by McGregor who had no right to sign it, it would never have been seen by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames). The minister will have it voted down but the public will have their suspicions. When they see that the majority in this House prevent the minority from seeing public documents the public will suspect that such permission would not be

refused without some reason. This will engender suspicion in the public mind. The Prime Minister cited Todd to the effect that papers should not be brought down unless sufficient reasons are given. Is any hon. gentleman going to ask for the production of a document in the department on the ground that he believes it bears a forged signature? He will have no authority to make such a statement as the information will have been given to him from some outside party, and no one on this side would make the statement that the signature was forged and that that was why he wished to see the document. In any court of law such documents can be seen not only at the trial but before the trial and yet the highest court, parliament, is by virtue of the might of the majority to say that the opposition in the House of Commons shall never be allowed to see the documents unless they can show that there is something in connection with them necessitating the expenditure of public money. Once again, we ask no favours where the expenditure of public money is concerned, because we have the Public Accounts Committee but in a case of this kind where granting of millions of acres of land is involved, as the grant to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company or the granting of tens of thousands of acres of timber lands as has been done in many cases, the public will justly wonder why the government by the force of their majority say that the minority in parliament must never see these documents.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, as has been stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) this is an important question. But it is not, as was intimated by him, exactly a new question. The difficulty seems to me to begin in the refusal of some departments of the government to allow members of the House to have access, for the purposes of examination, to the papers on the departmental files. I lay it down as a fundamental principle, subject to no exception except good state reasons, that it is an absolute privilege and right of every member of this House to go into the departments of the government and without any allegation of wrong doing or any suspicion that any wrong doing has taken place, to examine the papers on file. It is an undoubted privilege in all public matters, that the people of the country have the right, subject to the ordinary convenience of carrying on the departments, to go in as a matter of course and examine these documents and see that they are correct. It is not necessary that we should allege that there has been wrong doing; it is not necessary even to suspect that there has been some wrongdoing. One hon. gentleman suggests that virtually we should lay an information and institute a prosecution, alleging upon suspicion that the government has been guilty of fraud, before we can see the papers. I do not say that we might not be justified to some extent in believing that from things that have taken place. I contend that, just as an auditor about to audit public accounts has a right to call for the original documents and satisfy himself that all is regular and honest, so we, as representing the people of Canada, have the right to go individually into all the departments of the government when we have occasion and ask to see the public documents on record, and these documents should not be refused us unless there are good state reasons that can be alleged for their non-production. If this had been done, there would be no trouble here to-day. My hon. friend who moved this motion, (Mr. Ames) last year had the right and was accorded the privilege of going into this very department and examining at his will all the public documents he wanted, to see whether they were regular or not. He found, unfortunately for the government, that everything was not regular, that everything was not right. He came upon wrongdoing of the government or its officials and so this year a new order of things prevails and for good reasons —I am not giving the reasons, but they are good reasons known to the government—they see fit now to say: We will not again run the risk of allowing that hon. gentleman to come into the department and see the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. They banged the door to.

Mr. LENNOX. They banged the door to, but some of the horses had got out last year. For that reason I take the liberty of reading a letter——

Mr. AMES. I think I would ask the permission of the Minister of the Interior before reading the letter, as it is addressed to me. Has the minister any objection to it being read?

Mr. OLIVER. What is that Mr. Speaker?

Mr. LENNOX. It is a letter from the Department of the Interior in reference to an application to see these original papers It is addressed to my hon. friend who moved this motion, (Mr. Ames) and is the reason, as I understand, for his having to make the motion.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection.

Mr. LENNOX (reading):

Ottawa, December 6, 1907.

Dear sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant, in whch you state that you are desirous of examining the original applications and tenders in connection with timber berths 824, 1062, 1107, 1108, 1171 and 1212.

In reply I beg to say that it is a rule of the department not to allow the examination of the files by others than officials of the department whose duty it is. The reasons for this rule are that if the privilege of examination of the files were permitted to one person, it could

not fairly be refused to another, and if all who might wish to so examine were permitted, the business of the department would be unduly hampered and the public interest would suffer.

By an order of the House for the production of papers the responsibility is taken off the shoulders of the department and is assumed by the House, I would suggest this means of obtaining what you want.

I understand that this is signed by Frank Oliver, as Minister of the Interior. We are told by the hon. minister that if all the members of parliament wanted to examine these files for the purpose of seeing that the public business was fairly carried on, in the interest of the people, great inconvenience would result. I guarantee that half the House at least will not want to examine them for that purpose at all; so that fact relieves him of one-half the responsibility and one-half the inconvenience. But the hon. minister says that if there were an order of the House for the production of the papers, the responsibility would be taken off the shoulders of the department and be assumed by the House. That is just what we want. We want this House of 214 members to say whether they are in favour of the people's representatives, as they formerly did, going into the departments from time to time, as occasion requires, seeing the public documents there on file, and satisfying themselves, if the evidence should be of such a nature as to satisfy them, that the government is carrying on the affairs of this country honestly and fairly, or discovering, as my hon. friend who moved this motion discovered, that they were not in all cases acting regularly; or is it the desire of this House that the people are not to know, that the administration is to carry on its affairs in the dark, and refuse members of this House the right to go into the departments and see the public documents belonging to the people of this country? I hope we will have a vote on that question. Now, I want to submit to the people of Canada, as far as it can go, that it is the right of every member of parliament, and his duty, as far as time will avail him, to examine the original records in every case in which there is any desire to know that everything is carried on regularly and fairly, in the interests of the public. Instead of this being a new question, we had it before us last session or the session before. I had occasion to go to several departments of the government. To one department in particular, the Department of Justice, I went on many occasions and examined original documents with the concurrence and approval of the Minister of Justice, the hon. gentleman who now presides as the head of the Supreme Court. But a session or so ago the hon. Minister of Agriculture, acting on that occasion in his dual capacity as Minister of War, I think, said that he would not allow it in his department, and I think that was the first intimation that we had that we would not be allowed that privilege. I claim as a member of this House the right, not for myself, but on behalf of the people I represent and on behalf of the people of Canada, to go to any department of the government and examine the public records, and I say that the government has no right to refuse them to me unless it can give good and sufficient reasons of State for withholding them for the time being. I think it is an outrage on the rights of the people of this country for the head of any department to say that members of parliament shall not be allowed to examine the public records. I was going to say a word or two about my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy), but I have matters of more importance to deal with now. I was amused at the manifest confusion in which he wound himself up in regard to reasons of State and State documents, two entirely different matters. Every public document is a document of the people, but the government has a right to allege, if it does so honestly, a reason of State for withholding a document for the time being.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Either from parliament or the courts.

Mr. LENNOX. Either from parliament or the courts; but prima facie it is the right of parliament or the courts to have possession of the document, and it is because the government alleges, presumably with honesty, and on their faith as members of parliament and cabinet ministers, that for good and sufficient reasons of State the document should not be produced, that it is refused in some instances. It is a little amusing to see the hon. member for North Simcoe come to the rescue. The coming cabinet minister always comes to the rescue of the government when it is in a tight place. I say my hon. friend is a coming cabinet minister; but I do not know whether he is even a coming re-elected member of parliament for that matter. I have been watching his course to some extent, and the evolutionary process he has gone through is rather interesting. At first he was an Independent Conservative—very independent of Conservative principles, I admit; then he became an Independent without the Conservative; and now he becomes a full-fledged Liberal without either the Independent or the Conservative. For years he stood aloof, and dared not subscribe to the Liberal platform. So long as a shred of respectability attached to the government my hon. friend stood aloof; but when all the scandas culminated around their heads, when there was hardly a shred of respectability attaching to the government's action, then he says, these are just the kind of people I like. Well, I will not waste any time over that. I want to say a word about the Minister of Marine

and Fisheries. He says that if the papers were brought down to the House, they would get out of the hands of the people that the ministry could control and get into the hands of people they could not control, that is, members of parliament. Is that undesirable ? The trouble is, as was suggested this afternoon by the hon. member for North Toronto, that there is too much control over the men who have control of the papers, and not enough control over the papers by the people themselves. The papers get into the hands of the members of parliament, the representatives of the people, and surely they could be in no better hands, speaking for this side of the House; I will not attempt to speak for the other side. And I want to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to the fact that the department need not lose control of the documents. It is perfectly absurd—if he will allow me the use of that expression; certainly it is perfectly unreasonable—to talk of the documents as though once they were in this House they would always be in this House, and never go back to the department. Where is the letter that was produced, written by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)? Is it in some gentleman's pocket? Or is it in the department from which it was extracted for the purpose of making political capital at the time? Where are the papers that are placed upon the table of this House from time to time. Why, of course, they go back to the department from which they came——

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) will permit me, original documents brought down by the minister to assist in the discussion of his estimates are not entered in the Votes and Proceedings. But, when papers are entered in the Votes and Proceedings, they become sessional papers and cannot be removed.

Mr. LENNOX. We will not draw that red herring across the trail—nor any red lines either. What I am talking about, is plain enough. Suppose we are going to put up a public building somewhere. The plans, or at least the elevations, and specifications are brought down and laid on the table for the information of hon. members. They are not kept in this House by reason of the fact that they have been brought here to be examined.

Mr BRODEUR. They are not sessional papers.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not talking about whether they are sessional papers or not. Hon. gentlemen opposite who are going to use their majority to vote down this resolution have a right to say—and nobody would object—We will bring down these documents but will stipulate that they are brought down only for the purpose of inspection and shall go back to the department from which they came. Let us face this thing as men who desire to do what is fair and square to the people of this country. We want no quibbling about the question whether these are sessional papers or not. No one wants them to be made sessional papers. This House has full control of the situation. Let it meet the situation honestly and squarely and vote that the papers be brought down with such conditions as the government sees fit to make with regard to their custody, as suggested by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Take the case suggested by my hon friend behind me, that of a divorce Bill. The moment we are done with the Bill, we pass a resolution that the evidence shou'd be returned to the Senate. We are all-powerful ; let us be all-powerful for the purpose of doing right, and not for the purpose of denying the people that for which they are fairly entitled.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) and hon. gentlemen who preceded him have stated a number of times that the country would be suspicious. The statement that these hon. gentlemen have tried to arouse suspicion is about the only reason they can give for their arguments. These hon. gentlemen belong to a party which was in power for eighteen years. When the government of that party was in power, and documents were moved for in this House, they brought down copies and only copies—not originals The point which should be distinctly understood is, that from 1867 down to the present day, the practice of parliament, when a return is moved for, is to bring down copies of the papers.

Mr. BOYCE. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) cite a case in which originals were asked for and were refused ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) is very good at asking questions. If he knows any case in which originals were asked for, and either refused or granted by his friends when in office, he can tell us about it when I get through. I want to make it clear that the one object of hon gentlemen opposite, who have tried so assiduously to make it appear that the public would be suspicious is to do what they can to arouse suspicion, as proven by the fact that they are asking for something unknown in the practice of this parliament. But my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is not satisfied with the practice of this parliament. He is not satisfied with what his friends did when in office. It has been enough for every other member of this House, from Confederation to this time, that copies of papers should be brought down. But the hon. gentleman moves for the original papers because he wants to see them. Copies will not do the hon. gentleman. He is a gentleman high and mighty, above

every person else, a gentleman whose sense of propriety is so keen that he can detect things in copies of documents that nobody else can detect. That is the only reason, I fancy, that can be given for his making this motion. Hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted from Bourinot. I think it was the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who discussed fully what Bourinot said as to limitations of the rights of the House in regard to the production of papers. Here is what Bourinot says at page 371, after dealing with the point that the House has an undoubted right to order the production of papers :

It is quite obvious, however, that no member should move for papers except on sufficient grounds. It is clearly laid down by the most eminent of English parliamentarians that it is incumbent upon the mover to state the reasons upon which his motion is founded, that the House may judge of the necessity, importance and expediency of calling for the papers which are the subject of that motion.

Now, does the minister here refuse to bring down these papers in accordance with the practice of this House ? On the contrary, he states that he is willing to bring them down. But the hon. member for St. Antoine wants to do something which the practice of this House does not warrant, and which is contrary to the dictum of the eminent authority I have just quoted. It is incumbent upon the hon. gentleman first to present a motion for papers only on sufficient grounds, and next to show the necessity, importance and expediency of this House making the order that the papers should be produced. But the hon. gentleman does not do that. He does not state that, in regard to this application or tender, there is anything to excite suspicion. He does not venture to give this House or the minister any particular reason why these applications should be produced. It is to be noticed that these are not governmental productions ; they are not orders in council or anything of that kind involving any responsibility on the part of the minister in the way of a departmental act. What the hon. gentleman asks for is that certain original applications shall be brought down. These documents do not emanate from the department; they are not made by the department. They are made by persons who come and ask that something should be done by the department. An application is made and a tender submitted ; there cannot possibly be an imputation as against the department in regard to these matters, in any respect whatever. So, all the hon. gentleman's rhetoric upon this subject is entirely beside the question. The hon. member for St. Antoine, even in regard to these original applications and tenders to which he has referred, has not ventured to suggest to the House one single reason of necessity, importance or expediency, within the rule laid down by Bourinot, why the rule of this House, which has been in force for the last forty years, should be violated to suit his own particular will. I submit, without going into arguments on the score of expediency, that the public records of this country, more especially in relation to titles to land, should be kept absolutely in the department. Let me point out, however, that where you have public records dealing with titles to timber berths, or lands, or timber in any province where titles are kept, all you get when you go to the registrar of deeds is the copy of that document as recorded.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is the original ?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend knows that except under special systems of registration the original document is not on file.

Mr. BENNETT. In Ontario it is.

Mr. LENNOX. You ask for the original in the registry office, and by paying five cents it is produced.

Mr. MACDONALD. I speak of the maritime provinces more particularly. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition can verify what I say, because he learned his practice in legal matters in that province. I say if you have to deal with that question in the province of Nova Scotia as it relates to land titles, and you go to the registry office to get information, all you can get is a copy of the document that is recorded in the books.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That depends upon what kind of a document it is. If it is a bill of sale, the original is kept on file, and you can see that at once. You cannot see the other documents because they are not there.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend refers to bills of sale. I was speaking in regard to land titles. The leader of the opposition knows that he cannot see the original deed in a registry office in the province of Nova Scotia, he can only see the copy that is recorded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because the original is not there.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend says because the original is not there, but that is not material, I was dealing simply with the practice and endeavouring to point out that the public interest is there fully served by providing for the production and inspection of copies and not originals of documents of title.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with

considerable interest to the observations which have been made on the other side of the House, especially the remarks of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), indicating as they do an evident intention on the part of the supporters of the government to extend further the restriction that is sought to be upheld here. At the last meeting of the Public Accounts Committee we had one or two hon. gentlemen who usually take the position of representing the government on that committee giving us warning that they were not going to submit in future to the production of original papers, and after some discussion amongst those who were present another gentleman came in—the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston)—who carefully announced to the committee, or warned it, that he intended to bring the question up and that he was not going to submit to orders for the production of original documents. He probably had heard of the preliminary action of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and wishing to go one better, he played the autocrat, or attempted to do so, or gave warning that he would do so in the Public Accounts Committee. It behooves us, under these circumstances, to take great care that the government does not steal a march upon the people of the country by such methods as these. I listened with, as I say, a very considerable interest to the remarks of the right hon. First Minister and really, while I always listen with great pleasure to him when he is laying down what, from his experience may be considered parliamentary procedure, I fail on this occasion to see much force in what he has said. Some stress has been laid upon Bourinot and one expression there, but the expression has been, I think, entirely drawn away from its real meaning. At page 371 of Bourinot this sentence was quoted :

It is quite obvious, however, that no member should move for papers except on sufficient grounds.

Well, I think we can all agree upon that. I should doubt that any hon. gentleman in the House would question that for a moment. I do not think any member should make any motion, however trifling it may be, without sufficient grounds. If you read the context, that is all that Bourinot means. He goes at some length into this question as to asking for papers. At page 364 he says :

Occasions may arise when the government will feel constrained to refuse certain papers on the ground that their production would be inconvenient or injurious to the public interests.

Is there anything here to show that the production of these two papers asked for by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) would be inconvenient or injurious to the public interest? There is no pretense of anything of the kind.

Consequently there are frequent cases——

He says.

——in which the ministers refuse information, especially at some stage of an investigation or negotiation; and in such instances the House will always acquiesce when sufficient reasons are given for the refusal.

Of course, the House will always acquiesce under such circumstances while the matter is under negotiation, while it is pending and the public interest requires it, and when, mark you, Mr. Speaker, sufficient reasons are given for the refusal. Who has given any sufficient reason for the refusal to produce these papers? Nobody has pretended to do so. Then he goes on :

On this account, members will sometimes consent to withdraw their motions; or in case only a part of the information sought for can be brought down, they will agree to such alterations as the minister may show to be advisable in the public interests.

Who has shown that in any degree whatever that motion should be modified in the public interest? There is no pretension of anything of the kind.

Sometimes the government may be obliged to withhold all information at the time, or they may be able to put the House in possession of only a part of the correspondence.

Is there any pretense that that applies to the case before us?

If the government objects to the production of documents on the ground that they are of a confidential nature, it is not usual to insist upon their being furnished, except under peculiar or imperative circumstances, on the ground that it would be absolutely without precedent to produce them.

Is there any reason here of that kind?

Estimates and reports of the engineers of public works, in many cases, are considered confidential.

No pretense of anything of the kind here.

The opinions of the law officers of the Crown. * * * *

The same rule applies to communications between the law officers of the Crown and respecting particular trials; or the judge's notes, taken at a trial, or to coroner's notes.

As to 'confidential documents' passing between officers of a department, Mr. Speaker Peel observes that:

'They are not necessarily laid on the table of the House, especially if the minister declares that they are of a confidential character.'

Does the Minister of the Interior say that these papers are of a confidential character? I have not heard any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House profess that they are of that character. Mr. Bourinot adds :

If a minister stated in his place that a document was of that class, the House should take his word, and he would not be bound to lay it on the table.

Will the hon. minister stand up in his place and say that the documents asked for here are of a confidential character? If so, perhaps the House will be disposed to follow what Bourinot says here. These are the cases he cites except cases that I need not go into particularly with reference to what are called State papers which have been referred to by the hon. member from North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy). Then he goes on to say:

The right of a member to obtain every information from the government within the limits previously described is so undoubted that it seems almost beyond the power of a minister to keep the practice within narrower bounds, and thereby save much public money.

Even if these words applied, will the minister tell us how much public money he is going to save by making copies of these documents instead of producing the originals?

It is quite obvious, however,——

These were the words that were so much relied upon in this instance——

——that no member should move for papers except on sufficient grounds.

I think we may assume that that is correct. No member in this House should stand up and ask for anything which he cannot justify asking for. There is no question at all about that. But the right hon. gentleman apparently contends that a member should stand up and on his own responsibility state that he has suspicions which require the production of original papers. Who ever heard of such a thing? Has the House, when it wants the government to produce the paper, to go to work as a man does in the prosecution of a criminal; must a member in solemn form lay an information against a minister; must he stand up and state as a person would in prosecuting criminals, that he has just cause to believe, &c., and then ask for production by the minister as if he were asking a magistrate for a search-warrant to examine the premises of a den of thieves? We are told that we must on our responsibility say we have suspicion before we will get papers. Who finds authority anywhere to say that when a representative of the people asks in parliament on behalf of the people for the production of a public document he must say: I suspect you of some rascality, or he won't get the papers. While the hon. gentleman for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is not taking that course, I would say for myself that if the minister at the head of a department of this or any government were to refuse to allow me as a representative of the people to see a public document relating to the people's affairs, and if the government were to back him up and refuse the production of the papers, I would say that was sufficient ground for me to suspect some wrong doing on the part of the government or concealment of wrong doing by others—if not wrong doing in the particular case, I would suspect that the minister in question desired to create a precedent in his favour so that in other cases where wrong doing occurred he would not be obliged to produce the papers. I would not hesitate on my own responsibility to make such a statement in this House. But the hon. member for St. Antoine stands upon his rights; he denies the right or the power of this government to call upon him to make any such statement; he is here as a representative of the people performing a duty he owes to the people. As a member of the Opposition he believes it is his duty to look into and investigate certain matters and he has asked for the production of the papers, and hon. gentlemen opposite say: We will not give you the originals, but we will make copies for you. Can they find authority to say they will only give copies to parliament and keep locked up the original papers? I have not heard one person pretend to-day that he has such an authority. May has been quoted—let me read a few words from May and see whether he draws the distinction, that the government may withhold and keep secret the original documents and furnish copies. At page 507 May says:

Parliament is invested with the power of ordering that all documents be laid before it——

Documents; not copies of the documents but the document itself.

—which are necessary for its information. Each House enjoys this authority separately, but not in all cases independently of the Crown. Accounts and papers relating to trade, finance and general or local matters, are ordered directly and are returned in obedience to the order of the House.

Ordered directly; mark the words. Why, the Minister of the Interior is getting ready for months ahead; he has been issuing orders by which members cannot see papers as has been the practice in the past, and when the hon. member (Mr. Ames) after being told by the Minister of the Interior to apply in the House for the papers, does so, than he is told here that he cannot get them. That is a most extraordinary thing. May says:

Accounts and papers relating to trade, finance and general or local matters, are ordered directly.

Under that authority one would suppose there would not be a question raised. May further says, and here is the only qualification:—

But returns of matters connected with the exercise of the royal prerogative are obtained by motions of address to the Crown.

May lays down in a very few words the principle upon which we are acting and which to-night the government are trying to break down. The right hon. gentleman stated it was the duty of the member moving this motion to declare his suspicions, and he was followed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) who endorsed his leader and even went a little further. He said the same rule applies to the Public Accounts Committee, and original papers should not be asked or obtained there unless an assertion of suspicion is made.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. What I said was that in the Public Accounts Committee, when the committee orders production, the papers are brought in the custody of the officer in charge of them and in that sense they do not leave the custody of the department.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the hon. gentleman was supporting the contention of the Prime Minister, and I think he was. The hon. gentleman also said, apparently thinking he had a very strong point against the leader of the opposition, that he did not see what the case of Lazarus alias Leopold had to do with the matter. My impression is that that case was used by way of illustration of the case before the House, and I shall attempt to show, also by way of illustration, how appropriate the comparison is. At that time the Public Accounts Committee were investigating the expenditure of this Department of the Interior (which now refuses papers) with regard to immigration and especially with regard to the expenditure of that particular pet of this government, Mr. Preston. In the course of their examination it turned out that money for enormous sums had been paid which Mr. Preston had been certifying, and among others, large sums of money for printing professed to have been done by what was called the Arundel Printing Company which was a mere fiction and pretense to cover the name of a man named Somerville, a friend of Mr. Preston. As one of the last items in a very large account, Mr. Preston had certified for something like £2,500 for the Arundel Printing Company, and in the investigation of that some time was occupied. The receipts were produced, the accounts were there ; there was not a figure in the papers produced which indicated the slightest suspicion or connection with this Mr. Lazarus or Mr. Leopold as you choose to call him. There was not a word that would indicate to any member of the committee a suspicion that Mr. Lazarus had anything to do with the account. Well, some member of the committee asked that the original cheque should be produced, and it was produced by the Auditor General, and what do you suppose we found ? Not one cheque for £2,500 but four cheques about equally divided for the total amount of £2,500, and the four cheques were issued at the same time.

When we got the original documents these facts were disclosed. One of these cheques for six hundred and odd pounds, payable to the Arundel Printing Company, was endorsed by a secretary of that company who, when we got the cheque, we found to be the wife of Mr. Somerville. and that cheque for £600 had been deposited in the bank where Mr. Somerville kept his account. A second cheque for £600 was payable to a man in Hamburg, who undoubtedly was a member of the North Atlantic Trading Company. Cheque No. 3 went to a bank in which Mr. Preston kept his account ; but who got the money we could not find out. The fourth cheque was endorsed to this Mr. Lazarus. Mr. Lazarus received one-fourth of that money paid out by the government for printing in the interest of immigration. Suppose that the member of that committee had been told that the original cheques would not be produced until he declared a suspicion that Mr. Lazarus had something to do with it. No one supposed for a minute that there was anything of that kind, but the moment the original papers were put into our hands, we found that the secretary of the Arundel Printing Company was Mrs. Somerville who was signing at her husband's request, and that the other cheques went to the parties I have indicated. If the rule which it is now sought to apply had been applied to that committee we would never have ascertained the facts, and yet no hon. gentleman will deny that it was important in the interest of the public of this country that these facts should be known.

Another transaction occurred in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department. A Mr. Strubbe sold a quantity of French files to the Marine and Fisheries Department ; a witness from the department stated that there were as many files as the department would use in about nine years. He was paid for them and we asked Mr. Strubbe what he did with the money. He said he took the money to Montreal and deposited it with his bank, but he could not say which bank as he had several accounts. We obtained the original cheque from the Auditor General and found on the back of it little pencil marks made by a bank teller which showed that about one half the money had been paid in Ottawa, and Mr. Strubbe, being confronted with that fact, admitted that he had taken one half the money in cash in Ottawa and took the other half to Montreal in a draft. He had cashed the cheque in Ottawa at another bank than the one on which the cheque was drawn. He could not explain why he did that and of course he did not say that he

had used one-half of the money in Ottawa. I mention that as a second instance of the necessity for the production of original documents.

Then, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L Borden) has intimated, we all know that reports are made by officers of the department on different matters which come under their care. An officer who is efficient will set forth in his report the pros and cons of any transaction on which he has to report; and I venture to say that you will find frequently on such documents here, as in all public offices, the head of the department would draw his pen through paragraphs of which he did not approve and initial those of which he did approve. If you asked for the production of a copy of such a report a clerk would copy only what had not been cancelled and thus we would be deprived of the information of what the officer who reported had set forth against the proposition. But we are entitled to know what he had to say on each side of the question, and a government that endeavours to prevent a member of parliament from obtaining that information is concealing what the country is entitled to know.

I do not intend to elaborate that argument; it seems to me so clear that it is hardly necessary to argue. Why the Minister of the Interior should wish to conceal such things I cannot understand. What object has he in concealing them? Is he serious in telling us that he is afraid that if he places them on the table of this House some body will steal them? That is too ridiculous an argument for him to pretend to support; he cannot do it. He says cases have occurred where documents have been lost in this way but he has not cited a case. I doubt if he could. In the Public Accounts Committee the other day a minister said that last session his department had submitted documents to the committee and they never came back. The matter was explained by a word from the secretary who said that the inquiry had not been concluded. The minister apologized and said: All right, I did not know that. I venture to say that it was something very like that of which this minister was speaking. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) advanced a still more extraordinary argument; he asked how he or another minister could be expected to let out of his hands into the hands of the people of this country or their representatives, a paper which he wanted in his office —why he would never see it again. He said that it would belong to the records of this parliament because a note of its production would appear on the Votes and Proceedings of this House. He must know that on the conclusion of the inquiry here the document could be returned to his department and another note of its return could appear in the Votes and Proceedings. He could not have been more serious in advancing this argument than was the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) when he talked about the registry office in Nova Scotia. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to give up his argument as these documents could be returned to the department in the way I have suggested.

I will not detain the House any longer. I only say that I have seen the government again and again, without any specific order, lay original documents on the table when they found it ocnvenient to do so. The hon. Minister of the Interior surely was not actuated by a desire to save public money by copying those two or three little documents. By laying the papers on the table he could save even the expense of having them copied. There is nothing in it except a desire to prevent people knowing what is going on; there cannot be anything else. Why does the hon. gentleman, when he has papers in his office, in the hands of himself or his deputy, refuse to allow a member of this House to look at them? Will he give any explanation of that? He cannot give it, nor can the right hon. leader of the government suggest a reason for it, except—I do not use the word offensively—a pig-headed obstinacy in saying, I will not let you see them anyhow. That is the only way in which one can account for it. There is not even the objection that a member might take up a little of his valuable time by asking to be allowed to see the papers in the departmental office, because all he has to do is to have a clerk in his department collect the papers and be present while the member examines them; and he could thus in many cases do away with any need to lay them on the table of the House.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this resolution is a request for a return laying upon the table of this House the original applications and tenders in respect of certain timber berths —numbers 1107, 1108 and 1171. I have listened to the discussion of this matter on both sides of the House, and while it is asserted by the Prime Minister and others on this side that the invariable practice of this parliament has been not to lay the original documents on the table, but copies of those documents, I have not heard that position successfully refuted by any member who has spoken on the opposition side. So that if we are to vote on this question, I take it that we are voting on the question whether the government shall be obliged to lay on the table of the House the original documents, or whether we shall follow the practice that has always been the practice of this parliament heretofore, of laying on the table of the House copies of those documents. Now, according to the authorities that have been cited, Bourinot and

May, it appears that a member moving for the production of original documents must move upon good grounds. While it may not be necessary for him to assert that there is anything wrong or anything dishonest in connnection with the papers; still he should present to the House some good grounds why we should depart from the ordinary parliamentary practice, and adopt what is practically a new practice.

Mr. HAGGART. Where did the hon. gentleman learn that the parliamentary practice is to refuse to place original dodocuments on the table of the House ? I have never heard of that before.

Mr. GALLIHER. I said that I had listened to-day to the arguments on both sides of the House—I do not pretend to say that I am an authority on parliamentary practice—and I have heard no reason urged why these papers should be brought down at all, unless it is the broad and general principle that every member of parliament has a right to call for original documents and have them produced and laid on the table of the House. That is altogether too broad and general to be urged as a reason for asking for any particular document relating to any particular transaction in any department. There must be something more than that. Even if the member does not go to the length of imputing wrong, he has to assert something more substantial than that as a member of parliament, no matter what his reasons are, he has a right to ask for the production of the original documents. That is not giving a reason; it is assuming a principle. If he is correct in that, and if that is the practice that has been followed in this parliament, I do not think he will be refused; but what do we hear some hon. members of the opposition say ? They say that if the minister or the government refuse to bring down the originals of these papers, the country will naturally think there is something suspicious behind that refusal ? Now, why should the country think there is anything suspicious about that? My hon. friends opposite smile, and I am pleased to see their smile; I would rather see it than their frown. But I ask, why should the country think that there is anything suspicious behind that ? Simply because this government says that the practice of parliament has been so and so, we are satisfied to follow that practice, and we are not going to depart from it simply because a member of this House may request original documents, thinking he has the right to them.

Speaking of the people being suspicious and believing that there is something behind this, perhaps I may be excused if, while listening to hon. gentlemen opposite, a dim suspicion entered my mind, a doubt whether these hon. gentlemen were really so anxious that the people should know what was in these documents, or whether this was the anxiety of some politicians to have the opportunity to examine documents with the bare hope that there might be some flaw in them or something out of which campaign material could be made. Now, I hope I am too fair in debate to say that any hon. member would do that sort of thing. But when we are told that suspicion attaches to the government, because it refuses to depart from the old and recognized practice of this House, surely I shall not be found fault with if I find it impossible to resist a slight suspicion that there is something behind this motion that does not appear on the surface.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not bring in the documents and get rid of the suspicion?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think the people are so suspicious as that. Speaking for myself, I do not think that the people I represent will find fault with the position I take and the vote I shall give in support of the government in its maintenance of the established practice of this House. Lest this matter should be misrepresented in the country, and there might be an idea that the government were trying to conceal anything, I think this motion can be met honestly and for the purpose of giving absolutely all the information that can be reasonably asked for, by moving an amendment. That amendment would be along the lines of the procedure and practice in this House by inserting the words 'copies of' so as to make the motion read:—

Order of the House for a return laying upon the table of this House copies of the original application and tenders in respect of timber berths 1107, 1108 and 1171.

Mr. HAGGART. They are already furnished to the House.

Mr. AMES. I have the copies here.

Mr. GALLIHER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has the copies, he should be satisfied. There is no ground whatever for asking for the originals.

Mr. D. ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). I am afraid I am out of order in discussing this question, for, if the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has copies ordered by resolution of this House, then, as I understand the rules, I do not know how he can bring the matter up again. I would ask your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. AMES. I got them last session.

Mr. D. ROSS. Then the hon. member is very hard to satisfy. If he got what he wanted last session, why is he asking now for something he already has. The hon. member and those with him are endeavouring to create a new precedent in this House. After forty years of unbroken practice, he

declares that now, for the first time, this House must establish a new precedent and order the production of original documents. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) is very insistent on this new order being established. I would like to ask him whether, while he had charge of a department of government, he ever brought down original documents and laid them on the table of this House.

Mr. HAGGART. Often. Some of them are obligatory under statute.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. D. ROSS. I venture to say that the ex-Minister of Railways cannot point to a single instance in which, when he had charge of a department of government, he consented to the bringing down of original documents in response to a motion by a private member of this House. A good deal has been said about original documents being brought before committees of parliament. We all remember what happened last year. The Superintendent of Immigration was asked to bring down documents in connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company. He brought down original documents and placed them in charge of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization——

Mr. SPROULE. Except what he burned.

Mr. D. ROSS. That is more of the suspicion of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to know the foundation of the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. The statement made in the committee by the witness, that he had taken the documents and burned them—that statement made under oath.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the hon. gentleman from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) to have spoken of the Commissioner of Immigration. I say that there is no foundation for the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey in regard to the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not speaking of the Commissioner of Immigration but of Mr. Smart, who was before the committee, and I repeat the statement.

Mr. D. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey, and ask you if he is within his rights as a member of this House, in making such a charge against the Superintendent of Immigration. Has the hon. member any right to say that the Superintendent of Immigration burned certain documents, though he has no evidence for such a statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say that of the Superintendent of Immigration. I said it of Mr. Smart, who was then deputy minister.

Mr. D. ROSS. When I was interrupted by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) I was pointing out that the Superintendent of Immigration, Mr. Scott, had been asked to bring certain files of his department to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. He did so. The committee kept that file several weeks with the result that the whole work in connection with Mr. Scott's department was tied up, and when he came and asked for the return of the file he was not treated any too courteously by these very gentlemen who are raising objections to-day, and he had to come and plead for that file before he could get it back and continue the ordinary routine of his department. We have heard here something about stolen documents; the minister is asked if he is afraid that these documents will be stolen. Well, that has happened before—original documents brought down before certain of the committees have never been returned to the departments from which they came and that might happen again.

What are these documents? As I understand, they are applications in connection with certain timber limits. They are legitimate applications for timber lands, they are the titles of the gentlemen who are asking for these timber limits, probably the only thing they have to show until their title is completed. Put them on the table of this House? Hon. gentlemen opposite—if you admit suspicions which have been thrown around here—are also interested in timber limits, and these documents might surreptitiously disappear, and the only title these gentlemen had to the timber they are legitimately asking for would vanish and they would have nothing to show they had a title to this timber. Why, it would be a very poor department indeed that would allow its business to be transacted that way. These people who are doing business with the Department of the Interior, whose documents are in that department, who have paid their good money to the department, naturally expect that the department would take ordinary business precautions to have their interest protected. What right has the Minister of the Interior to delegate to this House the custody of documents that are in the nature of titles of these gentlemen who have paid their money to the department? He has no such right, the House should not demand it. Now hon. gentlemen have been reading out of Bourinot to bolster up their case. Let us read something further out of Bourinot. On page 399 you will find this:

From the discussions in the English parliament it appears that the document of which it is proposed to order a copy must be official in its character.

And so on. Bourinot implies, at least, in this rule that it is a copy of the document which is ordered, not the document itself. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to read Bourinot from cover to cover and to find in it one suggestion that the original document is to be brought down in response to a motion of this House. In this quotation Bourinot lays down the principle that the document of which it is proposed to order a copy must be official in its character, and you cannot find in Bourinot a single instance saying that this document should not be a copy but the original. Bourinot also speaks of the method of preparing these documents; he speaks of the care that ought to be exercised in making the copy conform to the resolution. He does not say anything about the original. He says that care ought to be exercised by the officer whose duty it is to prepare the return, to see that it conforms with the resolution of parliament—another instance to show the clear intention to be that it is to be a copy of the papers asked for. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite are surely endeavouring, after forty years of practice, which has worked very successfully, which worked successfully when they were in power—they are endeavouring to establish a new method of getting documents in this House. And for what reason? For absolutely no other reason in the world than to enable them to go to the country and say to the people: We have asked for information and this government would not give it to us. It is no such thing. The hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) acknowledges to-night that he has got the information he wanted, that he got it last year; that he had been cogitating over it for twelve months. Now he comes to this House and wants to make a little political capital and takes up the time of the House in a pretense that he wants to get what he got twelve months ago. If that is not playing politics, I do not know what it is.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). My hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) last year introduced a motion asking for copies of all corespondence and everything else in reference to the purchase of certain limits in the Northwest. Upon getting the information which was furnished to the House, thinking perhaps that the correspondence was too lengthy, he wrote a letter in accordance with the direction of all the writers on parliamentary practice; he wrote a letter to the Minister of the Interior stating that the information produced in the copies was not such as he required, and that it might be furnished in the originals. He was suspicious in relation to some of the transaction that the original papers would disclose further facts. So he wrote a letter to the Minister of the Interior stating the facts and asking to see the original documents, as he had a right to do. The Minister of the Interior refused him the right of access to the documents, and suggested the plan which the hon. gentleman proposed today. When he now proposes a plan suggested by the Minister of the Interior, he is met with the whole force of the government urging that the practice is irregular. Who ever heard of it being irregular? I have been in this House a great number of years and I never knew a motion of this kind refused. Original papers have again and again been produced and laid upon the table upon a motion of the House.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Can the hon. gentleman give the House another instance of a motion of this kind asking for the original papers?

Mr. HAGGART. Let me get through my argument and I will deal with the question of the hon. gentleman. We know that everything in reference to public accounts, everything that is found in the Auditor General's Report, all the correspondence, all the original documents, are by order of this House sent to the Public Accounts Committee—not copies of the papers at all, but the original documents. The hon. gentleman says that this would be a deplorable practice, that perhaps the officers of the department might lose them. Cannot the Minister of the Interior send an officer to the Public Accounts Committee with these original documents whose duty it is to look after them? In this case where the order is for the original document to be placed on the table, if there is any danger of its disappearing, surely you, Mr. Speaker, with all the myrmidons at your disposal, could detail one or two of them to see that the documents was not filched. But what I insist upon is the right of parliament to see every original document. What is the rule laid down ?

Transactions of state are necessarily official, and no public officer would be justified in withholding access to any document emanating from himself in his official capacity in relation to public affairs.

The rule extends to private correspondence between members of parliament and a minister of the crown on public affairs. Private correspondence may be seen. This parliament, or any member of it, has a right to see any official document. Fancy a refusal made by the government of Canada to a demand to see the tenders that have been received by the Department of the Interior in relation to timber limits ? There may be something wrong about them. There may be something wrong which the original correspondence will show to the public. We have the right to see it. I suspect from the refusal given by the government that there is something wrong in reference to the awarding of these timber licenses, that the government are aware of that fact and that

there can be no other justification for the statement made by them refusing to the parliament of Canada the right to see the original documents. I have the right to draw that inference from the refusal, but what I insist upon is the right of every member of parliament to have access to the documents, not merely to copies, but to the originals and that an order of the House shall issue as a matter of course for the original documents ? What are the exceptions ? The exceptions are in reference to the negotiation of a public treaty and in reference to the expenditure of funds for the secret service, but, there is nothing as to the management of a big department in reference to the awarding of contracts, or the awarding licenses to cut timber, or anything of that kind. Surely this House would be abrogating its privileges and its rights it it were to say to the government of this country : You have the power not to show the originals upon which these contracts are founded. I never heard of a position of this kind before being taken by any government. I venture to say, in answer to the hon. gentleman who asked me the question that if he will give me the time I will go to the library and show to him dozens of cases in which the original papers have been placed on the table of the House and cases in which, for the convenience of the department instead of bringing down copies, the originals have been placed on the table. What is the excuse ? The excuse offered by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was that papers had disappeared or might disappear from the table of the House—that they might be stolen. Surely precautions could be taken by you, Sir, and by your officers to see that nothing of the kind happens. But supposing that even it possibly might happen, do not deprive the grand inquest of the country of one of the greatest rights of examining all accounts and correspondence of the government and especially all original documents upon which they issue timber licenses and other privileges.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be placed on record as having been a party to the refusal of the production of any public documents before this parliament. I believe that where it is in the interest of the country that a document should be produced that document ought to be produced, but, Sir, I also believe in following up the procedure that has been followed by all tribunals and which should be followed by this the greatest of all tribunals in the land. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) who has just resumed his seat, stated that there was no case when his party was in power of a refusal to produce any documents before this House. Perhaps my hon. friend has forgotten that in 1870 Sir Charles Tupper, the then Minister of Public Works, refused to lay on the table of the House certain documents in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Speaker, several authorities have been quoted for and against the proposition before the House and I would like to quote May. It appears to be that Sir Erskine May is very explicit in the matter which we are now considering. He says, at page 539, 11th edition :

> But however ample the power of each House to enforce the production of papers, a sufficient cause must be shown for the exercise of that power.

If the hon. member for St. Antoine had shown to the House that there was a sufficient cause for the production of the papers in this case I have no doubt the government would readily have assented to his motion, but he stands up in the House and simply asks that the old rule of procedure followed by this House be set aside and that a new rule shall be established for his purpose. That, Mr. Speaker, seems to be asking of the government a little too much. The hon. member for St. Antoine has had in his possession, for nearly a year, certain papers relating to some question or other in which he is interested. He tells us that these papers are not sufficient for the purpose for which he intends them. I put it to the hon. gentleman opposite if the rule which is followed out in the courts of justice should not be a rule proper to be followed out by this House in the matter of the production of documents. Let me refer you to the rule that is followed under 'The Canada Evidence Act.' In section 24 I find that :

> In every case in which the original record could be received in evidence,—
>
> (a) A copy of any official or public document of Canada, or of any province, purporting to be certified under the hand of the proper officer or person in whose custody such official or public document is placed——

——is receivable in evidence. Again, in section 26 :

> —A copy of any entry in any book kept in any department of the government of Canada shall be received as evidence of such entry and of the matters, transactions and accounts therein recorded, if it is proved by the oath or affidavit of an officer of such department that such book was, at the time of the making of the entry, one of the ordinary books kept in such department, that the entry was made in the usual and ordinary course of business of such department, and that such copy is a true copy thereof.

For all purposes is not this rule a sufficient rule to be followed out by this House? Will the people of Canada exact that a rule other than that which has been followed for many years, in this parliament shall be made to suit the hon. member for St. Antoine or any proposition he may have ? It seems to me that the statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is sufficient to satisfy the public of Canada. There is no concealment of any evid-

ence, there is no concealment of any papers, it is not a case where the originals cannot be produced, but if the hon. member for St. Antoine follows the proper course goes to a committee of the House and makes some charge or gives, at least, to the government, some sufficient cause for the production of these papers then, I have no doubt, that the rule laid down by May and all other authorities on parliamentary practice will be followed and that there will be an immediate production of these papers.

Mr. HAGGART. What committee will he go to ?

Mr. BERGERON. The committee on expectation.

Mr. BENNETT. The committee on contingencies.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is not satisfied that there is a committee at the present time which the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, may go before—I do not agree with him—but if he is not satisfied this parliament has power to institute such a committee.

Mr. HAGGART. But if they refuse it ?

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not think the government has been in the habit of refusing anything which is just.

Mr. BERGERON. What are they doing now ?

Mr. DEVLIN. They are not making any refusal. The government are simply trying to follow out the rule of procedure that is laid down by all constitutional authorities, and which has been laid down as a matter of practice in this parliament. Therefore I have no hesitation in supporting the position taken by the government, and I do not think any injustice is done to the member for St. Antoine or to the people of Canada.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in his opinion a committee of the House has at the present moment jurisdiction to make this demand?

Mr. DEVLIN. Most assuredly.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. gentleman state what committee has that jurisdiction?

Mr. DEVLIN. I would say to the hon. member in answer to that, that if he finds there is any extravagance in any application for these timber limits——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, there is no extravagance!

Mr. DEVLIN. I am glad to hear the leader of the opposition admit that in one case at least there is no extravagance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The very opposite.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the hon. member for St. Antoine has any charge to make as to the falsification of papers, or if he has absolutely any cause to give to the government as to why the papers should be produced, there will be no difficulty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) has referred to the Canadian Evidence Act ; does he say these papers are certified in compliance with the Canadian Evidence Act?

Mr. DEVLIN. The original papers are now in the department and they may be produced in the ordinary way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Surely the hon. gentleman knows enough to understand that if an officer of the department improperly certifies papers under the Canadian Evidence Act, he may be subject to punishment under the criminal law.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have no doubt that if the hon. member (Mr. Ames) finds that these papers are improperly certified he can make a charge and that officer will be liable.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). This is another instance of how far party feeling can carry a man, when we hear the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) an Irishman, and who would be a Nationalist member if he were in the Imperial House of Commons as his brother was; get up in this House to defend his party in an attempt to curtail the privileges of parliament. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) tried everything in his power to defend the government; he spoke of the Canadian Evidence Act as if we had anything to do with it here; he tries to prevent the members of this House obtaining information from the government which as representatives of the people they have the right to obtain. The people of Canada are represented in the persons of the members of this House; they are demanding their privileges and their rights here, and the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) is in the forefront in an attempt to deny these rights. It has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side that the copies which were furnished last year are sufficient, but if my hon. friend from St. Antoine thinks they are not sufficient; if he has reason to believe—and he is not obliged to give his reasons to anybody—as a representative of the people if he has reason to believe (and I think he has reason) that those copies are not according to the originals, it is his right to have the originals brought down to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let him say so.

Mr. BERGERON. He does not need to say so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He does.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. My right hon. friend knows very well that last year or the year before original documents were brought down from the Department of the Interior, and they were found to have been mutilated. There was a contract entered into by the Dominion of Canada with a company which never had any existence, and when that contract was submitted to the House the signatures were torn off. And after the refusal of the government to bring down the original documents to-day, and after seeing the manner in which their supporters have stood up to uphold that refusal, I am myself convinced that the government is afraid to bring down this original document. They know what it contains; we don't know; they are afraid to bring it down. Is it not a most extraordinary thing to see a Liberal government attempting to curtail the liberties and rights of the people? All have admitted that they are obliged to bring down original documents before a committee of the House; it is done every day. But the committee only has the power to demand these originals by an order of the House of Commons, which is paramount over all committees. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has cited the only cases where originals of public documents of official correspondence may not be brought down, but the present case does not come within the purview of these exceptions. Everything bearing on the administration of departments belongs to the House of Commons, and the ministers are obliged to submit them to parliament, and they should do so unless there is something that the government wants to hide, as I think there is in this case.

Mr. DEVLIN. What about Sir Charles Tupper refusing to lay papers before the House in 1879?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know what my hon. friend refers to, but that may have been in reference to a case where negotiations were pending between Canada and some foreign country. I challenge any man on that side of the House to say that during the eighteen years the Conservatives were in power the Conservative government ever refused to bring down an original document when it was asked for by the opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say without any hesitation that no such demand was ever made unless cause was shown for it, and if there is cause shown for it now these papers will be brought down.

Mr. BERGERON. That is no proof because if the opposition in those days never asked for them the government could not have refused them. We know that the custom is to ask for a copy of a document.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, because it is more convenient to send a copy to the House, but that does not mean that in principle the members of this House have not the right to exact the original document.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at all. In this case the copies have already been brought down in the ordinary manner, and if the hon. gentleman who makes this motion will say that he has reason to believe and does believe that the copy is not correct; that it has been tampered with, the papers will be brought down immediately, but they will not be brought down until that is stated.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very sorry to see my right hon. friend, a Liberal and a French Canadian taking that position. I admit that in the case of pending negotiations between Canada and a foreign nation the papers need not be brought down, but that rule does not apply to the present case. This has reference to a purely departmental matter and the member for St. Antoine is not obliged to say that he thinks these copies have been tampered with. My hon. friend does not ask the government for a favour; he demands a right. He speaks in the name of the people of Canada and he says: I want to see the original documents in such a case, and the government knowing what is in the originals, refuse, because they know that the member for St. Antoine is right in not saying openly——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. He does not need to say it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. When the hon. member for St. Antoine spoke at first, I myself did not know whether there was any difference between the originals and the copies which were brought down.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Do you know now ?

Mr. BERGERON. I am convinced, after this discussion, that the copies are not the same as the originals, because if they had been the same they would have been brought down, and anybody in Canada who reads to-morrow this discussion will be convinced of the same thing. I am sorry to see the position taken by the government on this question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that these papers are not a correct copy of the originals ; does he take that position ?

Mr. BERGERON. I believe they are not, and that is why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) wants to see the originals.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is altogether wrong.

Mr. BERGERON. Then let the right hon. gentleman bring the papers down and we will have proof.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend believes that and makes a charge he will have the evidence he wants.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think it is necessary to make a charge in order to get the information that it is the right of this House to have.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this discussion, but I think one of the strongest features of this case has been brought out by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in connection with the letter of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in answer to Mr. Ames' request for permission to see the original tenders. It has been said that Mr. Ames had all the information he required in respect to his motion of last session by having copies of those documents brought down. That hon. member thinks otherwise, and this session desires to see the originals; one reason for this being his experience in connection with original document last session and the session before. It is remarkable that a member in search of information should be directed by the head of a department to take certain steps to secure it, and that having followed implicitly these directions, contained in a letter written only a month ago by the Minister of the Interior himself, he should be met in this House by that minister with an attempt to thwart him in his effort to secure the original documents. Here is the minister's reply to the request for access to these documents:

Dear sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant, in which you state that you are desirous of examining the original applications and tenders in connection with timber berths 824, 1062, 1107, 1108, 1171 and 1212.

In reply I beg to say that it is a rule of the department not to allow the examination of the files by others than officials of the department whose duty it is.

It is a rule of the department, says the minister. How long has that rule been in vogue? Why was that rule not brought into operation to prevent gentlemen obtaining the same information last session? The rule was not observed then and it is because of the disclosures at that time that the Minister of the Interior has now refused the request. He says in effect that the people's representatives in parliament assembled are not to be permitted to inspect public documents. State documents if you choose, because an official of his department might be inconvenienced by such examination. He says:

The reasons for this rule are that if the privilege of examination of the files were permitted to one person it could not fairly be refused to another, and if all who might wish to so examine were permitted, the business of the department would be unduly hampered and the public interest would suffer.

In what manner would the public interest suffer if a private member of this House went into the Department of the Interior and asked for certain original tenders? If the file is required in the meantime for any other purpose by an official, no member is so unreasonable that he would refuse to hand over the file and wait his turn until it would again be free for his use. They put up a suppositious case creating all imaginable difficulties that would never occur and on these grounds refuse the request of this member. Here is the important part of this letter:

By an order of the House for the production of papers the responsibility is taken off the shoulders of the department and is assumed by the House.

The very thing the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is trying to do, to relieve the Minister of the Interior and the department of any responsibility in connection with this matter and to place the responsibility upon parliament as a whole, upon the people's representatives here. This is the suggestive point in the minister's letter:

I would suggest this means of obtaining what you want.

Why did the minister give such advice as that if he was not sincere in giving it? When he was giving it, did he intend to throw obstacles in the way of the hon. member when attempting to follow out the advice he had given? I never heard of a parallel case, a minister given advice to a member, the member acting on the advice and the minister then calling on his humble and servile followers to prevent the carrying out of the course he had suggested. The minister no doubt looks on it as a piece of very sharp practice, and it is, but I do not think the people of the country will view the matter as leniently as does the hon. gentleman. We have been asked to give reasons. The experience of members in past sessions should be sufficient reason for our being somewhat suspicious in regard to original documents differing somewhat from the copies produced.

We have had authorities quoted. The Prime Minister himself has delved down into the misty shadows of the past to resurrect authorities to bolster up his argument. The people of this country will not bother much about Bourinot, May or any other authority; they will ask whether people are entitled to information on the public files in connection with the public affairs in this country, and will not care to excuse the hon. member and his colleagues by reason of ancient precedents. When the argument was advanced that anything

brought down by the minister becomes the property of parliament and therefore could not be handed back to the department. while I am not a lawyer, it struck me how easy it would be to follow out that argument to its conclusion, and to see that parliament who ordered the production of a document could as easily order its return. Parliament is supreme in these things. But one instance after another has been quoted to show that that practice has been followed without an order of the House. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) referred to a letter produced by the Minister of the Interior in order to make some political capital against him, not by order of the House, but of his own volition. Where is that letter to-day? Is it the property of parliament? I venture to say it is on the files of the Department of Interior, probably to be resurrected by the minister at some future day in order to again make capital against the hon. member.

References have been made by a number of speakers to the formal printed reports of the Department of the Interior. How simple these gentlemen must take the opposition members of the House to be. They say : If there is anything wrong, if there are any erasures in the copies, any names omitted or alterations, there would be an excuse and a sufficient reason for the production of the originals. How are the members to know whether these copies are genuine or not until they see the originals? Take the reports of the departments submitted to parliament a session or two ago. We could not tell anything from the printed copies, nothing on the face of the report disclosed anything wrong or suspicious. A member moved for the originals and then it was discovered that there had been emasculation of some of the reports; the reports of the land agents at Battleford and Swan river were not given in their entirety in the official printed report. It was only then that we saw there had been some tampering with the reports lest they might reflect on the department and the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. Would my hon. friend permit me to correct him? I think in the case he mentions the documents which were produced in the House was a copy and not the original.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) Did the hon. member refuse the original because he thought it would become the property of parliament and could not go back to the department?

Mr. OLIVER. He was not asked for the original he was asked for a copy and produced a copy.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). He is asked to-day for the original but he takes a different stand and refuses the original.

Mr. OLIVER. He would have taken the same stand then.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I believe the original was brought down to the Public Accounts Committee by order of this House. I do not know whether the documents quoted by the Minister of the Interior the other day were originals or no. I refer to his quoting from a letter written by the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). Was that a copy or an original?

Mr. OLIVER. A copy.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And the minister would not bring the original because he was afraid it would become the property of parliament and would not be returned to the department.

Mr. OLIVER. I presume every one knows that if a paper is read in the House and a demand is made it becomes the property of the House unquestionably.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Well, the demand is made to-day, and the hon. minister has no excuse to-day, whatever he may have had in the past. The hon. member for East Simcoe referred to another case, the celebrated case of the H. B. Brown lease. The copy may have contained the initials J.D.M. This was only a suspicious circumstance; but the probability is that some one acquainted with the handwriting of Mr. J. D. McGregor might have known, after inspecting the original, not only that the document had never been signed by Brown, but that the letter was written by McGregor only one day previous to its being received by the department, and not by H. P. Brown, who lived in the State of Montana, so that it was an absolute impossibility for a letter written by him to be received by the department within that time, and it was written by McGregor, who had no authority from Brown to write it.

Mr. OLIVER. All that was shown in the copy brought down, except the handwriting of the signature. I might ask the hon. gentleman to be fair enough to say that the copy brought down was an exact copy of the original.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Was the date of the receipt of the letter on the copy brought down ?

Mr. OLIVER. Whatever was on the original was on the copy.

Mr. AMES. The date that was stamped on the letter as received by the department was May 27th. The letter was dated Great Forks, Montana, May 26th, and if it had not received the stamp of the department, you would never have known what a rapid trip it made.

Mr. OLIVER. I would ask the House to take notice of the absolute unfairness of

the idea that is tried to be conveyed. What I said was that the copy that was sent down was an exact copy of the original.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Without that stamp.

Mr. OLIVER. Without that stamp, which was not a part of the original.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why not?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The important point is that not only the signature, but the date of the letter, bears very strongly on its authenticity.

Mr. OLIVER. Not the date of the letter, but the date of the receipt in the department, which was not a part of the letter, but a part of the record of the department.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Which shows that the letter was not written by H. B. Brown, in Montana, but by J. D. McGregor, in Ottawa. No longer ago than last session, at the time the Minister of the Interior was refusing to bring down promptly, in response to motions of hon. members on this side of the House, returns from his department, and declaring that the hon. member for St. Antoine was a special sinner in this regard, loading down the Order Paper with motions, and overloading his officials with work in preparing documents, we saw hon. members opposite getting up in their places and quoting from briefs which had been prepared by those very officials. I remember one gentleman from the west quoting a long list of names of gentlemen who had applied for timber limits during the Conservative regime, and he distinctly stated: 'I hold in my hand a document prepared by an official of the Department of the Interior.' This official had not time to prepare returns which had been ordered by this House for members on this side of the House, but he could prepare a brief without an order of the House for the assistance of a gentleman on his own side of politics. The Minister of the Interior declares that it is his intention in the future not to allow members on either side of the House to have the opportunity of inspecting original documents. Well, our experience in the past, such an experienec as I have just referred to, makes us rather sceptical about that rule being enforced either by the minister or by his officials against his own political associates, and we believe it will be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. I am somewhat surprised at the First Minister, a gentleman who in the past has represented himself with a great deal of pride to be a democrat to the hilt, and claiming to lead the party of the masses, getting up in his place in parliament and taking the autocratic position which he has taken on this question to-day. But surprised as I am at the attitude of the First Minister, I am more than surprised at the attitude of the western representative in the cabinet, who, if he had been blown in here by the chinook wind as a member of the opposition while the Conservative government was in power, would not have taken the position he has taken to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member, I think, is wandering a little from the question.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I do not wish to transgress, but I thought there had been a good deal of latitude allowed to other members.

Mr. SPEAKER. There has been no particular latitude allowed. A number of illustrations have been given, which were referable to the matter under discussion; but this is surely wandering from the question.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). That is exactly what I was going to do. I was going to say, as an illustration, that the Minister of the Interior, had he been on this side of the House, would have condemned the Conservative government for doing what he is doing to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. That was not the remark of the hon. gentleman to which I took exception.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Well, I will just say that I am rather surprised that a gentleman coming from the western plains, where we are not supposed to be tied down by so much red tape or so many restrictions, should take the autocratic position taken by the Minister of the Interior to-day. He and the First Minister are very strong on parliamentary practices. They say it has been the practice of parliament for forty years to retain original documents in the possession of the government, and the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) challenged the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) to specify any original documents that had been brought down. The hon. member for South Lanark accepted that challenge, and mentioned dozens of cases in which original documents had been brought down, by a Conservative government, and no cases have been cited where some in response to motions and some without motions, documents had been refused to members on the opposition side of the House on the same grounds as they are refused to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not anxious to follow past practice in other respects. What about the practice of opening tenders for timber limits? In years gone by, when the Conservative government was in power, these tenders were opened, not in the presence of one official only, but in the presence of two or more; but since the present government has been in power, one official goes into a private room and opens these tenders

and creates the suspicion in parliament and in the public that there has been certain manipulation of these tenders; and you cannot get that suspicion out of the minds of the people.

The head of the department has admitted on the floor of this House that there is only one official opening tenders at the present day. There is nothing in their practice in this regard to show that they are anxious to follow the course of their predecessors when that course was the right one. Then, the hon. gentleman claimed that it would not do to have those originals brought down, not only because of the inconvenience involved, but on other grounds as well. Are they afraid that, if the original documents are brought down in every instance, we shall have more gentlemen threatening the procedure that was threatened by certain members of the North Atlantic Trading Company, and that we shall find suicides taking place among those connected with the departments ? The members of the North Atlantic Trading Company hid themselves behind that threat that, if their names were divulged to the public, they would take the short cut to eternity, I would not advocate that by any means, but if they are bound to take that course, as I said before, it would have been better for the people of Canada had they taken it before delving into the public treasury of this country for some $300,000 or more. There is another case of original contracts, having been brought down even by this government. This was done in the case of the Davis lighting contract, which was discussed in this House. The present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, was then Minister of Justice, and had charge of that work. He said: We will bring down the original documents. He did not even wait for a motion to be made in this House, if I remember well. He brought down those original documents and laid them on the table. They were in the private members rooms for weeks, and members were allowed to take copies of them as they desired. There was no inconvenience in the matter, and where are the original documents to-day, in possession of this House? No, Sir, they will be found on the files in the department as usual. If this can be allowed in one case, why not in another? The action of the government will do more to create suspicion in the minds of those who had no suspicion up to this time that all is not correct than any other course they could have taken. Had the government been wise in their generation they would have acceded to this request without hesitation, and would have brought down the original documents. And, in conclusion, I would like to say to the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, not as a threat, but as a piece of judicious advice, that he will greatly facilitate the work of this House by acceding to this and similar requests and bring down the documents required to enable us to form a correct judgment as to what is going on in connection with the affairs of this country. The right hon. gentleman will get his supply through very much more quickly in this way than by taking the autocratic position of denying to the representatives of the people the information that properly belongs to them.

Mr. WM. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). There is one point that we must not lose sight of in this discussion, and that is that the documents referred to must belong to somebody. Two points only have arisen, as I recollect, in this connection. The first is : Who is the owner of these documents and the second is : Who is entitled to the right of possession ? The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) defined his views very clearly. He has no doubt about how he is going to vote, and he is perfectly right to vote as he says he will if his conception of the right of possession be correct. That hon. gentleman asks : What right would the Minister of the Interior have, on a demand of parliament, to bring down these documents and part with their possession? On what meat do these our masters feed that they have grown so great? No member of this House will dispute that the ownership of these documents is in the people of Canada. I suppose that no member will dispute that the hon. member for St. Antoine is not a representative of St. Antoine merely but a representative of all the people of Canada. And the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the House will not dispute the fact that members of the government, though they seem to look with such utter contempt upon hon. members on this side, are after all only members of a committee of parliament, dependent on the suffrage of this House, and that this House could turn himself and his colleagues out of office as readily as they put them in. And I suppose he will admit that members on one side of the House must have equal rights with those on the other side. That being the case, the House has authority to say what shall be done with documents belonging to the people we represent, and it is a monstrous thing for any member to say : What right has the minister to part with possession of documents in response to an order of this House ? for these are the deeds of A, B or C. Imagine a representative trying to do his duty to the people of this country in this House, having his vote killed on such an important question as this by an hon. gentleman who honestly believes such a doctrine—for he would not have said it had he not believed it—as that these are the title deeds of one who got his patent long ago. Another hon. member—the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) I think it was—sees a noteworthy parallel in the case of the law courts, because in 'The Canada Evidence

Act' it is provided that certified copies of public documents may be used in evidence. Certainly they may be used in evidence. But why ? Simply and merely because this House and the other House, which together constitute parliament, decreed that they may be used in evidence. And, if we can provide that copies may be used in courts where they could not be used without our permission, surely we can allow the originals to be used in this, the highest court of the whole country. In one sense, it is a small matter whether these documents are brought down or not. I do not suppose that any hon. member thinks that one scandal more or less is going to affect the result of the next election in any constituency. But it is most important, in this, which is expected to be the last session, of the parliament, and may naturally be expected to be a fighting session—I say it is a tremendously important thing, and will be fought out for months if necessary, if we are not allowed to see original documents. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that we should have grounds of suspicion. Can he have forgottten all that has occurred ? Can he have forgotten the cases in which the original documents, when produced, proved what no copies could have proven ? Those who have been obliged to work in the Public Accounts Committee know that we have before that committee original documents by the dozen. I am sure that I have handled hundreds of such documents from different departments in the last few years. There were several cases that are worthy of being referred to in this connection. There was, for instance, the case of Strubbe. I happened first upon the cheque with certain significant figures on the back of it which led to an explanation of that transaction. This man bought certain property for the government and received a cheque in the western block for $4,700. He swore that he had taken it to Montreal and deposited it in his own bank. Yet, on further investigation, he had to admit that he had gone past the Bank of Montreal here, where he could have cashed the cheque, to another, to him a strange bank, the Ontario Bank. There, in the presence of somebody, he cashed his cheque for $4,700, took $2,500 back to Montreal and deposited it—and he produced his book to show it—and put $2,200 in his pocket. And he swore that he did not know what he had done with that money—did not know what had become of it. The only thing that he did know—because we proved it—was that it had never gone into his bank account. Then, there was the case of the steamers 'Champlain' and 'Montcalm,' in which the country was bled—I say it advisedly—for luxuries in the way of silverware and so on for the furnishing of the these vessels. We could never have discovered the rascalities in connection with the 'Montcalm' except for the original invoices. We had what was supposed to be a copy, but the opposition secured the original, and the result of what was shown thereby was that Mr. Coghlin paid back between $1,100 and $1,200 to the people of this country. We have the Galway horse deal, the cattle company deal that has been referred to, one of the most suspicious transactions that has ever occurred in this country, and in the very department of the minister who now refuses the production of documents; and had it not been for the production of the original application, not in the handwriting of the lessee this country would never have known why it was that when other people could not get leases this unknown man Brown was allowed to have it thrown at him again and again by the department, and after the rules had been changed governing the granting of leases, when he was offered it on the lower terms or on the higher, and he took it on the lower, and the bargain was then closed, and he was afterwards given the right to get a lease with provisions that no other man could get one on, and it turned out that a member of parliament had been for years the Brown referred to, and had it not been for the significance of the initials, this House would never have understood the meaning of that transaction.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. gentleman say if the owner of these initials was the beneficiary of the lease?

Mr. NORTHRUP. If the members of this side of the House could find out who were the beneficiaries of all the leases granted in the department, we would not have the slightest anxiety about the election coming on this present year.

Mr. OLIVER. Did not the hon. gentleman say a minute ago that a member of parliament was the beneficiary of the lease?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. Was that member of parliament the owner of these initials?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly not. He may or may not have been the owner of the initials. If you ask me if these were his initials, I would say no; if you ask me if he was the owner of the initials I would say I do not know. That is another story, as Kipling says.

Mr. OLIVER. Then what have the initials to do with a member of parliament?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Well, there again is one of the inquiries that I would like to have made into the Interior Department. The initials represented a gentleman whom we know must have had extraordinary influence of some kind, we know those initials were there, we know it was an extraordinary transaction, and the country never would have understood the transaction had it not been for the production of the original documents, and all this took place in the very department whose minister now

refuses the production of another original document. Then we had another case in this minister's department, which was referred to by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche), certain reports were published, and it turned out they were only copies of the reports. They were published by his department, by his knowledge and approval, and although the reports were there with apparently the name of the writer at the bottom, the writer never wrote such reports, because important clauses were omitted from them. And that also occurred in the department of the minister whose action is being criticised to-day. Then we had another case of a similar nature, one of the most important that ever came before this House, the Grand Trunk Pacific deal which probably will cost this country more than any other transaction in which it ever engaged. The right hon. gentleman will remember when he declined to bring down a certain letter, saying that he had brought down all the letters on the subject. Again and again and again he refused to bring down this letter, and he will remember that his colleague now sitting on his left a year later, in order to meet another point altogether, did bring down that letter, and when it was produced, the original this time, then we found that the Grand Trunk had offered to give to the Intercolonial all the traffic that would reach the city of Quebec, a fact which if it had been known to the people of this country, would have prevented what I consider the most extravagant bargain ever entered into by this government. Again the production of the original document would have made all the difference in the world to the members of this House and the people of this country. Well, without enumerating any further cases, when we find in the very department presided over by the Minister of the Interior that we have the Galway horse deal, where the production of the original did give us valuable information; when we had the North Atlantic Trading Company contract where the production of the original did give us valuable information, when we had originals of reports of engineers which showed that the original had not been properly copied, and when we find an hon. gentleman no longer than ten minutes ago saying in this House that he had brought down all the papers in connection with a certain transaction, when one of the principal points, the stamp on the letter, showed that the document was not what it professed to be, this letter written in Montana, I ask the right hon. the premier if he can be surprised when I make the statement that I believe there is not a single gentleman on the Conservative benches of this House who is not suspicious of this transaction. These original papers are not thrown on the street, the custodians do not lose control of them, they never pass from the hands of the officials of the government from the time they leave the pigeon holes until they get back. I would just as soon trust an official of this House with the custody of such documents as any official of the Department of the Interior, and I say that without the slightest disrespect of the officials of that department. Why then is such an extraordinary risk to be run? Documents are brought before parliament, and laid on the table, and placed in the custody of officials of this House. Surely we have reason to suspect that there is some stronger reason than the trouble of carrying those documents over, that prompts hon. gentlemen to refuse their production. And this is altogether aside from the question as to whether there has been any wrong done or not. We cannot tell until we see the documents whether there is anything wrong. The hon. gentleman knows that we have not seen them, they have taken care that we should not see them. But while we cannot make a distinct charge, hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that we have every reason to be suspicious, and we believe this country will be suspicious at this new doctrine now laid down for the first time. It is idle to say that copies are generally brought down. In the olden days perhaps there was not any reason to produce anything more than the copies; perhaps there was no Galway horse deal, no North Atlantic Trading Company, no Strubbe case, no 'Montcalm' and 'Champlain' cases, perhaps the circumstances were so different that hon. gentlemen opposite were not suspicious and were satisfied with the copies brought down. But if a different view prevails now, in consequence of these cases I have referred to, hon. gentlemen have only themselves to thank; and perhaps it would be better in their interest, and surely it would be better in the interest of the country, if all such suspicions were removed, and if it were understood that it is not merely hon. gentlemen opposite but that every member of this House is determined to do his duty by the people, and see whether their money is honestly, fairly and economically expended.

Mr. SPROULE. I think this motion ought to be pressed, because we have departed from the well understood practice of parliament for years. It has always been customary in the past, if you required to get information in the Department of the Interior, to go down there and ask for a file of the papers, and they were presented to you and you went over them. This I have done myself over and over again, and I never knew of the privilege being refused until the present government took possession of the treasury benches. Now for the first time, to my knowledge, they deny the well understood right of par-

liament to go into any department and examine the papers for themselves.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member I think has already spoken.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is an amendment introduced then I have a perfect right to speak.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who moved the amendment?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Galliher) moved the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Galliher) did not press the matter when he ascertained that the——

Mr. SPROULE. He did not withdraw it with the consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment was not read by me nor was it handed to the chair. I understand that the hon. member who moved it, when he ascertained from the hon. member (Mr. Ames), who moved the original motion, that the copies which his amendment proposed to substitute for the original had been supplied to the hon. mover of the main motion, dropped the amendment. That was the impression that he left on the chair and the amendment was not handed up to me and was not read.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware of that fact, otherwise I would not have spoken. I did not think the hon. member was playing a burlesque in regard to the rights of the House.

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. member has referred to me as playing a burlesque in the House. I am not in the habit of playing a burlesque in the House or out of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GALLIHER. I rise for the purpose of making a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member rises for the purpose of making a personal explanation that is a different matter.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do, Sir. I was not aware that the hon. member who moved the resolution received the copies, otherwise I would not have attempted to move the amendment which I did. When I ascertained that he had, the object of my amendment was gone, and I at once ceased to press it or put it forward as an amendment. I do not think that is acting a burlesque in the House.

Mr. AMES. As the mover of the substantive motion I believe I have the right to say one word.

Mr. SPEAKER. If any other hon. member desires to speak who has not spoken he may do so now before the hon. mover replies.

Mr. SPROULE

Mr. AMES. We are accustomed throughout this country, whenever we go upon the platform and enter into a debate, to be told that the opposition has every possible facility for examining all documents and for discovering every possible sin the government might commit and that we do not discover more is often times hurled upon us as a charge of impotency or as a declaration that the government is spotless. But we sometimes find in this House and in the committees that it is not by any means as easy to get information as we might wish. We are very jealous of our rights in this respect and on this particular occasion it is not so much the brief resolution, comparatively unimportant in itself, that is here opposite to my name on the Order Paper, as it is the principle involved that brings us to our feet and leads to this prolonged discussion. For my part I feel that it is very important that I should know what are my rights as a member of parliament; what are my privileges as the representative of 60,000 people in the city of Montreal and whether I have rights in respect to the examination of documents which I presume belong to the people of Canada and which I presume belong to all of us who are to-night members of this parliament. These documents are open to the Minister of the Interior and I have no doubt if any friend of his asks that he might be permitted to see him there would be no obstacle raised officially, but if a member of the House——

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say that the hon. member has no warrant for the statement he has made to the House at this moment.

Mr. AMES. When, however, we members of the opposition, who, I consider, are performing a function to the country just as important as the function of governing the country, in the exercise of the right to which we are elected at the present time, are endeavouring to criticise the government in order that they may do better, or in order that the government may be replaced by a government that will do better, I think we should be given every possible facility in making our investigations and in studying the material. It is because of the principle involved that this resolution has been placed upon the orders of the day and that this discussion has taken the form that it has. The simple question is this: Is a member of parliament entitled, if he so desires, to see an original document when no reason of state can be alleged why it should not be displayed? It makes little difference to us as to the methods by which that document is to be disclosed. It makes no difference to me as to whether I am permitted access to this document by the method I have followed here, but I have simply taken this step because the Minister of the Interior him-

self, in a letter to me, advised me to do so. In the innocency of my heart I imagined that he was giving me friendly advice and that he was not buncoeing me.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that the reference to buncoeing is parliamentary.

Mr. AMES. May I substitute 'goldbricking'?

Mr. SPEAKER. That would be just repeating the offence.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not object because it is what I have learned to expect from my hon. friend.

Mr. AMES. I did not imagine when I received that letter that I was being invited to ask the House to do something that the minister himself would declare could not be done. I did not know that it was courteous treatment on the part of the minister to ask another member to take a course of action which he intended to oppose when the opportunity came. I followed exactly the course which the minister laid down. When I came first to this House and asked for some rather voluminous returns I was remonstrated with by the minister on the ground that I gave the department a great deal of work. Word was sent to me: Why did I ask for such voluminous returns. It would be so easy to come down to the department and indicate the letters which might be desired.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. member say that I ever made any such communication to him?

Mr. AMES. I do not. I say that that word came from the department.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman give me the name of the officer who made that communication to him ?

Mr. FOSTER. What are you going to do with him?

Mr. OLIVER. I want to know.

Mr. AMES. Not in this particular instance.

Mr. OLIVER. I have every assurance that no such statement ever came from any officer in the department, but I would remind the House that the suggestion was made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R L. Borden) on the floor of the House and that it was not accepted by me.

Mr. AMES. Very well. Then just let me say Mr. Speaker—and it will serve the purpose just as well—that a return in connection with the Galway Horse and Cattle Company was prepared and copies were laid on the table of the House. I wrote the deputy minister asking whether there would be any objection to my seeing the originals. I received a very courteous reply from him saying that there would be no objections whatever and that I might call at his department some morning whenever convenient and he would go over them with me. This he did. I spent an hour with the deputy minister and examined the entire file of the originals of the H. P. Brown transaction. In the presence of the deputy minister we discussed the stamps, we discussed the writing, we discussed everything which the originals brought out and which no copies would bring out. I was perfectly satisfied and I felt that there was no necessity for asking for the production of any original documents after that. I had presumed that such was the custom of the department, knowing that it is the custom of other departments. I had been permitted to do the same thing in the Department of Finance and when this matter came up I dropped a note to the Deputy Minister of the Interior and asked him whether he would have any objection to my looking at the file in connection with these timber limits. To my surprise I received a letter saying no ; that the departmental attitude had been changed and that no member of parliament would be allowed to examine original documents. Then it was that the minister advised me to ask the permission of the House. Now the minister tells me that the House will not grant me that permission. What method is open to any member who wishes to see original documents? Have I a right to see original documents? If I have that right what is the constitutional method by which I can exercise it? Up to 1908 it seemed to be the simplest matter in the world to step into the Department of the Interior and, as a matter of courtesy, examine these documents. Now that privilege is denied to members of the House and we are told that even in the House we cannot get that privilege. Will the Minister of the Interior or the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) tell us what is the proper or constitutional method, or are we to understand that no original document is ever to be seen by a member of the opposition? Does the government want to go on record in that regard?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman has alluded to a letter I wrote him as to the course he might take if he wanted to see the original document; he has been informed by the leader of the House of the course for him to take to get the sanction of the House to see these documents. All in the world he has to do is to allege that he has not been furnished with proper copies of the documents.

Mr. NORTHRUP. How can he make that statement without seeing the original?

Mr. OLIVER. If he does not dare to make that statement, I ask him to act as a gentleman and not make an insinuation.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) should not make a statement of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. I will withdraw my allusion to the gentleman; I seem to be under a misunderstanding as to what constitutes a gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. That is worse still.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the explanation of the hon. gentleman is not satisfactory.

Mr. OLIVER. I will withdraw the explanation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is nothing left.

Mr. AMES. Now that my character as a gentleman has been rehabilitated by the Minister of the Interior, I will continue to call the attention of the House to the important point at issue. If the old privilege is to be taken away what new privilege are we to have in its place? If the right or privilege, whichever it may be, which we have so freely enjoyed in the past is now denied us what other avenue is there whereby we may enjoy the same? That is the simple question I wish to ask. It is not necessary for us to make allegations. Some of us prefer not to make allegations in the dark; there are reputations involved; we do not wish to make promiscuous allegations. If anything comes up which leads us to believe there has been wrong doing, I for one am prepared to state in this House specifically every allegation I have to make. But I am going to make no insinuation without substantial proof, nor am I going to urge that there is anything about these documents which is improper so long as I am denied an opportunity to see these documents myself. How can I know whether they are forgeries? I do not allege that they are. How do I know that there is anything in connection with these documents which would lead one to believe that there was any intentional suppression of truth? It is not that at all. But every man knows that a typewritten copy of a letter does not always contain everything that that letter conveys. Every man knows that the actual letter, the stamp of its receipt, the handwriting, oftentimes tells between the lines far more than a cold typewritten copy will tell. And I claim that everything that a letter discloses directly or indirectly is information to which this House is entitled, and if we are to be denied the originals we are denied a large portion of the information which the correspondence contains and which it is our right to have. We are dealing with the great national assets of this country; the land and the timber and the grazing leases of the Canadian Northwest have been given away, many of them to favourites and many of them in a manner which we have previously condemned. We believe (and the Minister of the Interior admits that we are right) that the method whereby the granting of timber leases has been for the last few years carried on is a method which is in itself defective. The minister admits it because he has completely altered the regulations within the last few days.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to say that the alteration of the regulations does not at all admit that the system formerly in force was defective.

Mr. AMES. Then why were they altered? If the system in vogue before was a better system why not maintain it?

Mr. OLIVER. It only means, if my hon. friend does not understand, that the time has arrived for a change owing to the change in conditions.

Mr. AMES. I can understand, as can a good many others, that after the horse has been stolen it is high time to close the door. But it is a fact, that thousands of square miles of timber limits have been alienated; that many thousand square miles of timber limits are to-day in the hands of speculators; that a thousand square miles of timber limits are here on sale in Ottawa, and the minister knows it. I want to see the applications and the tenders in connection with certain timber limits; I am not going to allege what I believe with reference to these timber limits at this particular time. It is my right in the House to ask this information to be placed where I can see it, and in due time I will give all the information I have with reference to these limits in a form that will quite satisfy the Minister of the Interior. Here is the return we have been speaking about; it contains 453 pages. I have read that return from cover to cover. Now, there are nine pages of that return which can be illumined if I may see the originals. As to all the other pages the copies are all I want. But there are nine pages there with respect to which the copy does not tell me all I want to know or which I have the right to know if I understand my rights in this House of Commons.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend say that these nine pages differ from the original.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could he tell unless he sees the original?

Mr. AMES. I say that these nine pages will in all probability clear up certain doubts which I have regarding peculiar features in connection with some of these transactions; I say that the handwriting of some of these nine pages may have a very important bearing on the case. The hon. gentleman for Yale-Cariboo made an argument in this House to the effect that a man's title to his timber limits might be

involved because these papers might be lost. In the first place the minister can take any precaution he likes to see that these papers when they are laid before this House are properly safeguarded ; ten minutes will suffice me to look them through; he can have them back in ten minutes in his department if he wants them. What I am asking for is not the original lease which has been passed between the various owners of these timber limits and the government; that is the official document in which the rights of the lessees have been set forth. What I am asking for are three applications made for timber limits and six tenders in connection with timber limits, in all nine documents, nine pages. It is a very enormous amount of work for the department to produce these nine pages ? Is it running an enormous risk to leave these nine pages here for half an hour, so that I and possibly one or two other members may see them ? Is there any great hardship entailed upon the department or any one else to gratify my right to see these papers as a member of this House ? The argument which the minister has made falls to the ground in this respect. Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle that when we on this side of the House have what we consider good and sufficient reason we may have the right to see an original document, or else, be prepared to take the odium throughout the country that you do not wish an original document to come to light. That is all I have to say. I simply wish that the question be brought to a vote in order to ascertain whether the government shall take upon themselves to declare, that when a member of this House has what he considers to be a good and sufficient reason, there is no way open for him to see an original document such as this.

House divided on motion (Mr. Ames.)

YEAS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Leonard,
Ames,	Lewis,
Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Avery,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Barker,	Marshall,
Barr,	Martin
Bennett,	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Bergeron,	Morin,
Borden (Carleton),	Northrup,
Boyce,	Owen,
Bristol,	Paquet,
Broder,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Porter,
Christie,	Reid (Grenville),
Clements,	Roche (Marquette),
Cockshutt,	Schaffner,
Crocket,	Sproule,
Daniel,	Stanfield,
Elson,	Staples,
Foster,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Ward,
Herron,	White,
Jackson (Elgin),	Wilmot,
Kemp,	Wilson (Lennox &
Lancaster,	Addington),
Lefurgey,	Wright (Muskoka)—51.
Lennox,	

NAYS.

Messieurs

Archambault,	Loggie,
Aylesworth,	Macpherson,
Black,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Borden	McColl,
(Sir Frederick),	McCool,
Bourbonnais,	McCraney,
Brodeur,	McIntyre (Perth),
Brown,	McKenzie,
Caldwell,	McLean (York C.),
Calvert,	McLennan,
Caron,	Major,
Carvell,	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm	Marcil
(Antigonish),	(Bonaventure),
Clarke,	Martin (Montreal, St.
Conmee,	Mary's),
Copp,	Mayrand,
Crawford,	Meigs,
Cyr,	Miller,
Demers,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Parent,
Dubeau,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Pickup,
Fielding,	Power,
Finlay,	Proulx,
Finlayson,	Pugsley,
Fortier,	Robitaille,
Galliher,	Roche (Halifax),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Graham,	Rousseau,
Greenway,	Savoie,
Harty,	Schell (Glengarry),
Hughes	Sinclair,
(Kings, P.E.I.),	Sloan,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Smith (Nanaimo),
Johnston,	Smith (Oxford),
Kennedy,	Talbot,
Knowles,	Templeman,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tolmie,
Laurier	Turgeon,
(L'Assomption),	Verville,
Lavergne (Drummond	Watson,
& Arth),	Wright (Renfrew),
LeBlanc,	Zimmerman.—86.
Logan,	

PAIRS.

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Grant,	Clare,
Telford,	Tisdale,
Macdonald,	Fowler,
Pardee,	Beattie,
Turriff,	Blain,
Maclean (Lunenburg),	Hughes (Victoria),
Lemieux,	Haggart,
Dyment,	Lalor,
Stewart,	McLaren,
Gordon,	Maclean (York S.),
McIntyre	Lake,
(Strathcona),	

Carney,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Fisher,	Forget.
Emmerson,	Ganong,
Bureau,	Monk,
German,	Osler,
Parmelee,	Thompson,
Guthrie,	Pringle,
Law,	Smith (Wentworth),
Hall,	Seagram,
Beland,	Brabazon,
Tobin,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ratz,	Worthington.

Motion (Mr. Ames) negatived.

MAIL SERVICE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) moved :

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports and memoranda, in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, respecting the establishment of daily mails and improvement of the mail service in Queens county, Prince Edward Island.

He said: During the early part of this session the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) announced his intention to perfect the mail service of this country, and I do not know that there is any section of Canada where improvement is more required than in the county which I have the honour to represent. In this twentieth century bi-weekly and tri-weekly mails in this country should be a thing of the past. No section of Canada ought to be satisfied to-day with either a bi-weekly or a tri-weekly mail. In the early part of the session, I put a question on the Order Paper, asking for the number of post offices in my county and the service accorded to each, and I must say that I was astonished to find that the account stands much worse than I expected. I found that in my county there were altogether 143 post offices, and of these fifty-two received only tri-weekly mails. Twelve of them received only bi-weekly mails, and eleven were served daily in summer and tri-weekly in winter. I do not think that this is a service of which the Postmaster General should boast. He claims that he has been doing a great deal for the post office service of this country; he has been boasting that he has been hoarding up money, but he has been hoarding it at the expense of the people of this country, the people of my riding. In some sections of Canada we see the mail delivered three or four times a day and those who receive this service pay no more taxes than those who receive their mail only twice or three times a week. The people of this country are a reading people, an intelligent people, and I may say for the province I represent that they are second in this respect to no other province in Canada. We have something else to our credit, we are the most thickly populated province in Canada and the county of Queens is the most thickly populated section of Prince Edward Island. We are a reading people, our people desire to read the daily newspapers, but of what use is a daily newspaper in a section which receives only a tri-weekly or a bi-weekly mail? We desire to keep our people posted in the news of the day, but when a section of country receives only a bi-weekly or a tri-weekly mail any one can see that the dissemination of information must be greatly hampered. It may be said that we are perhaps a little better off than ten years ago, but ten years ago the people of this country and of my province and county were paying only their share of a very small amount of taxes compared with to-day; they were paying their share of about $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 a year. Now they are paying their full share of a taxation of nearly $100,000,000 a year and when they are paying that they are entitled to some accommodation. I am within the judgment of this House when I say that this government, which claims to be a progressive government, should do its utmost to see that every section of our country has at least a daily mail. If you can do anything further after giving them a daily mail, I shall be most happy. There is a large surplus of revenue. This government some years ago imposed a tax on newspapers which is an additional source of revenue ; let them remit that tax also and give the people of this country a free newspaper; let the people get information as cheaply as they can.

I do hope that the minister, who I am sorry is not in his place, will take this question of improving the mail service and giving these sections in my province which embrace many important places, places where a great deal of business is done, a daily service. In some of these sections where there is only a tri-weekly or bi-weekly mail, there is no return mail so that actually a letter and reply require a week to get from one end of the province to another. That is not a satisfactory state of affairs. I have been asked during the holiday by many of my constituents to bring this before the House. I am doing only my duty in bringing it up, and it now only remains for the Postmaster General to fulfil the promise he made in the early part of the session that he was ready to meet all the wants of the people of this country in regard to mail accommodation. There is not a section in Canada in which a daily service is more imperatively required than in the province of Prince Edward Island, and would here suggest that the members of the government might take a leaf out of the policy of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and establish free rural mail delivery. If the premier, who has been acting Postmaster General during the absence of the Postmaster General, were to inaugurate that policy first in Prince Edward Island, the smallest province in Canada, where it

could be fairly tested, he would be doing the first favour he has ever done to that province, and would be adopting in this respect, as he has always done in other respects, the policy of the opposition. I do not think it would be derogatory to the dignity of the leader of the government to adopt the views of the opposition in this respect. The great objection urged against free rural mail delivery has been the sparseness of our population and the great distances from point to point. There would be no such difficulty in my province. In the meantime, while I do not anticipate that the leader of the government or the Postmaster General will act on my suggestion, I stand here to claim that every section in my county and in the province should have a daily mail service. If the government wish this country to be progressive, as they profess, the first thing they will do will be to place in the hands of the people of this country every morning the news of the day. The people are hungering for it. In some sections we have a daily mail in the summer, but in the winter we go back to a tri-weekly mail. The premier knows that the winter is the time when in the long evenings the people read; and to give them a daily mail for a few short months in summer and to withdraw it in the winter, appears to me to be the height of cruelty. I hope the Postmaster General, when these facts are placed before him, will fulfil the promise he made to improve the mail service in my province. One of the answers to the question I asked concludes in this way: 'Postal car service established in October, 1906, and no complaints received since that date.' This is very astonishing to me, because I have been, by questions on the Order Paper and otherwise, bringing this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General every year since I have sat in this House. 'There is only one train daily except Sunday each way on this branch, and these trains are used by the department. It is already as satisfactory as the department can make it with the present train service.' Here is a dispute between the Railway Department and the Post Office Department. Are the people of Prince Edward Island to suffer because the Railway Department and the Post Office Department cannot come to any terms in regard to the train service? If in the southern section of Prince Edward Island there is only one train a day, is that any reason why the people of that section should be punished in that way? I asked the Minister of Railways why there should not be two trains a day on the Murray Harbour branch: I asked besides if the traffic on that branch would not warrant it. He fell back on the statement that he had kept no account of that particular branch. His predecessor told me in this House that that branch was the best paying branch of the road; yet that branch has only one train a day, while other sections which are not as lucrative in traffic get two trains a day.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Perhaps that is the reason they do not pay so well. It costs double as much to run two trains as one, and perhaps that branch pays better because it has only one train a day instead of two.

Mr. MARTIN. It would be as well for the Minister of Railways to make the experiment, and then there would be no perhaps about it. That section of the country wants just as good railway accommodation as any other section, especially when the postal arrangements are contingent on the train service. I hope the Railway Department and the Post Office Department will act in unison and give that whole section of Queens county the mail accommodation to which it is entitled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry that my colleague the Postmaster General has not been present to hear the observations of my hon. friend. I shall not fail to report to him what he has stated, and moreover, I am sure he will peruse 'Hansard,' and learn of the complaint of my hon. friend, I do not know whether well founded or not, and will, if it is well founded, try to remedy it. But I am afraid that it will be hard to please my hon. friend. It is a difficult task to give him all he wants, because the more we give him the more he wants.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the government will take up Bills to-morrow, then Supply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Supply in what departments?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Marine and Fisheries and Public Works.

Mr. FIELDING. I may add that I expected to go on with the French Treaty to-morrow, but as the information asked for by hon. gentlemen opposite is not ready, I would like to fix it for Thursday, when the information will be ready in manuscript, if not in printed form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for North Toronto made certain engagements with the understanding that the French Treaty would be taken up to-morrow. He expects to leave for Toronto on Wednesday, and will be away for the remainder of the week.

Mr. FIELDING. I might take it up to-morrow with the understanding that I cannot produce the information desired.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am rather inclined to think that the hon. member for North Toronto would prefer to go on to-morrow, even if the balance of the discussion should be postponed to another day.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not anticipate that, but I think I can be ready to make the statement to-morrow. I will endeavour to do so.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 14, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Bank of Hamilton pension fund.—Mr. Barker.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the name of Mr. Major be added to the following committees: the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, the Committee on Private Bills, and the Committee on Agriculture.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the name of Mr. Caron be added to the following committees: the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, the Committee on Private Bills, and the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queens). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask leave to refer to a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the withdrawal of the steamer from the Charlottetown route.

Leave having been granted,

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I suppose the question will not be considered very urgent when I say that I have received this morning a telegram from the agent which states that the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley' have been on the Pictou-Charlottetown route since the 11th instant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. MARTIN. I have only to say that I am very glad I brought this matter up yesterday.

Mr. BRODEUR. They had to come back to Charlottetown before.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. minister consulted me about the matter at the beginning of the session, and I advised him to send boats to Charlottetown and I am sorry he was by some one so ill-advised as to remove them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. May I inquire why the boats were taken from the Charlottetown route while navigation was open ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter is left entirely in the discretion of the captains—Captains Finlayson and Brown who are very experienced sailors. Of course, the department could not undertake to decide from here whether the boats should go from Georgetown or from Charlottetown; so the matter was left to the discretion of these captains. Last week, owing to the fall in the temperature, it was thought necessary that the boats should go to Georgetown, and they went there ; but since that time the weather has become more moderate, and they have gone back to Charlottetown.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the minister mean to say that the officers of those boats have no instructions from Ottawa ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter is left entirely to the discretion of the captains.

Mr. MARTIN. That is not the way I understand it. That is a matter of dispute in the province.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect any announcement of the result of the visit of the Postmaster General and Minister of Labour to Japan ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that before the end of this week the Postmaster General may be able to fix a day for his announcement.

THE HALIFAX GARRISON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire whether or not there is any foundation for a newspaper report which I saw some time ago that the Canadian garrison at Halifax is to be disbanded and to be replaced by men from the British Islands, the expenses of the garrison to be paid by the Canadian government ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Militia is not in his seat to answer this question, but I can say that there is not the slightest foundation for that rumour.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to call the attention of the government to the fact that a return ordered by the House on March 11 last in reference to claims of several people for damages caused by a fire at Alberton has not yet been brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would my hon. friend kindly send me a note about this ?

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I desire to call your attention to correspondence in 'Le Soleil' of Quebec from the press gallery of this House under date of Friday, January 10.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is this a matter of privilege ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. A matter of privilege. This correspondence appears to have been written by the correspondent of 'Le Soleil.' As my attention has only just been called to it by one of the electors of my county, I have not had time to translate it; but I will give a translation of it into English as well as I can. It is as follows :

Mr. Bourassa is no longer in the House of Commons, yet French is spoken there more than ever. No one can say now that he is the only defender of the French language, and that without him it is condemned to disappear. In leaving the House, a little against his will, he has left two disciples, one of whom has hastened to proclaim his disappearance by calling him his ex-leader.

One who has proclaimed his lack of allegiance under his ex-leader.

These two pupils have shown their attachment to their language by both speaking in English. Mr. Lavergne and Mr. Robitaille, these 'two specimens of an extinct species,' that is the nationalism of Mr. Bourassa, have both spoken but not one of them has yet said a word of French. Even in the debate on Canadian tobacco inaugurated by Mr. Dubeau last Wednesday, a great part of which was carried on in French, Mr. Robitaille thought it was more chic to speak English.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. It is idiotic but it is in 'Le Soleil,' I cannot help it. The article continues :

If the French language is to maintain its influence and prestige at Ottawa, if practically it is to continue to exist, it will surely not be the nationalists who can claim this result. They may go on the hustings and try to cater to racial prejudices by saying that Sir Wilfrid Laurier sacrifices his language, that the French deputation are cowardly and without any national pride, as Mr. Bourassa used to assert; but these same nationalists when they are in the House give us the first example of abandoning their language; when all their French Canadian colleagues speak French they are the only ones to forget their language and speak only English.

The fact is worth noticing. Mr. Bourassa is no longer in the House of Commons and it is some time since Mr. Fisher, replying in French to a member of the House declared that he had given orders for the simultaneous printing of the French and English versions of the report of his department, saying that he greatly desired to see all the ministers follow his example. Men may be judged by actions and not by words. Mr. Bourassa protested and thundered. Outside of the House he was the only true French Canadian in the House, but he almost never spoke French in the House. He is gone and his two partisans who are in the House refuse to speak their own language.

Then the article goes on to say that those who speak French in this House do more for their language than those who speak English. First of all I did not think it was a crime for a member of this House to speak in either of the two official languages, and I would not have noticed what 'Le Soleil,' said, if it had not been in time which is in keeping with its reputation of beng the biggest liar among the newspapers not only in Quebec but in the Dominion.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Shame.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friend says shame, because he writes for that paper himself. I was about to say that I would not have noticed this article except that the report is entirely incorrect and untrue. Those who have been in this House know that I generally speak in the language of the majority and I have given my reasons for doing so in this House. There is no crime in using either the French or the English language. I use French when I feel I ought to ; at the beginning of this session I used it and at other times during the session. The correspondent of 'Le Soleil' ought not to forget that he is in the press gallery only by tolerance. I am in favour of having the representatives of the press in the gallery. It is good for the House and good for the country to have reports of the proceedings in this House published, but at the same time I do not think it is fair to have in the press gallery members of the press who are there to lie about the members of the House ; and that is what the gentleman who represents 'Le Soleil' has done. He has done it deliberately, he has stated an untruth in his paper in order to injure if that paper can do so, the member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) and the member for Quebec (Mr. Robitaille).

Mr. TALBOT. Where is the lie ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The lie is in the statement that these two members had not spoken in French since the beginning of this session.

Mr. TALBOT. He did not say it then.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friend should read 'Le Soleil,' which he serves so generously to the electors in Bellechasse.

Mr. TALBOT. You were there a little while ago.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Yes, and I did not see my hon. friend ; he was hiding himself. A press correspondent has no right to state an untruth and even if the whole report were true, the argument based on it would not be correct. That is the kind of argument that 'Le Soleil' has been serving to the people of the province of Quebec since it came into existence, and that is the kind of catering to racial prejudices which does more harm to the welfare of this country than any claims we have made in this House, even in the English language, for the rights of French as an official language. I do not want to boast and would not have noticed the article except that the correspondent says that those who occasionally speak French in this House—and I would be one of them—have done more to preserve the rights of the French language as an official language, than those who claim the rights of the French language, speaking in English in this House. That is not the fact as I shall show by a few examples. Last year I moved a resolution calling on the government to give greater attention to the rights of the French language. The credit for what has been done since has been received by others ; with that I have nothing to do, I am not here for compliments, but to do what is my duty. After that resolution was brought before the House and after the right hon. the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had spoken on it, the French language received better treatment from the government. On the Intercolonial we have seen French time-tables introduced and French has received that consideration to which it was entitled in the post office service in the province of Quebec. In every department there has been shown greater consideration for the rights of the French language. I do not claim all of this as my work, I do not say that I brought all of this about by myself, I do not even say that all is now perfect, but I claim to have had my share in it, and although the compliments of the ministers or the ministerial servile press of the province of Quebec have been given to other members, I care not ; I have nothing to ask for and I do not wish for those compliments, I am satisfied to see that a change has been made. Therefore the article is untrue. Its more dangerous aspect and that which I especially deprecate, is that it is fanning racial prejudices by attacking two members of this House for having spoken in one of the two official languages of this country. Solely in order to hurt a political adversary untrue statements have been sent from the press gallery by the official correspondent of a paper which is represented in this House. I hope Mr. Speaker, that that correspondent will go against the custom of his paper and will take back the untruth which he has published.

Mr. LORENZO ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the question of privilege which has been raised to-day. I have to complain of the reports of 'Le Soleil' on two different occasions. In the riding which I represent there is a majority of French speaking Canadians. I must say it was my intention to address the House in French upon the occasion of the debate on tobacco, had it not been for the suggestion—I might even say the pressure brought upon me by the member for Joliette (Mr. Dubeau) to address the House in English, it being immaterial to me which language I used. He even stated that it would be courtesy to the English members in this House who would like to take part in the debate and who would better understand the discussion if the speeches were delivered in English. I find that after I had spoken in French few members on the Conservative or Liberal side continued the discussion in English.

My intention in speaking English was to impress my views on the Minister of Inland Revenue, who I feel sure is not familiar with the French language. I claim to be a supporter of the administration although perhaps I am not as strong a supporter of the government as my friends would expect me to be, yet I claim the Liberal party as my party. And so I think it is very wrong that a newspaper which is supposed to favour the government should make an unjust attack on me in this manner and endeavour to stir up racial prejudices. In the ordinary commercial relations of life it is held to be common courtesy to address any person to whom you are speaking in the language which he understands, and so it was that I spoke English when addressing the Minister of Inland Revenue. I make this explanation so that it may be recorded, and if that newspaper does not endeavour to retract the false impression it has created amongst my constituents and amongst its readers in the city of Quebec it shall be my duty to send this my vindication broadcast through the mails. There is another question to which I wish to call the attention of the House and that is with reference to the statement I made the other day in the discussion on the Inland Revenue vote with reference to methylated spirits. The reporter of 'Le Soleil' whose time is so occupied in teaching Latin to young girls that he has not time to devote to a comprehen-

sion of the English language, seems to have mixed up methylated spirits with ethylated spirits or grain alcohol, and in his notes from Ottawa he makes this statement:

Mr. Robitaille, who had not yet said a word, made a speech to boast up the superiority of the products of his father's manufacture at Beauport, and asked that the duty on wood alcohol be raised in order to enhance the price and thereby increase his profits. Once more Mr. Robitaille has shown that if public matters which he does not understand, do not interest him, he is very much awake to his own personal affairs. That is his appreciation of a mandate obtained by fraud. The members of the House of Commons do not intend to take part in that interested game, and if he hopes thereby to promote his business, he is labouring under a great delusion. Let this be well understood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a gross insult to any member of this House that a newspaper man should so forget his position as to state without any justification whatever that there are some members in this House who utilize their position in parliament to advance their own private interests. I think I have the right to express my views upon any subject in this House which concerns the public interest, and I may fairly claim that I have expressed my views without any personal object in view. I am quite sure that this newspaper man was not influenced by the Liberal party in writing as he has done, but no doubt he was influenced by some members of the party who seem to have the control of a few of these newspapers, and who are ready to publish any kind of libel on a man who will not support their little schemes. I shall always be prepared, now or at any future time to defend my position in this House and to advocate the interests of the people I represent.

THE FRANCO CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It was understood in a conversation I had a few days ago with one of my hon. friends opposite, that we should pass this resolution through committee pro forma, and that the explanation which I may offer should accompany the introduction of the Bill. With that understanding I beg to move that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resoved, that it is expedient to provide as follows:—

1. That the convention of the nineteenth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and seven, entered into at Paris by plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and by the President of the French Republic be approved.

2. That there shall be levied, collected and paid after the said convention is brought into force, and so long as the same remains in force, upon all natural and manufactured products enumerated in schedule B to the said convention originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, imported into Canada in the manner provided in the said convention, the several rates of duties of customs set forth in column 2, Intermediate Tariff, of the Customs Tariff, 1907, and in any amendment of the same; and that there shall be levied, collected and paid, during the time aforesaid, upon all natural and manufactured products enumerated in schedule C of the said convention, originating and imported as aforesaid, the several rates of duties of customs set opposite to each item respectively in the said schedule C.

3. That whenever in the manner provided in the said convention the terms thereof are extended to Tunis, the provisions of the last preceding clause of these resolutions shall apply to Tunis and the products thereof, to the same extent and as completely as said provisions apply to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China and the products thereof.

4. That the Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such orders and regulations as are deemed necessary to carry out the said convention and the intent thereof.

5. That the advantages granted to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China by the said convention, with respect to the commerce of said countries with Canada, shall extend to any and every other foreign power which by reason of the operation of such convention is, under the provisions of a treaty or convention with His Majesty, entitled, in whole or in part, to the same or to the like advantages with respect to its commerce with Canada, to the extent to which in manner aforesaid such other foreign power is entitled thereto; and that such advantages shall continue to so extend to such other foreign power as long as the said convention remains in force, or until the right of such other foreign power to such advantages under its treaty or convention with His Majesty is sooner determined.

6. That the advantages so granted to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China by the said convention, shall extend to the United Kingdom and the several British colonies and possessions with respect to their commerce with Canada, so long as France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the said territories continue to be entitled to such advantages; and that during the period for which France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the said territories are so entitled to such advantages, all laws inconsistent with the enjoyment thereof by the United Kingdom, and such British colonies and possessions shall be suspended to the extent to which they are so inconsistent; provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall be held to diminish any advantage which the United Kingdom and British colonies and possessions now enjoy under the British Preference Tariff.

7. That from the date of the coming into force of the said convention as provided in article xx. thereof, The French Treaty Act, 1894, and chapter 3, 58-59 Victoria, an Act respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada, shall thereupon be repealed.

8. That the operation of all laws inconsistent with giving to the provisions of the said convention and of this Act their full effect shall from time to time be suspended to the extent of such inconsistency.—Mr. Fielding.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report the resolution?

Mr. HENDERSON. Before you leave the chair, I would like to say that it shall be understood that no charge must be made against the opposition hereafter because of not having thoroughly discussed this resolution in committee. The Minister of Finance, not long ago, made a very serious charge against the opposition in a matter of a similar character and claimed that we on this side had assented to a certain resolution simply because we had not risen to criticise it or oppose it by vote. I want it to be understood so far as I am concerned that that charge must not be laid against us as regards this matter, but that we consent to the proposal of the government on the distinct understanding that no such reflection shall be cast upon us.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know what was the former occasion to which my hon. friend refers, and I am sure there must be some explanation of the incident. However, I do not hesitate to say that in this instance I am acting upon the suggestion of an hon. gentleman opposite as to the most convenient method, and I would be quite content to reverse the proceedings and address the committee at once if that should be deemed the convenient course. I will undertake to say to my respected friend from Haldimand that I will not hold him responsible for this particular vote, whatever I may do as to his later action in the matter.

Resolution reported, and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 57) respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic. He said: This Bill embodies the substance of the resolution which we have already agreed to pro forma. It is designed to accomplish three purposes. The first purpose is to give to our recent convention with France that formal approval which is contemplated by article 20 of the convention. The second purpose is to extend the benefits of this treaty to such portions of the British Empire as may not already be in the enjoyment of equal or greater privileges, it being a cardinal principle of our policy—and I will take it for granted, of the policy of every British colony—that we shall not propose to extend to any foreign country any commercial privilege without at the same time extending it to all parts of the British Empire. Most of the British Empire is already in the enjoyment of the British preferential tariff, which is a more favourable tariff than the project now presented to the House in the form of the French treaty; but there are some portions of the British Empire, notably the Commonwealth of Australia, which are not in the enjoyment of the British preferential tariff. The purpose therefore in this resolution will be to extend to Australia and to any other portion of the empire which may not already enjoy the British preferential tariff—in a word, to extend to the British Empire generally the full benefit of the concessions which we propose to grant to France. The third purpose is to extend the benefits of the convention to such foreign nations as may be entitled to receive those benefits by virtue of any treaty with His Majesty. As to the question of what these foreign nations are, and what is the effect of this treaty upon them. I shall have something to say before I conclude.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are they enumerated ?

Mr. FIELDING. They will be. But not in the Bill. It has not been customary to enumerate them in an Act, but to declare the principle involved and to leave to the customs authorities the proper application of it. That, I say, has been the rule, and we do not depart from it in this instance. I will give a list of the countries and our impression as to their relations to Canada under the treaty.

The home market of Canada, one can easily see, is one of the utmost importance and of ever-increasing importance. As the field of our industrial activities has broadened, we are producing a larger quantity and a greater variety of the things our people need; and, with the great increase of population that has come to us in recent years, there is a larger home market for the products of Canada. But, while we recognize the great value of the home market, it is unquestionably true that the prosperity of Canada is dependent, in very considerable degree, upon the prosecution of an oversea trade. In that oversea trade, of course, Great Britain must take the principal part. Our greatest market for exports is Great Britain, and no doubt, it will continue to be so. That we are not unmindful of the value of that market, I think, is abundantly evident. By the cultivation of better methods at home ; by the improvement of our inspection laws, by the appointment of officials at the port of shipment, and at the ports where our goods are landed, in order that goods may receive the best treatment; by improved methods of transportation and increased cold storage facilities; by the appointment of additional trade commissioners in Great Britain ; and last, though not least, by the adoption of the British preferential tariff, we think, a great

deal has been done for the development of our great British market. And, when we recall the fact that, in 1897, the exports of the products of Canada to Great Britain amounted to only about $69,500 000, whilst last year those exports amounted to $119,843,000, we may regard that as evidence that the exports of Canada are receiving every possible consideration in the markets of Great Britain. If we turn to the total trade,—and by that I mean the exports to Great Britain of the products of Canada and the imports from Great Britain for home consumption, and not including goods in transit—we find that, in 1897, this total trade amounted to $98,935,000 and in the last year, 1907, it amounted to no less than $208,745,000. So, I think it will be admitted that we are keeping our eye upon our great market, the market of Great Britain, and that no effort on our part shall be neglected to do whatever is necessary to command that market for the produce of Canada. But, important as the home market is, and important as the British market is, they are not sufficient to satisfy the ambition of the Canadian producers. They desire, in these growing times for Canadian affairs, to reach out for their share of the trade of the wide world. That desire exists, I am sure, on both sides of this House. Our predecessors in the government, some years ago, realizing, as they naturally would, the desirability of extending trade with foreign countries, entered into negotiations for establishing a treaty with France. The result of these negotiations will be found in what is commonly called the French treaty, to be found in the Acts of this parliament of 1894. The treaty was negotiated in 1893 and enacted the following year. It is not too much to say that this treaty, at the time, was received with some hesitation and doubt even by the gentlemen who were responsible for it. It was held over for one session for further consideration, but, in the end, it was thought well to adopt the treaty. In some respects, the conditions of the treaty seem to be open to criticism and objection. Perhaps the House will pardon me if I call attention to its provisions to show how far it dealt with the trade question of that day. Article 1 of the treaty reads as follows :—

ARTICLE I.

Wines, sparkling and non-sparkling, common soaps, savons de Marseille (castile soaps) and nuts, almonds, prunes and plums of French origin entering Canada should enjoy the following advantages:—

1. Non-sparkling wines, gauging 15° by the centesimal alcoholometer or less, or according to the Canadian system of testing, containing 26 per cent or less of alcohol, and all sparkling wines should be exempted from the surtax or *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent.

2. The present duty charged on common soaps, savons de Marseille (castile soaps) shall be reduced by one-half.

3. The present duty charged on nuts, almonds, prunes and plums should be reduced by one-third.

That gives the list of articles upon which Canada granted concessions to the products of France. Under article 3 is a list of the articles upon which France granted the concession of her minimum tariff to the products of Canada :—

ARTICLE III.

The following articles of Canadian origin imported direct from that country accompanied by certificates of origin shall receive the advantage of the minimum tariff on entering France, Algeria or the French colonies:—

Canned meats; condensed milk, pure; fresh water fish, eels; fish preserved in their natural form; lobsters and crayfish preserved in their natural form; apples and pears, fresh, dried or pressed; fruits preserved, others; building timber in rough or sawn; wood pavement; staves; wood pulp (cellulose); extract of chestnut and other tanning extracts; common paper, machine made; prepared skins, others, whole; boots and shoes; furniture of common wood; furniture other than chairs, of solid wood, common; flooring in pine or soft wood; wooden sea-going ships.

It is understood that the advantage of any reduction of duty granted to any other power on any of the articles enumerated above shall be extended fully to Canada.

That is the list of articles upon which Canada obtained the concession of the French minimum tariff. I think it may fairly be said that the treaty, although not in all respects satisfactory, was a step in the right direction, as indicating the desire of Canada to establish friendly relations with that great country, France. There were, however, one or two conditions to which exception was taken at the time, and which seems unfair to Canada. The first disadvantage was with respect to what is called the favoured nation rule. France, by the terms of this treaty, received favoured nation advantages to a larger degree than she granted to Canada. Canada received assurance of favoured nation treatment—which is the best treatment accorded to any foreign country, as respects the list of articles mentioned in the treaty, and which I have read. But France, on the other hand, received favoured nation treatment in all commercial matters without limitation. The concession of favoured nation treatment to Canada was limited to the specific list of articles mentioned. Article 2 reads as follows :—

ARTICLE II.

Any commercial advantage granted by Canada to any third power, especially in tariff matters, shall be enjoyed fully by France, Algeria and the French colonies.

So, as I have said, France received the advantages of favoured nation treatment in all commercial matters in Canada, while

we in return received it only on a limited list of articles mentioned in the treaty. That is a disadvantage which has been frankly recognized from time to time. There is another point in which the old treaty seemed to be open to objection. Hon. gentlemen will have noticed that when I read the list of articles mentioned by article 3 of the convention it provides :

That the following articles of Canadian origin imported directly into France shall receive the benefit of the treaty.

In order to receive benefit on this list of articles the goods had to be sent directly from Canada to France. But when we come to the other side of the case as respects the French articles which were entitled to be admitted to the benefit of this treaty in Canada, there is no such limitation. France had the right to send her goods into Canada by any channel that might be desirable or convenient on her part, while Canada, on the other side, was limited as respects the benefit of the treaty to goods exported directly to France. So in these two particulars the treaty seemed to be somewhat unfair and inequitable. Nevertheless, if I may repeat what I said a moment ago, the treaty on the whole was regarded, I think, with considerable favour, not because it was extensive, but because it was a manifestation on the part of Canada of our desire to have commercial relations with that great country.

In the last session of pariament we adopted a somewhat new tariff policy, though in its general character it was substantially the same as before. But the new feature was the adoption of what was called the intermediate tariff. We recognized the fact that in dealing with foreign nations it is always well to have something to offer them. What that should be is some times a vexed question in the discussion of tariff matters. Of course, the English free trader would claim that it is not necessary to have anything to offer, but that you can get along without any such concessions. Whether that be right or wrong, most of the world runs to the other view, and finds that if you can make some discrimination in what you may have to give one country for a consideration from what you may be giving others, it is always helpful in negotiations. We adopted the intermediate tariff, stating that we desired it to be understood as an instrument of negotiation, as an indication of a willingness to make a general measure of reduction of our tariff to any country which wished to give us concessions in return. An intermediate tariff, as its name implies, stands between the rates of the British preferential tariff and the higher rates of the general tariff.

We had to recognize that in dealing with this question we might find some embarrassment from what is called the favoured nation clause in certain commercial treaties. These favoured nation treaties, many of them, are of olden times. In bygone years the imperial government made commercial treaties for the empire; the colonies were not specially consulted, but the treaties applied to the empire at large, and some of these old treaties still remain. In the development of Britain's colonial system a different policy has been adopted, and now it is the well understood policy of all governments in Great Britain that no commercial treaty will be made affecting any of the self-governing colonies without the consent of the colony itself. So if to-day any commercial treaty were undertaken by Great Britain, a clause would be put in stating that the treaty should not apply to Canada unless Canada desired by her own act to adhere to the treaty. Now the embarrassment that did sometimes arise from the existence of these old treaties is this, that if you wanted to make some arrangements with a country where you will receive some concession and give something in return, whatever you give to that country you will be obliged to give to all countries having these favoured nation treaties, though you may receive no special consideration from them in return. There are embarrassments in the matter, although it is not, I may say, without its compensation. But we found ourselves particularly embarrassed by the favoured nation terms of our own treaty with France, the treaty from which I have recently quoted. As I have pointed out, we were obliged by the terms of that treaty to give France every consideration that we might grant to any other foreign country. As a rule if we give the benefit of a given concession to a favoured nation country we would at least get the benefit of the favoured nation treatment in return. But in the case of our relations with France it was not so. We were obliged to give France favoured nation treatment in all commercial matters and especially in tariffs without getting any further concession than that which was contained in the treaty of 1893, which as I have explained, is a very limited one. For illustration: Suppose we had desired to make a treaty with Germany. Suppose Germany removed some of the disabilities under which we think our trade has laboured in that country. Suppose we in return were to agree to admit the products of Germany at favoured rates, we would get in that case some return from Germany. But we would be obliged to give the concession to France and receive no return whatever; because by the terms of the treaty of 1893 we are obliged to give France favoured nation treatment, not on a limited list of articles, but in all commercial matters. So it seems obvious that if we were to do any business with foreign nations generally, one of our first steps should be, if possible, to dispose

of this French treaty of 1893. Of course we could have disposed of that by simply asking the imperial authorities to denounce the treaty. But I am sure I voice the sentiments of every member of the House irrespective of party affiliations when I say that such a course would have been regarded as most regrettable and unjustifiable. There are many reasons why Canada should desire to establish the most friendly commercial relations with France; these reasons will occur to us on reflection. It seemed, therefore, that the proper course to pursue was, as a first step, to approach the French government and see if we could not make some more satisfactory arrangement with them. That course was determined upon, and a few months ago steps were taken to deal with the French government in the matter. I need hardly say that the making of a treaty is the work of the Sovereign, and that only those who are authorized by the Sovereign can undertake negotiations of that character. Our next step therefore, was to open communication with the imperial authorities in order that we might have the benefit of their co-operation and approval. I rejoice to be able to say, although it is only what one might expect, that from all in authority in the imperial government we received every assistance and every consideration and every courtesy. As we approached the French government we came into contact with two or three different departments of the British government. Lord Elgin, as head of the Colonial Office, would naturally be consulted; Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Minister, would naturally be consulted in a matter concerning negotiations with a foreign nation, and Mr. Lloyd-George, as head of the Board of Trade, would naturally come into the matter in the examination of commercial question. No one of those gentlemen was obliged to give the matter much time or attention, but at all events it is my duty and pleasure to say that each one of those distinguished members of the imperial government, and all the officials in the several departments, gave us their most hearty and most cordial co-operation. We can say the same for His Majesty's ambassador in France, Sir Francis Bertie, and Sir Henry Austin Lee, the commercial councillor of the embassy. We were not obliged to call upon them very often, but we had the gratification to know that any assistance we desired or any co-operation they could give us were cordially offered to us and freely given.

We were brought into communication, through the good offices of His Majesty's ambassador, with Mr. Pichon, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. After a preliminary discussion of the matter with the Foreign Minister the details of the transaction, on the part of France, were committed to certain high officers of the several departments who would naturally be called upon to deal with a commercial matter—high officers of the Foreign Office, the Departments of Finance, Commerce and Agriculture. These gentlemen entered into a discussion with us as to the details of the proposed arrangement. Our first suggestion, as is disclosed by the correspondence which has been placed on the table of the House, was to offer them, as a basis for opening the negotiations, our intermediate tariff for their minimum tariff, and we suggested that we should make a treaty for a term of at least ten years. The reply of the French authorities was, first, that they were not able to entertain the proposal for an exchange of our intermediate tariff for their minimum tariff, because under the French law, they were only at liberty to grant their full minimum tariff to a country which was prepared to give them the very lowest rate of duties that was accorded to anybody. Now, the very lowest rate of duties under our tariff, of course, was the British preferential, and as we were not prepared to grant the rates of the British preferential the French authorities felt that our proposition did not fall within the intention of their law. Another point upon which they were not able to agree with us was as respecting the fixing of rates for a period of ten years. They thought it more desirable that their legislature should be free to change these rates from time to time. They were willing to consider a list of articles as respects which they would give us the benefits of their minimum tariff, whatever they might be from time to time, but they did not wish to fix, or as they expressed it, to consolidate their duties for a period of ten years.

Mr. FOSTER. What would happen supposing that at the next session of the French chambers one of the items of their tariff which is now at the minimum rate and for which we are giving an equivalent should be placed on the general list—should be revised upward?

Mr. FIELDING. They would undoubtedly have the right to do that and we would get only the benefit of the revised rate, but on the other hand, the same thing would happen as respects us. We grant them on certain articles, the rates of our intermediate tariff. We do not grant a particular rate, we do not say the rate on this thing shall be 20 per cent and never anything more, we say the rate shall be the rate of the intermediate tariff, and if we see fit to change that rate and make a higher one we have a perfect right to do so, just as they have a perfect right to change the rate under the minimum tariff. But it is only fair to say that in both cases they can only do that if they do it at the same time as respects all foreign nations. If we change

our intermediate tariff and place a higher rate of duty on any article we could not give a lower rate to any other nation. We are obliged to give France the best we give to any foreign nation, and in like manner, if France should propose to change her rate, take some item from the minimum tariff and place it under the general tariff, she has a right to do that, but she can only do it for Canada by doing it at the same time for the whole foreign world.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the difficulty about the preferential tariff of England ? Did they look upon England as a foreign country ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, it has taken our European friends some years to understand the true relation which Canada bears to the empire at large, and there has been a strong disposition on the part of European nations to insist that we must give to them whatever we give to Great Britain. My hon. friend will remember that this was the great trouble in regard to the German and Belgian treaties a few years ago. A favoured nation treaty simply admits a country enjoying the benefits of that treaty to the treatment that we give to any foreign country, but the Belgian and German treaties required that we should give Germany and Belgium, not only what we might give to any foreign nation, but what we might give to any part of the British Empire. It was against these treaties that we protested and ultimately these old treaties—Lord Salisbury called them these 'unlucky treaties'—were denounced. Thus the right was established for Canada to make any arrangement that we thought fit and proper either with the mother country or with any portion of the British Empire. However, I am bound to say that our French friends did realize that position. We claimed that we must have the right to grant to any portion of the British Empire any tariff arrangement which, in the judgment of the parliament of Canada, might be wise, and in like manner we recognize the right of the French authorities to grant any tariff preference that they might desire to any part of the French possessions, whether they were distant or not. France is an immense country. Including her possessions she has a populaion of 93,000,000, and a territory of nearly 4,000,000 square miles. We recognize that that consitutes the French family and that they should have the right to make any tariff arrangement they might think proper within that circle. But if they should grant a concession to a foreign nation as respects any article in our treaty that concession must be given to Canada. In like manner we say that within the British Empire we have the right to make any arrangement we please. I hope I have made that point clear to my hon. friend from Beauharnois. In approaching our negotiations with the French authorities we tried to keep in view several purposes :

First, to remove the inequalities—I do not think any hon. gentleman will object to my calling them that—of the old treaty and make the conditions fairly reciprocal.

Second, to guard against the granting of concessions which would injure any large Canadian interest.

Third, to keep, as far as possible, for British trade the degree of preference established by the tariff policy of last session

Fourth, to grant to France to a reasonable extent of favoured nation treatment—the best treatment which is accorded to any foreign country—and to reserve to Canada the right to make any tariff arrangement which we may see fit with Great Britain or with any British colony.

Fifth, in the granting of any special rates which might be thought desirable we desired to confine them as far as possible to French specialties which would not be likely to come into competition in any large degree with our industries or with British industries.

Sixth, to secure favoured nation treatment as far as possible for the chief articles of export which we might hope to send abroad.

And lastly, to seek the favoured nation treatment on some things which, though we may not now export them, we may reasonably hope to export in the future.

Our first duty should be to give consideration to the lines of goods in which Canada is now engaged in the export trade, but we thought at the same time that we should have some regard to the articles in which Canada might at no distant day desire to obtain an export trade abroad.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What were the articles of the present export to which attention was chiefly directed in that regard ?

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be glad to call my hon. friend's attention to them as I proceed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Later on ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Now, I want to read article 1 of the treaty which hon. gentlemen probably have in their hands, because it will properly fit into this part of my statement.

The natural and manufactured products of Canadian origin enumerated in schedule A to this convention shall enjoy, on their importation into France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, the benefit of the minimum tariff and of the lowest rates of customs duty applicable to like products of other foreign origin.

I desire to call attention to the word 'foreign' there because it deals with a point to which I referred a moment ago. We

only asked to receive the best terms that are granted to a foreign country. We did not ask the best terms that are accorded by France to her colonies and we do not propose to give France the best terms that we give to Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. Non-British would be the meaning of that ?

Mr. FIELDING. The word 'foreign' in diplomacy has a definite meaning.

Mr. FOSTER. But as far as we are concerned ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, we reserved our freedom of action as respects British countries, but guaranteed to each other the best treatment that is accorded to a foreign nation. This article 1 deals with Canadian products which are entitled to the benefits of the minimum tariff. That, as I have already explained, does not fix the rates as respects the articles mentioned in the schedule—a very long list as my hon. friend will see—but France guarantees to us the benefits of her minimum tariff. She has undoubtedly the right to change that minimum tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. Upwards or downwards ?

Mr. FIELDING. Upwards or downwards, but whatever change she makes must apply to the world at large, and she must give us the best treatment she accords to any foreign nation. Article II emphasises that although I am not quite sure that the emphasis was necessary :

> Every reduction of customs duty granted by France to any foreign country whatever on any of the products enumerated in schedule A shall apply to the fullest extent to similar Canadian products.

So it is beyond all question that we shall receive under this arrangement the best rates that France may grant to any country. Now, if we turn to schedule A to which reference is made, we will find a long list of products. I remember that when the treaty of 1893 was being considered the criticism then offered was that we were receiving no concession upon the various products of the farm, and the answer that was made and justly made, was that it seemed hopeless at that time to expect from the French government any concession whatever upon farm products. Undoubtedly the policy of France has been towards the protection of its agriculture, and so strongly was that policy manifested at that time that the gentlemen connected with the negotiation of that treaty thought it was useless to attempt to obtain any concession in that respect whatever. Well, the situation is a little better to-day. We have not obtained concessions upon all the agricultural products that we should perhaps desire to have favoured, but we have obtained concessions on a considerable number. We have obtained the concession of the French minimum tariff on, animals, fresh meats, salted meats, tinned meats, eggs, cheese, salted butter, honey, apples, pears, peaches, canned or preserved fruits, vegetables, fodder including hay. These are the principal agricultural products upon which we have received the benefits, so far as they may be benefits, of the French minimum tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has left out pine apples.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes, pine apples would probably square with eels which were in the old treaty. Then, among the other natural products which are mentioned in the treaty are, fish fresh and salted, fish oils, wood pulp, lumber; some of these articles are in the old treaty of course and are carried forward.

Mr. BERGERON. How do our goods compare with American goods going into France ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Americans have a very limited tariff with France but they are trying to get a new one now. They have some few articles on the minimum tariff, a list of which I read to the House the other day.

Mr. BERGERON. Do Canadian goods stand on a better footing than United States goods entering France ?

Mr. FIELDING. On some of the articles in this treaty they unquestionably do. I do not say that always will be the case, I do not wish to put forward that view.

Mr. BERGERON. What about agricultural implements ?

Mr. FIELDING. I will be happy to discuss that a moment later with my hon. friend. As I stated, these are the principal articles of Canadian export. There are a number of agricultural items upon which we receive no concession and yet these items are set forth in the treaty. The items of grains, wheat, oats, every thing of that kind, will be found to be set forth in the treaty, but if you examine carefully you will discover that the minimum tariff which they are kind enough to give us amounts to the same as the general tariff. I would not be surprised if some hon. gentlemen would say : Well, if the rates are the same what is your concession, why do you put it in the treaty ? There is no immediate value we frankly admit, but the reason we put these items into the treaty is that France may at any time make treaties with other countries in which concessions may be granted on these items, and if we have no reference to them in this treaty, it may be that a year hence France will make a treaty with the United States and give reduced rates upon wheat and flour and such things, and she would then, were

these articles not mentioned, be under no obligation to give the same reduced rates to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an important point which my hon. friend has touched and I would like to be clear on that. I would judge that with reference to these articles just mentioned France has no minimum tariff ; she only has a general tariff and if that be so and we are not getting the minimum tariff on these articles I do not see how we could benefit from the contingency that the hon. minister has spoken of. Would he be a little more definite about that ?

Mr. FIELDING. We certainly get no concession now because where the rates are mentioned at all in the French tariff they are the same, and if they are left blank in one column and the rates are mentioned in the other that amounts to the same thing ; there is no minimum rate. But if at any time France were to grant to our neighbours in the United States—I take the United States for the sake of illustration—a minimum rate upon these articles, she is obliged to give us that minimum rate at the same time, and that is why we put in the tariff a rather numerous list of items as to which at present there is no concession at all. Have I made it clear ?

Mr. FOSTER. Where has my hon. friend the authority in the treaty for that ; will he point it to us ?

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend reads more carefully article 1 :—

> The natural and manufactured products of Canadian origin enumerated in schedule A to this convention shall enjoy, on their importation into France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, the benefit of the minimum tariff and of the lowest rates of customs duty applicable to like products of other foreign origin.

And to remove any possible doubt and to make assurance doubly sure, article 2 says :—

> Every reduction of customs duty granted by France to any foreign country whatever on any of the products enumerated in schedule A shall apply to the fullest extent to similar Canadian products.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to me to meet it.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that is quite clear and it was for that purpose it was inserted. I can well understand that without explanation it might seem to be a waste of time to put into that treaty a long list of items with respect to which there is actually for the moment no concession at all. But in the light of interchange of observations between my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and myself, I think it will be seen that it is of the greatest importance to place in that list our chief articles of export, so that, though we may not receive any concession at the moment, we shall be sure that if at any time hereafter France should grant a concession upon these articles to any foreign country, then she will give that concession to these similar products of Canada. I think that in that respect this provision of the treaty is very important indeed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the meaning of the blanks in the French minimum tariff ; is it that there is no minimum tariff with respect to these articles ?

Mr. FIELDING. The structure of the French tariff is somewhat peculiar in that respect. In some cases they put in the two columns the same rate and in some cases they put a rate in only the general column. The result is the same; if there is a general rate given and no rate mentioned in the minimum column then certainly we have to pay the general rate for the present, and there is no minimum in that case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a little confusing.

Mr. FIELDING. It is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Sometimes, for example as in the case of seed grain, we find the same figures in both columns and sometimes you find no figures at all in the first column ; that I did not understand.

Mr. FIELDING. Like my hon. friend I find it a bit confusing, but there can be no doubt that in these cases there is no minimum rate and only the general rate can apply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They have two tariffs, as we have?

Mr. FIELDING. They have two columns.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend know how many countries approximately have the same advantages that France is offering to us under this treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. I gave a list of the countries the other day; it is quite numerous. No great country to-day is going to give to any one country a monopoly of its tariff privileges. Even if Canada were a very much greater and bigger country than it is, no country would give us a monopoly of any concession. It might give us a concession for the time being, as France does, but it would hold itself free to grant the same concession to any other country that would satisfy it. France has given the advantage of its minimum tariff to quite a number of countries. Of course, our chief competitor, to speak frankly, is to the south of us. Our enterprising brethren in the United States produce the same things that we do, and in the world's trade they are going to be our chief competitors.

In all our transactions with foreign countries it should be our aim to see that we are put on even terms with them as respects our chief articles of export. I have said that we have endeavoured to secure under this treaty, first, such concessions as we could get as respects the articles which we are now exporting; and we have thought it well also to put into the treaty a list of articles which we do not now export. Canada not many years ago, in the negotiation of a commercial treaty, would have hardly thought it necessary to do more than seek consideration for her natural products. The reciprocity treaty of 1854 was a treaty in natural products almost entirely. But Canada since that time has grown immensely. We are no longer relying on natural products alone. Our manufactures have made considerable progress; and even if in some lines we are not exporting to-day, I ask hon. gentlemen, was it not the part of wisdom in the ministers who were negotiating with the French government to look ahead and consider whether some things which we have not exported in the past are not likely to be the subject of export at no distant day? We are not making a treaty merely for a day or for a year. We hope that this treaty will prove so beneficial to both countries—because a good treaty can only be good when it is beneficial to both parties—that it will last for a long period of years. Therefore we have to look ahead and consider not only the things which we export to-day, but the things which we may wish to export in the early future. Take a glance, for instance, at the condition of manufactures in Canada to-day and at the progress that has been made. It is not many years since Canada imported all her cement from Europe—from Great Britain or Belgium. During the last ten or fifteen years Canada has made enormous progress in the manufacture of cement. We now produce a first class article, equal to the best that can be produced in the old world. Up to the present, large as has been the development of our cement industry, our home market has been able to absorb the whole product; but any gentleman acquainted with that industry will agree with me when I say that the time is not far distant when our production will exceed the requirements of our home market and we shall be sending cement to Europe instead of looking to Europe for it. I ask my hon. friends if it was not the part of wisdom to put cement on the list on the chance of by and by finding the concession as to that article useful.

Apply the same rule to articles of iron. We have of course been importers of iron for generations, but of late years we have made very great progress in the iron industries of our own country. True, they have only been built up by means of great encouragement; we have not been able to hold our home market even with the assistance of bounties, and that is the condition at the present moment. We are not able to export iron at present. We made the attempt a few years ago, but it was only experimental and was not treated as a serious proposition. But who will say that with the expansion of that industry, five or ten years hence we may not send iron to the European market? It is at any rate within the bounds of possibility.

So you may go through the various lines of Canadian manufactures. We have always imported most of our locomotives. We have made a few in Canada, and of late years there has been a great improvement in that branch of trade. It is not many years since we had a single factory at Kingston, which has been expanded into a great industry, and we also manufacture locomotives at Montreal and Toronto, and in a few years we may be able to send some abroad. At any rate, no harm will result from placing locomotives in the list of articles on which we wish to get the best terms going. Take sewing-machines. Some years ago we had a considerable trade in sewing-machines. Since then there has been a change in the methods of the industry; but we have to-day a large sewing machine factory at Guelph, and recently another large factory has been built at St. John's, P.Q. We are not sending sewing machines at present to the European market, but as that industry is growing, we thought it wise to put them on the list. Going through this list, I can well understand that hon. gentlemen might find a few articles on which there might be doubt and criticism. They might say, we are not exporting these articles. The answer is that we are an iron, copper, nickel and lead-producing country; we have made enormous expansion in our manufactures in the last few years; and I hope I have the sympathy of the House when I say that we hope for a much greater expansion in the future; and it is in order that we may avail ourselves of that expansion and be in a position to send our productions to the European market on fair terms that we have placed these articles on the list. Instead of making a treaty with reference merely to the common natural products of the country, we are making a treaty which anticipates that Canada will take her place among the manufacturing countries of the world.

The hon. member for Beauharnois asked a question about agricultural implements. That is another illustration of what we may hope to do in manufactures. We have already done something in the way of exporting agricultural implements. Last year, in addition to supplying our home market, we exported them to the value of $3,248,000, and of these we sent over half a million dollars worth to France. Now, France is a magnificent agricultural coun-

try, but her methods have been old-fashioned and backward. She is beginning now to use agricultural implements very freely, and although some classes of agricultural machinery used in France are manufactured at home and some in England, there is a great demand for the modern kinds of agricultural implements manufactured in Canada and the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. What kinds, for instance?

Mr. FIELDING. Mowers and reapers, I believe, though I cannot answer my hon. friend's question as fully as I would like to do. We learned that there was a growing demand for the kind made in America, and we thought it was of very considerable importance that we should obtain favourable terms as respects agricultural implements, and we have been able to place them on the list. My hon. friend asked, what about the United States? The United States at this moment have no arrangement by which the minimum tariff shall be extended to them on agricultural implements.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend know the value of agricultural implements sent by the United States to France?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not. No doubt there is a large export of American agricultural implements. That is an industry in which the United States have been somewhat ahead of us, but we have been doing a lot of catching up in the last few years. At all events, agricultural implements are one of the lines of manufacture in which Canada has made great progress. It is the boast of one of the great manufacturing concerns in Toronto that they are selling agricultural implements under every flag in the world, and selling them at a profit.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount exported from the United States to France in 1895—I have not the figures for 1896—was $2,750,764.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my hon. friend state how the duty works out on the average binder or mower?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I could not; but I think for our purpose if I give my hon. friend the general and minimum duty on agricultural machinery he will see comparatively the advantage we get. In France of course their method of levying duty is different from ours; they levy there largely by weight and on each 100 kilograms of agricultural machinery, under general tariff, the duty is 15 francs, and under the minimum tariff it is only 9 francs. There is an illustration of a substantial advantage which we obtain. At this moment should the treaty be adopted, the American agricultural implement maker must pay a duty of 15 francs per 100 kilograms on his machines while on the same article the Canadian pays only 9 francs per kilogram. It is a very material advantage. But while we get that concession for the moment, I do not anticipate that we can hold it for ever. I think it is something to have got a start, to be able to say to-day that the duty on Canadian agricultural implements under this treaty will be materially lower than that on American; but we know that at this moment our American friends are in Paris trying to make a treaty. Their methods of treaty-making are somewhat slow and it may take them some time. I have no doubt that in the end these two great nations will come together and make a treaty and that agricultural implements may be included in the arrangement. Just how soon that will come I can hardly say. I have seen statements in the press that it is likely a Franco-American arrangement may be made at a very early date. On the other hand, as I have said, the methods of making treaties in the United States are somewhat slow and even after they have made up their minds what they want it may take some time to perfect an arrangement. However that may be, I do not want to hold out the hope that this concession will continue for Canada. But suppose that we did not have that concession and that then our American friends obtained the concession of 9 francs and we had to pay the 5 francs, what would then be our position? No matter what may be given to the United States we have the guarantee and the advantage of that concession. We cannot claim to have this concession permanently but if France makes a treaty with the United States they must give us the benefit of whatever arrangement they make with the United States with regard to agricultural implements. And so with other things.

If we have regard to statistics as respects our present exports, I am quite prepared to receive the criticism that there are many items mentioned in the treaty which are of little or no importance to Canada, but I beg hon. gentlemen when giving the subject their consideration to look ahead and have that abiding faith that we have that Canada, in making treaty arrangements to-day, should no longer confine herself to the products of agriculture, the forest and the fisheries, but should have regard to the increasing production of the workshops of our country.

Another article upon which we have asked a concession is spirits. There has been a little misunderstanding in the House on that subject; the impression seems to have got abroad that we are reducing the duties in Canada on French brandies, gins and spirits of all sorts. I can understand how one might fall into that error on hastily reading the treaty and finding these articles on the list, but the explanation is of course that at present there is no change in these duties. On both sides of this treaty will be found a number of items printed in italics, articles

of Canadian production which we hope to export to France and articles of French production which they may hope to send to Canada ; these articles printed in italics indicate that for the time being there is no reduction in rate, but each country gives the other a guarantee that if at any time it makes a reduction on these articles, France or Canada, as the case may be, shall benefit by the reduction. There is therefore no reduction whatever upon spirits coming into Canada. There is, however, a reduction on spirits going into France, amounting to about one-eighth of the duty on spirits as between the general tariff and the minimum tariff. I am quite prepared to have some good friend say we are not very much concerned in this spirit matter, that it would be a good thing if we did not have any spirits. But next to not having spirits produced in the country, it would surely be well instead of drinking them ourselves to send them abroad, and have some one else drink them. Last year we sent abroad $1,326,000 worth of Canadian whiskies, so you see it is a very considerable article of export. We exported to France only $3,674 worth of Canadian whisky, but I can bear testimony to the fact —not by actual drinking of course,——

An hon. MEMBER. Quite sure of that ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I prefer other beverages. I can testify that the manufacturers of Canadian whisky are very enterprising and one of the best advertised articles of Canadian origin on the continent of Europe, is one of the Canadian whiskies, I am not going to say which.

Mr. BERGERON. Was it good to drink ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know, but the Frenchmen seemed to think it was. If we can send abroad this Canadian whisky, which is strong—although many people think it is excellent, others believe it is not—and bring back the light wines of France, in addition to exchanging trade, may we not be advancing the great cause of temperance ?

Mr. FOSTER. What does the Minister of Agriculture think of that ?

Mr. FIELDING. He is not here to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. You are taking advantage of him.

Mr. FIELDING. I rather think he would prefer to send the whisky abroad and if he had to drink anything he would prefer the wines mentioned.

Mr. HENDERSON. You mean he would prefer the wines ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think of the two, if he had to take either he would take the wine. I have mentioned a number of articles of manufacture, that we have placed on the list, I do not know if it is necessary to enlarge on them.

Mr. FOSTER. Item 174 seems to be the item of which the minister is now speaking; is that the only item in which spirits enter ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I think that covers all forms of spirits. The word 'other' at the bottom of the item covers whiskies as they are not specifically qualified; they come under the general head of spirits.

Coming now to the articles in the line of manufactures in which we may hope some day to do business, although we are not doing much in them to-day, I may mention as examples mineral waters, cement, iron and steel rails, lead in various forms, nickel, antimony, skins and hides, boots and shoes (these are in the old treaty), leather belting locomotives, sewing machines, gas-buoys pianos, organs, carriages and carts, manufactures of india rubber, asbestos and mica. All these are things which are being produced in Canada; some we are already exporting and others we may reasonably hope to export in the future, and for that reason, we think it is important that they should be included. Schedule A gives a list of articles upon which Canada receives concessions. This list includes 152 articles. If we turn to the schedule B, we find that Canada gives concessions to France on 98 articles. I am not trying to suggest that a mere comparison of the number of articles necessarily means a great deal, but they happen to be respectively of these numbers. The rates we grant upon these 98 items are the rates contained in the intermediate tariff as adopted last year. There is nothing new in them—they are the rates that parliament has already approved of. Then, we come to schedule C. France claimed that the difference between her general tariff and minimum tariff was greater than the difference between our general tariff and intermediate tariff. It must be admitted that there is some force in that connection. Take for illustration a few items. The difference in most cases, in our tariffs, is 2½ per cent. In some cases it is 5 per cent. Some illustrations from the French tariffs will show that the difference between their tariffs is greater. For instance, take the following list of articles showing the duty for a given quantity under the French general tariff and also under the French minimum tariff, and it will be seen what a very considerable difference there is :

	French general tariff. Fr.	French minimum tariff. Fr.
Agricultural implements. . .	15	9
Salted meats, per 100 kilos (220 lbs.)..	50	30
Butchers produce..	100	50
Codfish, dried..	60	48
Fresh lobsters..	40	15
Fresh apples..	5	2
Dried apples..	15	10

The differences in these cases range

from 20 per cent to 60 per cent of the duty. So, our French brethren were correct when they claimed that the measure of reduction which they were able to give, item for item, as between their two tariffs, was greater than the reduction that we were able to give, item by item, under the tariffs adopted by this parliament. They gave this as a reason why they should receive consideration by way of special reductions. We felt that that was a fair claim and were willing to grant them concessions upon a few items which might almost be called French specialties. That is done by schedule C, which sets forth the special rates of duties in the cases there given. In most cases, these are the rates of the British preferential tariff, but as the goods, are not, to any extent, produced in England, the British trade is not affected by these reductions.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the relations of France and England in that matter?

Mr. FIELDING. England has the benefit of the French minimum tariff. England has only one tariff, which gives to France as low duties as are given to any other country in the world. We do not give to other countries as low a tariff as we give to England.

Mr. BERGERON. England, then, is on the same plane that we are on ?

Mr. FIELDING. England is better placed. We get the benefit of the minimum tariff on a long list of articles, while England gets the benefit of it on the full list. Of course the things that we have to sell over there are not the things that England has to sell, and we are not competitors as a rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there not a pretty large importation under article 220 of schedule C ?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) refers to liquid medicines. I am glad he called attention to that. Liquid medicines appear in our existing tariff under a general classification at 50 per cent. The French representatives desired to have a reduction on this item. We came to the conclusion that we would not reduce the duties on liquid medicines which contained alcohol. We divided this item into two parts, and while the rate stands as to medicines containing alcohol, on those not containing alcohol it will be reduced to 25 per cent. That and the duty on light wines, to which I shall refer presently, are the only duties that are lower than the preferential tariff. Wines, of course, Britain does not produce to any great extent; but in the case of liquid medicines, we realize that these are exported from Britain, and we propose to reduce the duties on these goods from Britain at the same time. The same rate will apply to the whole British Empire. In embroideries, velvets, silk fabrics, ribbons and manufactures of silk, we fixed rates below those of the intermediate tariff, but in all such cases still leaving a margin of preference to the British manufacturer. The margin of preference is somewhat reduced, but in most cases the British manufacturers are not serious competitors in these lines of goods.

Mr. BERGERON. Britain imports these goods.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, she imports them largely from France.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the item of embroideries, laces and so on, there is a large English manufacture.

Mr. FIELDING. Laces are made in Nottingham. But I was advised by a gentleman in the trade, interested in the trade with Canada, that the French laces and the English laces are really different articles. His judgment was that this would not seriously affect the export of English laces to Canada. That is one item as to which it may perhaps be said that there will be some competition on the part of England. But there is only a reduction of the margin of preference. I think that is the one item in the line of French specialties in which there is a possibility of the position of the English manufacturer being weakened.

Mr. DANIEL. With regard to medicines, I notice that under article 316, page 15, it says that those medicines not mentioned in any pharmacopœia are entirely prohibited. Does that mean that the ordinary proprietary medicines manufactured in Canada, unless they are mentioned in the British or other pharmacopœia are entirely prohibited from being imported into France? Item 316 says 'Compound medicines, not specified.' Then it says :

Mentioned in an official pharmacopœia, specific duties to be fixed by the superior school of pharmacy

Then it says that those not mentioned in any such pharmacopoeia are prohibited.

Mr. FIELDING. These are prohibited by the law of France ; it is not a new feature in the treaty.

Mr. DANIEL. No proprietary medicines made in Canada can be imported into France except those that are officinal.

Mr. FIELDING. That I believe to be the law of France to-day. I now come to the duties on champagnes and wines. Our French friends are makers of a large variety of things, but like every other country they have their specialties. Silks, ribbons, embroideries, laces, wines, champagnes and brandies are the specialties of France. I have stated that so far as brandies and strong liquors are concerned, there is no reduction whatever. With regard to cham-

pagne it was very natural that our French friends should wish for a reduction on our part. It is a great article of commerce with them, and they would have been very much gratified if we could have given them some decrease. But we felt that champagne was an article of luxury and a legitimate object of high taxation, and that the reduction on champagne which was made by the existing treaty of 1893 was about as far as Canada ought to go. At that time Canada had a specific and an ad valorem duty. The duty on champagne was $3.30, the ordinary case, with an addition of 30 per cent ad valorem. By the treaty of 1893 the 30 per cent ad valorem was removed, leaving only the specific duty. We make no change in that. We had to tell our French friends frankly that we regarded champagne as an article of luxury and a proper subject for taxation, and we thought that in striking off the 30 per cent ad valorem by the treaty of 1893 we had gone quite far enough, and we had to refuse to make any further concessions on champagne. By the treaty of 1893 light wines having not more than 26 per cent of proof spirit are made dutiable at a reduced rate of 25 cents per gallon. Our French friends wanted a reduction on wine generally; we had to refuse reductions on spirits and champagne, but we said we were willing to consider some changes on the lighter wines. We realized that in making a bargain with a country we must recognize the things that they wanted especially to sell and try to meet them. So we entered into a discussion with them to see what we might do in the way of some reduction on wines, and the conclusion we reached was that we would graduate the duties in proportion to the strength of the wine. So we say that a wine which has not more than 20 per cent of proof spirit shall be admitted at the rate of 15 cents per gallon; if it has more than 20 per cent and not more than 23, it shall be admitted at 20 cents per gallon; 15 cents per gallon up to 20 per cent and 20 cents per gallon up to 23 per cent, all above 23 to remain as at present at 25 per cent. 23 to 26 remains as at present.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. When wines are imported in bulk, is the gallon mentioned imperial or wine measure?

Mr. FIELDING. Our Customs Act defines the gallons as an imperial gallon. We have a small wine industry in Canada, but though it is small it should receive our full consideration. I am inclined to think that it is not an increasing industry. I have been told by the fruit growing people that they hardly found it profitable to sell their grapes for wine purposes, and that they did not look forward to any great extension of the Canadian wine industry. However that may be, I know that in one or two counties of our Dominion there is a wine industry, and when the duty of 1893 was considered, gentlemen interested in that industry were somewhat anxious as to the effect upon it. I think statistics will show that the importation of these light wines in Canada has not increased much. I do not think that it can be argued that the present treaty has been the means of preventing the Canadian industry from flourishing. However, I can well understand that gentlemen interested in that industry look upon the present treaty with some anxiety. I have been asked to meet some of them, and I will be glad to do so. But it must be remembered that we cannot make omelets without breaking eggs, and you cannot make a treaty with France or any other country without giving some concession to the special industries in which that country is engaged, and if we can make a treaty which does not effect any large industry in Canada then probably we ought to make it. However, I shall be glad to make further inquiry into the position of these gentlemen interested in the native wine trade, and if they have any grievances, there may be some means of finding a remedy.

Mr. BERGERON. The Canadian wine growers are to provide the omelet.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that they should not receive full consideration, if we are going to affect a very wide industry we should have to go slow about it. But if we had to affect a small industry in order to build up trade with a foreign country, it would be a fair question as to the balance of advantage to be gained. However, I have not met the Canadian wine growers yet, but I shall be glad to do so. At all events what we are doing is to make some concessions to France along the line of things in which France is particularly interested.

Mr. FOSTER. It would help us to understand the wine question if the hon. gentleman would give us a comparative statement which would enable us to understand what this reduction amounts to. Instead of being so much on all below 26, it is now graded with varying duties. Now on the importation of last year, what would be the lowering of duties under these rates as compared with the duties paid last year?

Mr. FIELDING. At a later stage I will be able to give my hon. friend that information.

Mr. FOSTER. It is important to find out what reduction we are really giving.

Mr. FIELDING. That is an important matter, and I will get the information for my hon. friend at a later stage.

MR. T. CHISHOLM. In regard to native wines, have not the French manufacturers of wines an advantage in getting alcohol

without any duty to fortify their wines and bring them up to a certain strength ? Have the Canadian manufacturers of wines the same privilege ?

Mr. FIELDING. I find in reading the debates of 1893 that the same question came up and it was held that in view of the concession to imported wines then made, something of that kind should be done, but I find that nothing was done and that the Canadian wine grower does not receive his alcohol free. Whether the case is exactly as it was then, and whether the reasons then advanced for granting free alcohol to the Canadian wine growers still remain, or whether the conditions have changed or whether they should receive some consideration of that character, is a proper matter for the inquiry upon which I could not say anything definite now. But, the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the concession is not granted to the manufacturer of Canadian wines.

It may be said that we will be obliged to give the benefits of this treaty to what are called the favoured nation countries. That is correct. There may occasionally arise circumstances under which these favoured nation treaties prove somewhat embarrassing to us as they restrict our freedom of action. Still it is only fair to say that there are some compensations. If we grant to any one of these countries the benefits of this tariff by reason of favoured nation treaties which these countries made years ago with Great Britain, they cannot give us any special concession in return but they are obliged to give us favoured nation treatment, and therefore we get from these countries the best that they will give to anybody. But, as I stated a little while ago, no country is going to give, in these days a monopoly of its trade to anybody. A country may negotiate with us and give us some concession, but it will reserve its right to give the same concession to any other country with which it wishes to deal ; so that all that Canada can hope to get is what is called favoured nation treatment, or the best treatment that is going. We shall have to give the benefits of this treaty to a number of countries and I shall be happy to give the House now a list of these countries. I think I mentioned on a previous day that the application of these old treaties to Canada is sometimes debatable and I have known occasions when members differed as to whether a treaty of this class did or did not apply to Canada. But, I think I would be justified in saying that the favoured nation countries, in addition to the British empire, which will receive the benefit of this French treaty are the Argentine Republic, Austro-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Venezuela, Switzerland, Norway and Persia.

Mr. BERGERON. These are the countries which will benefit?

Mr. FIELDING. These are the countries which many years ago made treaties with Great Britain which included a clause to the effect that any privilege granted to any other foreign country should be given to them, and these treaties, made years ago before the colonies had attained their present strength as self-governing bodies, are still applicable to Canada. Under these old treaties we will be obliged to give to every one of these countries whatever privilege we grant to France. When we come to look over that list very carefully we will find that is not a very alarming one. In the first place as I have already said, we get from every one of these countries favoured nation treatment, we get the best that anybody has got, and therefore we are protected against the idea that at any time any country mentioned in this list might give to our competitors some favour and refuse it to us. That is our compensation for being parties to these favoured nation treaties.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to understand this clearly. France has favoured nation treaties with other countries. Any minimum tariff that is given to any country these favoured nations get the full benefit of ?

Mr. FIELDING. Given by France ?

Mr. HAGGART. Given by France.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. We only get the benefit under our arrangement with the French government of the minimum tariff on the articles mentioned in the schedule ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. HAGGART. We are not then in the position at all of those countries which have favoured nation treaties with France ?

Mr. FIELDING. We are in the position of those countries as respects every one of those articles on the list.

Mr. HAGGART. On the list ?

Mr. FIELDING. And these articles include all the things that Canada is likely to have to sell and some, you may tell me, she is not likely to have to sell. So practically, there is no difference. If my hon. friend would add a great many other things to the list that we would have no chance of sending to them it would be of no great advantage, and I admit the possibility of the criticism being offered that as respects some of the things on the list they are of debatable advantage. However, as I have said before, France could only grant the full benefit of her minimum tariff, under the law, to the countries that gave her the very lowest rate of duty and they said to us :

You do not give us the very lowest rate of duty ; you are giving a lower rate to England and therefore, under the terms of the French law, we cannot give you the full benefit of the French minimum tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. It was England which was making the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. But, for commercial purposes England and Canada are not quite the same, for while these old time treaties do include Canada we are free now in our negotiations with France. As respects these favoured nations generally, when we give them the benefit of this tariff we do not give it to them for nothing. We get in return no special concession, but we get a guarantee that they will not do anything better for anybody else than they do for us.

Mr. BERGERON. How many are there that fall under that head ?

Mr. FIELDING. I will read them again.

Mr. BERGERON. No, how many are there ?

Mr. FIELDING. Thirteen—the unlucky number.

Mr. BERGERON. All the advantages given to us by France are shared by thirty other nations ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know ; I gave the list the other day but I have forgotten it. It is the policy of France to give her minimum tariff wherever she can get something in return.

Mr. BERGERON. To how many nations will our general tariff now apply ?

Mr. FIELDING. Our general tariff applies to all nations, subject to this qualification.

Mr. BERGERON. If you strike out sixty-three how many are there left ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a matter of geography that my hon. friend and I will have to study up. If you look over this list of favoured nation countries you will find that with a few exceptions they have no considerable trade with us and that the granting of the concessions of this treaty to them is a matter of small importance. Austro-Hungary has a considerable trade. She will get the benefits of this treaty, but she will never allow any competitor of ours into her market on any better terms than we are entitled to.

Mr. FOSTER. We have already that guarantee ?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly, and we are continuing it by this treaty. By the favoured nation treaty she becomes entitled to this and we get a continuance of the guarantee which she has already given us. Austro-Hungary is a country of some considerable trade, Japan is a country with a growing trade and Spain sends us some wines. Really among all the other countries, there are few of them that have a very extensive trade and therefore the concession that we are granting to these countries are not of the very greatest importance ; so that, I do not think the fact that we are obliged to give these concessions to favoured nations is of very great importance.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister whether this favoured nation treatment will extend only to those countries whose products would come and to which our products would go directly. This treaty only affects goods which are brought direct from France into Canada and which are sent from Canada to France ? Now, does that particular feature of it apply to these other countries which will come in under the favoured nation clause ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, any favoured nation country which claims and receives the benefit of this treaty must accept these benefits upon the same terms and conditions as France receives them; they can only get that which the treaty gives to France and that does include the matter of direct shipment. I think that makes it clear

Now, there are some other conditions of the treaty which are of a general character, not of the greatest importance. In both the French tariff and the Canadian intermediate tariff there are items which are at present exempt from duty, and you may say that so long as they are free of duty that is the best that any of us can get, and there is no use stipulating with regard to them. But we thought that there was a possibility that some of these items which are now exempt from duty in the French tariff might be placed upon the dutiable list in the future, and therefore we stipulate that if France shall at any time transfer any of these free items to the dutiable list then she must guarantee not to discriminate against Canada, but shall give Canada as respects these items the lowest rate of duty she grants to any foreign nation. And in like manner we stipulate that if we at any time shall transfer from our free list to the dutiable list any article, we guarantee to give on that article, to France, the lowest rate of duty that shall be given to any foreign country.

Mr. MARSHALL. If any Canadian goods on this list are being shipped from Canada to France and en route they are transferred at any foreign port, will there be any extra tariff on them over and above the minimum tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. In some cases, yes. I shall be glad to take up now the question of the direct shipment.

Mr. FOSTER. Item 711 in schedule B seems to be a very general item.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the general unenumerated item of goods in the Canadian tariff which pay under the general tariff 20 per cent and under the intermediate 17½ per cent, and this simply gives them the benefit of the intermediate rate of 17½ per cent on the unenumerated articles.

Mr. FOSTER. Which are how many?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot say. My hon. friend knows in his own experience of making a tariff that having put in everything in the world one can think of, for fear of leaving anything out you put in these unenumerated goods. Whatever comes under 'enumerated' would pay 20 per cent under the general tariff, and it is reduced now to 17½ per cent the intermediate tariff rate on these unenumerated goods, or 15 per cent if they come from Great Britain. We simply give France the intermediate tariff rate on these articles which are not mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister compare the extent of the free list in France with the extent of the free list in Canada; how do they compare as to items and importations?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the figures at hand, but I will take a note of the question. There is a considerable free list in both countries.

Mr. FOSTER. My impression is that the free list in France is comparatively small.

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever it is, my hon. friend will agree that although we had not any special items in mind, it is a general provision that if at any time they take anything from the free list and make it dutiable they shall not discriminate against us, and we cheerfully agree that if we take anything from our free list we shall not discriminate against France. We can put whatever duty we like upon such an article, but we must treat France the same with regard to it as we treat any other foreign country.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that it depends a great deal on the relative size of the free list in each case.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not quite see how that affects the question. We certainly do not want in any of these things to discriminate against France; we need not take an item from our free list if we do not wish to, but if we take it from the free list we can put whatever rate of duty on it we see fit, and all we bargain for is that we shall not discriminate against France with respect to the duty on that article. There cannot be anything wrong in that; I do not think my hon. friend could suggest anything else on reflection. France could not ask anything better from us and we could not ask anything better from them.

Now, with regard to the direct shipment. In the treaty of 1893, the old treaty which is in force to-day, the treaty negotiated by Lord Dufferin and Sir Charles Tupper, in that treaty article 3 gives a list of articles upon which reductions of duty are established, but it says:—

The following articles of Canadian origin imported direct from that country.

This means that they must be imported direct from Canada. The treaty stipulates that in order to get the benefit of the reduced rates on these goods, Canada had to send these goods direct to France, but France had the right to send her goods into Canada by any channel that is found to be convenient. Now, the French government attach great importance to that question of direct trade. They have made it their policy to build up their ports, and when the question has been discussed from time to time as to any modification of that if it were desirable, they have always said: It is no use to talk like that, that is our national policy in France and we cannot change it. Then we said: If it is not desirable that you should change, and we are not making a proposal on the subject, you should make it reciprocal, and you should only claim from us the same benefits that you are willing to give us; if we are only to receive the benefits of this treaty when we send the goods direct to you, then you can only in reason claim our benefits when you send the goods direct to us. So that whereas in former years this provision was one-sided and inequitable, it is now made reciprocal and they must send their goods either directly or by certain routes which are mentioned in article 8:—

To enjoy the benefits of the aforementioned tariff advantages, products originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, shall be conveyed without shipment from a port of those territories or from a port of a territory enjoying the preferential tariff or intermediate tariff into a sea or river of Canada.

French goods therefore would have to come to us direct or by way of a country which enjoys the preferential tariff (as Great Britain or any of the colonies having that preference) or the intermediate tariff. Now, no country has the benefit of the intermediate tariff and therefore at present that is not applicable. This clearly means then—and this answers the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall)—that the French goods coming into Canada would have to come direct or by way of Great Britain at present. If we should give the benefit of our intermediate tariff to some other country, then the French goods could

come by way of that country, but that contingency has not yet arisen.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says there is no country which when this treaty is ratified will enjoy the intermediate tariff —every most favoured nation country will have the intermediate tariff so far as the goods mentioned in this treaty are concerned, and will get them in under that intermediate tariff just the same as France and on the same conditions of shipment. The point that arises here is whether or not one of the most-favoured nation treaty countries in Europe becomes entitled to the entry of goods from that country to this country on the same terms as France, and enjoys thereby the intermediate tariff so far as these goods are concerned, and whether France can ship them through her ports, even by an indirect shipment. For instance, the United States enjoys a portion of France's minimum tariff. Does that entitle her to tranship goods through a United States port?

Mr. FIELDING. I should think the proper interpretation would be that the whole intermediate tariff must apply and not a portion of it. The whole intermediate tariff has not been granted to any country. It will not be granted to France by this treaty, and therefore will not be granted to any favoured nation country. If the other interpretation can be sustained, I do not think that will have any adverse effect on us; so we need not dwell very much on that. Let us turn to the other side:

To enjoy the benefits of the aforesaid mentioned tariff advantages, Canadian products shall be conveyed without transhipment from a Canadian port or from a port of a country enjoying the French minimum tariff to a port in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China.

Provided, however, that nothing in this article shall exempt the products of either country from any surtaxe d'entrepot that is now or hereafter may be, imposed on products imported indirectly.

As I have stated, the French government attach great importance to this matter of direct shipment. We are paying $120,000 per annum for the encouragement of direct trade between Canada and France. If we send goods by our direct line to France, they of course get the benefit of this treaty without any surtaxe d'entrepot being imposed upon them. If a ship goes with goods partly for France and partly for England she can go to England, discharge her goods for England and then proceed to France and discharge her goods for France, and these goods will be entitled to the benefit of the treaty. That would be a direct trade.

Mr. BERGERON. Could the same thing be done the other way? Could a ship leave France, touch at England and then come to Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; but I am dealing now with Canadian products in answer to a question which my hon. friend put to me. Now, suppose we send goods to London or Liverpool, tranship them there and send them by another ship to France, they will get the benefit of the minimum tariff rather than the higher general tariff, but will have to pay the surtaxe d'entrepot. The French government will make no concession on that point.

Mr. MARSHALL. How much will that be?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not uniform, but varies considerably on different articles. It is set forth in the printed memoranda. Now, I hope I have made myself clear. Inasmuch as the French government insist on the right to impose the surtax on indirect shipments, we have reserved the right at any time, if we see fit—whether parliament will do so or not is another question—to impose a similar tax on indirect shipments to this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does that appear?

Mr. FIELDING. In article 8.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister stated a few moments ago that we paid $120,000 a year to subsidize direct shipments between Canada and France. Does France contribute anything towards these direct shipments?

Mr. FIELDING. No. There was at one time a hope that an arrangement might be made for mutual adjustment of the subsidy, but it has not succeeded, and Canada has had for two or three years her independent line. I am in hope that under this treaty our trade with France will develop so much as to increase the trade of that line and develop other lines.

Mr. BERGERON. The policy of France is to subsidize steamships.

Mr. FIELDING. Not to subsidize trade in that way. She pays her ship subsidies on the basis of mileage.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister giving this as his own opinion of the interpretation of these clauses, or does he know officially how they will be interpreted by France? For instance, if I should make a shipment of goods to France through the port of New York, the United States having the advantage of the minimum French tariff on certain articles, and send them through in bond without transhipment, does my hon. friend know officially that they would be subject to the surtaxe d'entrepot?

Mr. FIELDING. That is our understanding. The treaty must speak for itself; a treaty is like a statute and can only mean

what is in it; but that is our interpretation. The other provisions of the treaty hardly call for much remark. They are such clauses as usually appear in treaties of this character. For instance, we require certificates of origin to accompany the articles claiming the benefit of this treaty; that is, in order that the articles going to France or coming to Canada shall be what they profess to be; and if it be deemed expedient that those certificates of origin shall be certified or approved by an official in France or in Canada—for example, a French consul in Canada or a Canadian agent in France as the case may be—such certificate shall be given free of charge.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the French practice with countries enjoying the minimum tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not quite sure. However, the French government were quite willing to agree that the conditions should be reciprocal, and it was agreed that that provision might reasonably be left to the intelligence of the Customs Departments of the two countries.

Articles 10 and 11 deal with the granting of ordinary privileges. We reserve our independence on tariff matters wherein we insist that we may do what we wish as respects British imports, but all other matters such as warehousing, &c., we guarantee to give France all reasonable privileges.

Article 12 deals with internal taxation. We have no such system of taxation here, but in France they have the system of the octrol, whereby goods after paying their duty on arrival, say at Havre, have to pay a local municipal duty on entering Paris and goods passing from Paris to other cities in France have to pay a similar duty.

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact are those duties imposed only on foreign goods or on local and foreign goods equally ?

Mr. FIELDING. They are imposed on certain classes of goods, chiefly provisions. The stipulation is that no taxes of that character shall be imposed except such as are imposed upon their own subjects. Of course we cannot ask any better treatment than they give to their own subjects.

Mr. BERGERON. They would not give it.

Mr. FIELDING. It would not be reasonable. Then there is a provision that drawbacks which are granted on exports shall not exceed the duties paid. That is another form of saying there shall be no bounty on exports. We, like most countries have a system whereby if articles are manufactured out of materials which have paid duty, and these articles are then exported, the exporter may collect all but a small percentage of the duty he has paid on the materials entering into their manufacture. Under this provision we may still do that, but the drawback must be limited to the actual amount of duty paid, so that we shall not, under the guise of drawback, pay a bounty. That is a legitimate proposal and it is of course mutual.

To encourage trade it is proposed that patterns and samples sent out, possibly not with the intention of being sold in the country, but simply to assist in procuring business must pay duty when they enter the country, but if they are re-exported in 12 months the amount of the duty may be refunded. That is also mutual.

There is a clause with reference to certificates issued by French Chambre de Commerce. The French Chambre de Commerce is somewhat different from our Boards of Trade : it is a semi-official body and it is called on to do certain official duties. The French government ask us to allow the French Chambers of Commerce to certify to the values of goods being shipped to Canada. We say that we admit that a certificate of that character, given by a responsible body, in some respects almost a branch of the government, is entitled to great respect and would probably be accepted, but we are not willing to guarantee that in every case we will accept it ; if we have reason to believe in any case the certificate is wrong we have still the right to inquire into the matter. The meaning of the clause is that we would treat a certificate of that character with great respect, but the Minister of Customs would still have in the last resort his right to inquire into the matter. There is a somewhat similar arrangement with regard to the certificates as to the character and quality of French wines. They have officials of the French Department of Agriculture whose business it is to examine and certify to the quality of wine. An hon. gentleman expressed fear that adulterated wines would be brought in. The French policy to-day is very largely in the direction of securing pure wines. Hon. gentlemen will remember the wine troubles in the south of France in the early part of the summer ; those troubles arose largely from the adulteration of wines which prevented the wine growers from selling their pure wines, and the French government are most anxious to prevent the adulteration of wines. They have established officers to certify as to the quality. Inasmuch as the wines are to be taxed in proportion to their alcoholic strength it becomes important that the test shall be accurate. All we say is that we will pay great respect to any certificate given by a French government officer but we will still reserve, in the final stage, the right of the Minister of Customs to make inquiry if he has any reason to doubt the correctness of the certificate.

Then we agree to grant favoured nation treatment with respect to trade marks, patents, industrial names, industrial designs,

&c. We would do that anyway as we have no desire to treat France differently from other countries ; in matters of that character we do not discriminate. There is a provision that the treaty may be extended to Tunis if France desires to do so. The government of Tunis is somewhat different from the others I have mentioned, and France simply desires the right to extend the treaty to Tunis if she so wishes.

The old treaty is to be superseded by this, and upon this treaty going into force the old treaty of course will cease to exist. The treaty in its form seems to contemplate a period of ten years, but on careful examination it will be found that there is no guarantee of ten years. That arises from the fact that, as will be seen from the correspondence, we first proposed a clause providing for a ten year treaty at least. The French authorities were not willing to bind themselves to such a length of time, but in the drafting they left the words 'ten years' in. They are there as a sort of moral obligation, but if the clause is read closely it will be seen there is no limit to the power of either country to bring the treaty to a termination on giving 12 months' notice.

Mr. FOSTER. Ten years unless terminated by notice ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon friend might assume that from the first glance, but on careful reading he will see that while they did not strike out the ten years the clause is so constructed that the ten years is not binding, as either party has the right to bring the treaty to a termination on 12 months' notice. I think the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) will see that that is the legal significance of the clause. That clause is mutual and if either party does not wish to continue the treaty they give notice.

Mr. FOSTER. The intention of the words seems to be pretty plain.

—after the completion of that formality and shall remain in force for a period of ten years——

Mr. FIELDING. Read on.

Mr. FOSTER (reading) :

—unless, however, one of the contracting parties shall within such period signify to the other party its intention to terminate this convention.

That is unless it is terminated by notice.

Mr. FIELDING. But it can be terminated by notice.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. FIELDING (reading) :

In case neither of the contracting parties shall have signified before the expiry of such term the intention of terminating this convention, it shall remain binding until expiry of twelve months from the day on which either of the two parties shall have denounced it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is after the ten years ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, before the ten years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or after the ten years ; it is exactly the same before as after ; it remains in force apparently, although extraordinary language is used to bring about the result, until one party or the other gives the 12 months' notice. But two clauses and about 150 words are employed to express what could have been expressed in about one dozen words.

Mr. FIELDING. We had proposed, as the correspondence shows, to have the treaty made for at least 10 years. France not being willing to agree to that, suggested a drafting which left in the ten years and my colleague and I did not see any reason to strike the words out, because it seems to imply a moral claim that the treaty should last for 10 years, although I am inclined to think, as a matter of law, either party has the right to terminate it before the 10 years.

Mr. FOSTER. The first part of clause 10 provides :

Canada and France undertake not to establish one against the other any prohibition or restriction of importation, exportation or transit which shall not at the same time be applicable to other countries.

It has been said that preferential goods coming from Great Britain may become subject to the conditions about direct and indirect shipment which apply to French importations.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see where the preferential goods come in at all in this.

Mr. FOSTER. 'Canada and France undertake not to establish, one against the other, any prohibition or restriction,' and so on. This would appear to be a restriction as against France with regard to the method of shipment 'Other countries' includes Great Britain. You can deduce from that that in order to give France equal treatment with 'other countries' these 'other countries' including Great Britain, must be submitted to the same condition. It says 'other countries,' not 'foreign countries.'

Mr. FIELDING. Except that, in the matter of tariff, we reserve our right to give preference to Great Britain, but we do not desire to reserve our right as respects ordinary commercial purposes. I think the clause is quite understood to mean that, except in the matter of tariffs, France and Canada agree to grant each other mutual consideration without limitation.

I have endeavoured to present, not all the details of this treaty, for that would have wearied the House—and I have occu-

pied much more time than I had intended —but enough to show the lines upon which we approach this question and the results of our negotiations. We submit this treaty —or convention, as it is technically called —with the strong hope and the strong confidence that it will have a considerable effect in the expansion of trade between Canada and France. It is not to be expected that that expansion will be brought about immediately, but we hope and believe that, even within a short period, the effects of this treaty will be observed in the larger volume of trade between these two countries. We feel that the arrangements we have made are, in the main, such as will secure for Canada all the advantages that any country has in France in respect of the lines of goods which Canada exports or hopes to export in the near future. As I have said, I am prepared to admit that some items are there as to which the advantages are only prospective; but I can say also, and say with confidence, that there is no important article in which Canada is engaged in export trade, or is likely to be so engaged in the near future, that is not covered by the treaty, giving us assurance of the most favoured nation treatment which is all that we could hope for. And, while we hope that the result will be an expansion of trade, we believe it is not too much to express a modest hope that. in taking this step, we are doing something to supplement the splendid efforts of His Majesty the King to bring about the good relations which now exist between Great Britain and the Republic of France.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked a question touching a subject to which the hon. gentleman said he would refer before concluding his remarks, but I did not notice that he dealt with it. I asked as to the exact articles of export in respect of which the government expect that there will be an expansion of trade between Canada and France.

Mr. FIELDING. I read the list. There are certain articles imported from France, which we hope in the early future to export. I said frankly that, in respect of many of the articles, we expect that it will take time to build up an export trade. But all our natural products, which we export to any part of the world, are covered by this treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, there are many articles in which we cannot reasonably expect a very great increase, in the immediate or, perhaps, even in the distant future. But I should imagine that the government had in mind some particular articles upon which we might anticipate some immediate expansion of our exports to France, under the concessions made by that treaty, and it was in regard to these that I asked.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FIELDING. Our view was not to prophesy with regard to any particular articles, but to secure the most favoured nation treatment for the classes of goods that Canada exports or might hope to export.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not expect the minister to prophesy exactly, but I supposed that some estimate of the kind I suggested had been made before the consent of the government was given to the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. No. If we never increased our trade by a single dollar, it would still be desirable, that, as far as possible, we should open the way.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any information to give us with reference to the loss of revenue that will accrue to Canada as a result of this treaty? That certainly is a most important consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) mentioned it. I have not the information in detail. Of course, it is right that we should regard this as a reduction of duty, a reduction of the burdens of the people, in the taxes on goods, not only from France, but from other countries that will receive the benefit of the treaty. Our estimate is—and it can only be an estimate—that the reduction of duty will not exceed $400,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, the hon. gentleman has divided that between direct and indirect. Would he give us the figures?

Mr. FIELDING. It is difficult to work them out in detail.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING. I desire to make a fuller statement with regard to one point that I mentioned this afternoon. I said with regard to the duties on champagnes and wines of the various classes that there was no reduction as compared with the old treaty except in the matter of wines of 23 per cent strength and below. It would have been more accurate if I had said that there is no reduction as compared with the rates fixed in the intermediate tariff. I find in that respect that I was not exact. In the old treaty 30 per cent ad valorem was retained on wines of 26 per cent and upwards, but when we arranged the intermediate tariff a year ago, we struck off the 30 per cent and let it stand with the specific duty only, that being one of the inducements of the intermediate tariff. Therefore as respects a comparison between the intermediate tariff and the rates in the French treaty, there is no reduction. But as compared with the old treaty and the new—and I think it was in that connection that I used

the figures—there is a reduction, because in the old treaty there was 30 per cent ad valorem on that higher class of wines; that we dropped out when we adopted the intermediate tariff, and the rate in the intermediate tariff is the rate in the French treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On how many items ?

Mr. FIELDING. On non-sparkling wines of the strength of 26 and upwards. The old treaty took off the ad valorem rate of 30 per cent on the lower class, but retained it on the higher class. The reason which influenced us in fixing that reduced rate in the intermediate tariff was this : The rate on wines of 26 per cent, and on the additional 14 degrees required to bring it up to 40, at 3 cents per degree, would make it 67 cents per gallon. We had fixed the rate on wines up to 40 per cent from South Africa, 25 cents per gallon, and we thought the difference between the 25 cents on wines from South Africa and the rate of 67 cents from other countries was a sufficient difference. However, the main point I wish to make is that while my statement was correct in a comparison between the rates of the intermediate tariff and the rates of the present treaty, it would not be correct to say that there was no difference between the old treaty and the new treaty in that item.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is No. 165 in schedule C ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is part of item 163 schedule C. Wines containing more than 26 per cent and not more than 26 per cent, 25 cents per gallon ; for each degree above that, it is 3 cents. But in the old treaty there was that 3 cents difference between each degree and the 30 per cent ad valorem. As I have explained, we dropped the 30 per cent ad valorem when we fixed the intermediate tariff and we carried the intermediate tariff rate into the treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No change between the old treaty in item 165 ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, champagne remains the same.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not propose to go very particularly into the details of the measure that the Finance Minister has introduced, for reasons that I will state afterwards. A treaty purporting to provide for an extension of trade between Canada and any other country ought to command the sympathy of all classes in Canada, and certainly ought not to be made a party measure. Personally I am sympathetic with any reasonable arrangement that can be made with any foreign country, and particularly with any arrangement that can be made with France, for an extension of trade between the two countries on a reasonable basis. That is more accentuated by the fact that I was a member of a government who, in 1893, made the first treaty that was concluded between France and Canada, and had something to do myself with the negotiations. For that reason as well as for the general reasons, I should be very glad indeed if, upon a thorough examination of this treaty, we can find that it would be fairly beneficial to Canada as well as to France. What the Finance Minister said is absolutely true, that a good treaty is one which is advantageous to the two countries who are making it, and there can be no grounds for the permanency of a treaty between two countries where there is a glaring inequality; for sooner or later that will become known, and the treaty will either be abrogated or a move will be made for its amendment.

So much with reference to the general question. But it becomes the duty of this House and this country to give very serious consideration to a treaty of this kind, because in its operation it goes beyond the two countries which are at first interested, in consequence of the favoured nation treaties by which Canada is bound. Therefore we have to extend our view beyond the simple exchange between France and Canada and ask how it may affect us in the wider area. On that point, and just at this time, I make a well founded claim for a grievance against the Minister of Finance and the government, in that they have been particularly careful to make this treaty in its promulgation to parliament as blind and obscure as it possibly could be. I do not see how they could have clouded the proposed information in any more effective way than they have done, I do not see how they could have given less information to the members of this House than they have given. So far as the country generally, the boards of trade, the associations of people who take great interest in active trade, are concerned, it is even more blind, more obscure than it is to members of parliament, who have some facility in deriving information which is absolutely necessary to show the trend of this treaty.

Now in the first place when we come to the consideration of this treaty, even after the Minister of Finance has given us the long and somewhat laboured explanations of it this afternoon, we find ourselves in a position in which we require more information to give us any adequate idea of the trend and effect of this treaty. What have we? We have, in the first place, the articles of the treaty and we have the attendant schedules. These tell us nothing but the articles, which, in the first place, from Canada may go into France and the articles which, from France, may come into Canada and they give us the number of francs per kilogram or per hectolitre that will be charged when they enter a port of France. The units of comparison

are essentially different between Canada and France and what the Canadian, what even we who are members of parliament want in order to understand this treaty is a calculation brought down to our own units of weight, measurement and value, and unless we have this we are not in a position to understand the incidence of taxation, to understand the relative value of the schedules, or to understand the relative advantages as between the two countries. What in the world was there that prevented the hon. Finance Minister, or the hon. Minister of Customs, or some one who had the clerks, the figures and the documents all at his disposal, from putting a plain statement of the case before this House and, if it were thought necessary to have the units of the French nation, to put alongside of these the units of Canada as well so that we might understand the incidence and the averages and the rates of duty computed in language that is plain to us and in units with which we are familiar. Why could not this be done? The Minister of Finance was asked to have it done and he seemed to think it would take a great deal of time and involve a great deal of trouble, but if the treaty is at all an important treaty it is worth all the time and trouble which are necessary to make it plain to the House and the country.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman permit me? Some of the information that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) sought was difficult to get, and some, in my judgment was not necessary. But, never mind that; I stated to my hon. friend that as far as possible I would get it and some of the information was being prepared. I did not anticipate going on with the treaty today but an intimation was given to me last night that it would suit my hon. friend's convenience better to proceed now than to wait for the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I should have supposed that all this would have been done during the time that the treaty was being negotiated.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I should have supposed that there was plenty of time since the hon. gentleman came back early in September to have had these schedules drawn up in a plain and distinct form so that the members of the House, when they came to deal with it, would have plain and definite information to go upon. I do not really think that there is any excuse for the government or the minister not having this matter clearly and definitely figured out. What else would be of importance in judging of this treaty? It would be of importance for us to have some certain tables of trade; it would be of importance to have the imports from France for the last eight or ten years of the articles which were included in the treaty of 1893. Here we have in this treaty some twenty-three or twenty-six articles which have been, since 1893, upon the favoured list as between France and ourselves and under this treaty no more favourable terms are got. Why should we not have had the tables of imports from France into Canada of those articles which have been part of the treaty of 1893 so that we could have had some basis for judging what had been the course of trade with respect to the articles admitted under the treaty of 1893 and which are continued under this present treaty? Surely we might have had that. Again, Canada received minimum treatment on a certain range of articles which went from this country to France. Why should not we have had a table of exports from Canada into France of the articles which went in at the minimum treaty rate, and which have been going in for the last fourteen years? These two tables put together would have given us some basis of measuring what were the probabilities of trade between France and this country. But up to this moment no such table of trade and navigation figures between these two countries has been put before the country or before this House. One can go to work and go over all these years, studying out the tables, and getting that information for himself. I have not done it, I do not propose to do it, and I do propose that the government shall give us that before we get this treaty through. It is their business to do that work for us, and they should have had the information ready for us when they laid the treaty on the table of the House.

Well, but there is more than that. We are not getting any special favour from France. We are getting the minimum tariff; on a partial list. We are not placed in as good a position as thirty-four nations of the world, we are not being put in a better position than some thirty other nations of the world so far as we know. We are getting minimum treatment on a partial list of imports into France. Now, it is well to know, if you are going to get into a country what competition you are to meet with when you get there. Who are our competitors? We have the names of nations but that is not worth a flip of your fingers. What kind of competitors are these? Have they been entering the market of France in increasing ratio, extending their trade, getting their connections and have they become large exporters to France? If so, we find that when we get into that country we meet competitors of a certain calibre. We meet competitors who have a certain standing and certain connections in the markets of France. Why could not we have and why ought we not to have the exports from all these countries which have had minimum treatment by France for a series of years, four, or five,

or ten, so that we might know what it is they are exporting into France and therefore what competition we shall meet. We ought to have this if we are to understand what advantages we may possibly get out of that treaty. But, we need something more. The Minister of Finance, in the statement which he made some weeks ago and which he has in part repeated to-day, expressed the opinion that all this House and the country need is to have the figures of France's general tariff and then the figures of the minimum tariff and if they can show that there is a diminution, greater or less, between these two lines of figures, that is Canada's advantage and that is all that Canada needs to know. It appears to me that that does not amount to anything. You have to take the relative height of the tariffs of the two countries. Does not my hon. friend know that in 1893 France revised her tariffs, that she placed as a minimum what had practically been before that the general tariff and then mounted the general tariff above that. In consequence the minimum tariff of France which we have to meet is a very high protective tariff and the general tariff is still higher as a protective tariff. We want to know what is the height of the wall we have to climb over to get into France at all. But, as far as the information has been given us by the government, we have not a single ray of light thrown upon that. It would also be of help to understand this question if we knew what was the average tariff put by France upon goods coming into her country under the minimum tariff as a whole. Is it 10 per cent, is it 17½ per cent, is it 22½ per cent, is it 25 per cent, or is it 40, or 50 per cent? What is it? Does the Minister of Finance think that it does not make an essential difference to us and to all our prospects of trade with France, as to the relative height of the tariff wall we have to get over to get into France through the minimum gate, and the tariff wall they have to get over to get into Canada by our intermediate gate. I should like to know what is the comparison between the importations under the minimum tariff in France, and its relation to the schedules to which we are admitted, particularly in order that we might compare it with the average that France has to contend with when she brings her goods to this country. That is the essence of the information you absolutely need before you can judge of the comparative advantages resulting from a treaty on these lines, between Canada and France. But not a single one of these things has been given to us, not a table has been laid before us as giving information to this committee or to the public.

Mr. PATERSON. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten the column of the imports into France?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not forgotten, and will my hon. friend tell me what that column is.

Mr. PATERSON. It is a column which shows that France imports a certain quantity of goods, and therefore the tariff wall of France must be sufficiently low to enable that amount of goods to go in from other countries, and if we get into as good a position as any other country will we not be in a better position than we are at present?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend should look at his tariff column and he will see it is a column of the total importations into France.

Mr. PATERSON. Exactly.

Mr. FOSTER It does not give us what we need as to the importations into France under the minimum tariff, and which is what we have to grapple with in so far as we are looking into the arrangement which has been made between France and Canada. That gives us no information at all except simply that in the matter of grain, or in the matter of iron, or in the matter of alcohol, there are certain total importations into France. How much of that is under the minimum and how much under the maximum tariff? These are the important things we want to know, and not so much the total importations of all goods into France. So that I do not think the Minister of Customs has made the matter much better by calling attention to this. But, he says, we will be in a better position than now if we get in on the same basis as others. Granted. But the point for this parliament to decide is whether it is worth the cost we have to pay to get in over a very high tariff even though it is a minimum tariff, and I submit to my hon. friend that we cannot decide that question unless we have the information I have been asking for. This information we ought to have had when the treaty was laid on the table. When I look at what occurred in connection with the treaty of 1893 I find there was quite a complete set of tables as to the interchange of trade placed before the House with the treaty itself, and this information was there for the members of this House.

Another peculiar thing—if I had not happened to have asked the question: What do we sacrifice in the way of revenue under this proposed arrangement? This House would not have had to this moment any idea at all of the total amount Canada has to pay in sacrifice of revenue for this treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. As reduction of taxation.

Mr. FOSTER My hon friend may call it reduction of taxation or whatever else he pleases, if it is $400,000 or $500,000 or $1,000,000 it is so much of the present revenue of the country which is given up in order

to get the advantages, whatever they may be, of this arrangement with France, it does seem strange to me that the Minister of Finance and his coadjutor who underook the negotiations in Paris with keen witted and long headed negotiators as the French are, with a system behind them to which they are wedded and into which they will allow, naturally enough, as few breaches as possible ; it does seem strange that these gentlemen should enter on these negotiations without having every bit of this information which I have just asked for. Is it possible that these gentlemen, without having that special and detailed information, could have gone on with the negotiations of this treaty, and if they had it, why should they not have made a present of it to parliament? So much with reference to that.

Now, the next point I want to take up, after having detailed my fault-finding—I think I have done it in a fair way, and I think it was necessary to call attention to these things—the next point I want to take up is the part that Canada played in this treaty. I commenced with saying that a treaty of amity and commerce between two countries ought never to be looked upon as the peculiar property of a party, to be used for the glorification of a party or for any ulterior and unworthy party ends. I think my right hon. friend and all gentlemen in this House will agree with me in that statement. A treaty between countries is on the basis of international relations in a certain way, and in a very large way, and it is best always to carry it on as though the whole country was behind the negotiation and not simply a party—to carry it through parliament, to carry it into operation as if the whole country were behind it and not simply as if a party were behind it. But, Sir, from the very moment of the inception of the negotiations until to-day—we may mark to-day off as being a little different from what preceded—from the inception of the negotiations until to-day there has been a persistent effort to in some way or other identify the present government and the present party with this treaty, and glorify them because of some extraordinary thing that has happened under their management and which never happened before. I find fault with that. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) mentioned this already and I thought he mentioned it very definitely and called it down in very appropriate terms. Let us see what took place. One of the very first things was an attempt by my right hon. friend who leads the government—I do not say that his attempt was a deliberate attempt to misrepresent. I should not like to make that accusation—but I say without any shadow of reserve that it had the effect of misrepresentation and that my right hon. friend never took any means to mitigate that effect. And following the cue of my right hon. friend, the party press and some of the ministers, all through Canada began to boast of what had been done, before a single mother's son of them knew a single line of the treaty, or what would be its effects, or what were its contents. It was as though a boy who never had a toy before suddenly got one and decided to parade it as far as he could to his own glorification and great joy. These hon. gentlemen headed by the Prime Minister himself, conducted that kind of campaign. I was startled somewhat on reading in the papers in Toronto on a certain morning a speech delivered by my right hon. friend at the manufacturers' annual banquet. Here is an extract from it. He said :

> It has long been the desire, if I mistake not, of the Canadian people that we should be entrusted with the negotiation of our own treaties, especially in regard to commerce. Well, this looked-for reform has come to be a living reality. Without revolution, without any breaking of old traditions, without any impairment of our allegiance, the time has come when Canadian interests are entrusted to Canadians, and just within the last week a treaty has been concluded with France—a treaty which appeals to Canadians alone and which has been negotiated by Canadians alone.

That was the statement made by the Premier of Canada. As I said before, I do not charge him with a deliberate desire to misrepresent, but I do certainly affirm that it had the effect of a misrepresentation, and that it was mischievous in proportion as it had that effect. Following that view, the ministers themselves came back, and they had their glorification number one in the old historic city of Quebec. My right hon. friend was there and several other ministers. Following the cue of the right hon. gentleman himself, when the address from the oldest board of trade in the Dominion of Canada was read, it congratulated those two gentlemen on the conclusion of the first Canadian treaty of commerce by Canadian statesmen, and those two gentlemen had to listen to a great deal of laudation of their force and of their great victory in marking an epoch in the history of Canada's development when, not by revolution, not by force of arms, not by any weakening of our allegiance, as my right hon. friend said, but suddenly, a great thing had dawned into life and broken into splendour—to wit, the right and might of Canada as a treaty maker. Well, this thing went on and has been current until the present time, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was very anxious the other day to make the assertion, and he did succeed in making it without getting on his feet, that this had been practically carried out, and that Canada had done what Canada had never done before, and in a way in which it had never been done before.

That is the general statement of the case. Let us see how true it is to history and to fact. As gentlemen around me know, the commercial relations which were treated of in 1893 were commercial relations between Canada and France in which England had no special or individual interest. In the very same way what were treated of in the recent negotiations were the commercial relations between France and Canada in which Great Britain had no special or individual interest. The very same set of circumstances existed, the very same subjects were about, and I am going to show that they were treated about in exactly the same way. I take up this present convention and what is it? It is a convention between the King of Great Britain and Ireland and of His Majesty's Dominions beyond the Seas and the President of France. I take up the treaty of 1893, and I read in the protocols and in the designation of the agreement that that was also a convention between Great Britain on one hand and France on the other. The two are precisely alike. They had to do with commercial relations between France and Canada then ; they have to do with commercial relations between France and Canada now. The King of England, or the Queen of England at that time, appointed her plenipotentiaries ; the King of England at this time appointed his plenipotentiaries. The plenipotentiaries in 1893 were British plenipotentiaries ; those appointed in 1907 were British plenipotentiaries. Those appointed in 1893 were the British ambassador in Paris and Sir Charles Tupper, the representative of Canada ; those appointed in 1907 were the British ambassador in Paris and two representatives of Canada. I take the two treaties, as they appear in the French copies, side by side, and there is absolutely no difference at all in the enabling language from beginning to end, except that in 1893 the thing was called an 'arrangement' and this treaty is called a 'convention' ; but there is no difference between the two words ; they are used interchangeably. That there is no difference is shown by the letter of the French plenipotentiaries in the present negotiations, in which they refer to the arrangement of 1893 as 'une convention.' There is no difference between the two ; from beginning to end they are absolutely the same. They were originated in the same way, carried on in the same way, completed in the same way, signed in the same way, ratified in the same way, and there is not a single shade of difference between the two, except this, that there were three plenipotentiaries this time and there were two before. But the essential thing about both of these treaties is this, that in 1893 the treaty was negotiated entirely by Sir Charles Tupper, the plenipotentiary of the Queen, not of Canada, in conjunction with Lord Dufferin, the British ambassador in Paris at that time ; and this treaty was negotiated entirely, as I believe, by the two plenipotentiaries of the King appointed from Canada, although, just as before, the other plenipotentiary, the British ambassador in Paris, was associated with them, made the initial arrangements, and was there for consultation and help all the way through.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend permit me ? He states that in 1893 the negotiations were carried on entirely by Sir Charles Tupper. Will he be kind enough to tell me on what authority he relies in making that statement ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I will do it with the greatest good will and with a promptness which ought to incite my hon. friend to give this House information with reference to this matter with equal readiness.

In the first place I give him as an authority my own statement to which he may attach much or little importance as he pleases. I was present in Paris whilst the negotiations were in progress, not all the time but for a considerable time, and I absolutely know, of my own knowledge, that Lord Dufferin did nothing more in the carrying out of those negotiations than to appoint the meetings, introduce Sir Charles Tupper and consult with him whenever Sir Charles wished. On more than one occasion I myself accompanied Sir Charles Tupper to conferences with Lord Dufferin at his own residence with reference to the treaty itself. I do not know whether my hon. friend will regard that as being sufficient testimony, but if not I shall give him more. On page 47 of the blue-book of 1893, which deals with this subject, I find a part of Sir Charles Tupper's final communication to the Canadian government reading :

> I cannot conclude this communication without saying that while the negotiations have been carried on entirely by myself on the part of Canada, and by M. Gabriel Hanotaux, Minister Plenipotentiary and Director of Consulates and of Commercial Affairs in the Foreign Office, M. G. Pallin, Councillor of State, Director General of Customs, and M. E. Roume, Director of Foreign Commerce in the Department of Commerce and Industry, on the part of France——

That is the testimony of the negotiator himself. That, backed up by my own personal knowledge, ought to satisfy any gentleman with reasonable credulity; whether it satisfies my hon. friend or not I do not know.

I suppose my hon. friend will say what about Sir Joseph Crowe ? Sir Joseph Crowe was not a plenipotentiary, he had no lot or part in the negotiations, he was the commercial attaché of the British embassy in Paris and he rendered invaluable assistance to Sir Charles Tupper during the negotiations, but he rendered it just as any specialist would to the principal negotiator,

just as I myself or any member of the Dominion government or any officer of the Dominion government down at Washington would when Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper met with negotiatiors of the United States in 1887, when we stood by to give them all the information that they needed and that we possibly could gather for them. We were adjuncts to the negotiations but we had no lot, part or matter in conducting the negotiations; only the Sovereign's plenipotentiaries conduct these negotiations. I hope I have satisfied my hon. friend with reference to that matter.

But in one thing there is a radical difference. I know that Sir Charles Tupper did not, in the papers which he gave to the Canadian government in 1893 nor did the Canadian government in the papers they laid on the table of the House, attempt to reproduce the somewhat archaic language in which the British government makes out its form of instructions to its plenipotentiaries. But I find that these hon. gentlemen have deployed upon page 10 of their correspondence the absolute wording of the power of plenipotentiary given to them by the British government and have done it in such a way that you would think there were no plenipotentiaries but the two men from Canada; while the document itself declares at the beginning that the plenipotentiaries appointed by King Edward to represent the empire are Sir Francis Bertie the British Ambassador and his loyal subject the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur)—loyal if not generous—and his loyal and generous subject the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Those are the plenipotentiaries. Is other evidence necessary? If this were a Canadian treaty and were negotiated simply by two gentlemen from Canada, why all this correspondence? I find on pages 5, 6, 7 and 8 letters from Mr. Fielding, letters to the Rt. Hon. Edward Grey and to others in which in almost every line he calls for the assistance or refers to the knowledge or desires the cooperation or asks for the necessary steps to be taken by the British government in order to have this treaty negotiated, signed and carried out. I find that it was submitted to the board of trade and to the colonial office as well as to Sir Edward Grey and that it went through every step necessary for it to go through before it could become a treaty under the powers that Great Britain possesses, a treaty with reference to Canada but yet a treaty made between Great Britain and France. So that in all these things there is not the least semblance or an approach to anything in anyway intrinsically different in policy or in practice from that which obtained in 1893.

But let us consider for a moment what the British policy has been. At first Great Britain made her treaties without any reference to her colonies and included them under the operation of these treaties whether they wished it or not. That policy was abandoned as better methods came into use. The next step was for Great Britain to include no colony in a treaty unless with the assent of that colony; and that has been the rule for nigh on to forty years or perhaps more. A step was taken beyond that, the appointment of representatives of the Sovereign as negotiators from the colonies interested in the case of treaties dealing with commercial or territorial affairs. So from an early period, from 1871 to go no further back, until the present day the policy of Great Britain with reference to her great colonies has been to associate as her plenipotentiary some able and competent representative of the colony to take part in the negotiations with reference to commercial or territorial matters in which that colony is interested. Sir John Macdonald was a co-plenipotentiary in Washington in 1871; Sir Charles Tupper was a co-plenipotentiary in Washington in 1887; members of the Canadian government were plenipotentiaries and agents of Great Britain in association with Sir Julian Pauncefote in Washington in 1892. Sir Charles Tupper occupied the same position in case after case in reference to Spain, in reference to France, and so the policy of broadening, which is distinctive of the march of the British Empire in the world, has gone on from year to year and decade to decade until the period has arrived when this full liberty of action in so far as the circumstances of the empire permit, has been accorded to the great colonies of the empire. But this last stage which has been exemplified in 1893 and now in 1907, is a matter of history.

In 1879, Sir A. T. Galt was trying to negotiate with Spain in connection with trade matters in the West Indies. The United States had a modus vivendi with Spain giving them privileges that were denied to Canada. The object of the Canadian representative, acting through the British government, and by advice and instructions of the Canadian government, was to bring about a better state of matters commercially with Spain and to have Canada put upon an equal footing with the United States. But Sir A. T. Galt complained that the method of negotiation was too tedious to be effective, that everything had to go through the British minister, and that he himself was simply an attaché or commercial agent, and that therefore he was unable to succeed. That complaint was made to the Canadian government and was carried to the British foreign office, where it was duly considered. In 1884, the British foreign office sent its instructions to the colonial office, which instructions inaugurated the present system of things. Those instructions are given in a letter of July 26, 1884, of which the following is an extract:—

If the Spanish government are favourably disposed, the full power for these negotiations

will be given to Sir Robert Morier and Sir Charles Tupper jointly. The actual negotiations would probably be conducted by Sir Charles Tupper, but the convention, if concluded, must be signed by both plenipotentiaries, and must be entered into between Her Majesty and the King of Spain for the special object of regulating Canadian trade with the Spanish territories specified in the convention.

That is the basis upon which this later and latest policy has been founded. On the basis of these instructions, Sir Charles Tupper was appointed, both to carry on the negotiations which resulted in the French treaty of 1893 and also with Sir Clare Forde, to carry on negotiations with the Spanish government, which were carried on but did not result in a treaty. I do not think there is more to be said on this subject. I have treated it somewhat in detail and with particularity, because I thought it right that a sufficient answer should be given to the vapourings of those hon. gentlemen opposite who would fain, for political and party reasons, convince this country that they had wrenched some great privilege from a tyrant authority and were to be worshipped because of the victory they had gained. If this is simply an attempt to make party capital, it is supremely silly. But if it is a serious attempt and goes further than that, it is not only silly but mischievous and wrong. We are a part of the British Empire and are bound by the constitution of the British Empire. It is silly and mischievous for any man or any government to teach the people of Canada that they have powers which they have not and cannot have without disintegration and separation taking place. And I would recommend hon. gentlemen opposite either to take the open and manly course of carrying on a propaganda in this country for absolute independence in treaty-making power on the part of Canada—and of consequent separation from the British Empire—or else to remain quiet; but above all, not to go about in this surreptitious way to seek an object of their own with the effect of causing discontent and a demand on the part of their followers for something which, under the empire, never can be given.

Now, I go a step further: I stated the other day that I thought the intermediate tariff, of which so much was made by the Minister of Finance, had broken down at the very point where he thought it was going to be a success. I was not supported by the Minister of Finance in that statement, and I beg to return to it just for a moment. On page 23 of the Budget speech of last year, the Minister of Finance says:—

> We propose to adopt this intermediate tariff as an instrument by which we may conduct negotiations from time to time with any country which is willing to give Canada favourable conditions. We want to extend our markets, and we want to have some tariff condition which we can afford to offer countries as an inducement to them to give us favourable terms, in order that we may find new and larger markets for the products of Canada.

Now, I need not multiply quotations. But it is clear that the government asked for power to put this arrangement—which, it was supposed, could be made by the device of the intermediate tariff schedule—into instant operation by proclamation of the Governor in Council. The granting of that authority was opposed on this side of the House, but it was ultimately carried by the government on the plea that if they made what were tantamount to treaties with foreign countries they wanted to have power to put them into operation. But the first time my hon. friend tried his intermediate tariff it did not succeed. He still sticks to it however. For, just the other day, he told us that we never should have had the French treaty if we had not had the intermediate tariff. Some one on this side asked him why? The answer did not come—and yet it was a pertinent inquiry. Was it impossible, before this, and without the intermediate tariff, to negotiate a treaty? You have the negotiators, you have the terms, you have the items—why can you not negotiate the treaty without the intermediate tariff? But let us come to the testimony itself. My hon. friends who represented Canada as plenipotentiaries of the Crown of Great Britain made a preliminary proposition. It starts out by asking that the reduced rates of duty on certain articles of French origin covered by article 1 of the treaty of 6th of February, 1893, shall be continued, and, the same with regard to articles of Canadian origin. Well, it is something worth knowing that these gentlemen approved of the treaty of 1893, after it had been in operation for fourteen years. They proposed that these articles, mutually admitted by the two countries, should remain at the same rates of duty. Then, they went on and asked the benefit of the French minimum tariff for all articles in the Canadian tariff and offered to give the French people admission of articles from France under Canada's intermediate tariff.

That is where my hon. friend tested the virtue of his intermediate tariff. He had his instrument, and therefore he said to these gentlemen who were negotiating on the part of France, here is what we will do. You give us the minimum tariff in France and we will give you the intermediate tariff in Canada. Well, Sir, what did these gentlemen say? They replied to him at once, away with your intermediate tariff, we dont recognize it at all; we recognize nothing but the lowest duties, and we give our minimum only in exchange for the lowest duties of any country with which we make the exchange. We propose that, instead of your intermediate tariff, with other devices, we settle down

on the treaty of 1893 as a principle, and we will try and see whether we can enlarge the scope of the treaty of 1893. Now was I not perfectly right in saying that my hon. friend's device did not work with the French negotiations ? They threw it aside, and substituted for it the treaty of 1893, in principle, and said, come gentlemen, sit down at this table and see whether we can enlarge the scope of this, both for France and for Canada.

Whilst I am on that point, I wish to mention another thing. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-day criticised somewhat the treaty of 1893 with reference to direct and indirect shipments. He said with regard to shipments, that we were tied up to direct shipments for Canadian products going to France, but that we allowed the French products to come in here in any way they could come. Suppose we take the memorandum of these two gentlemen, and what was its proposition. The proposition was this :

The reduction of duties on Canadian articles imported into France shall apply only to direct imports, and the reduction on duties on articles imported into Canada from France shall apply only when the articles are imported directly from France, or by way of Great Britain and landed at a Canadian port.

Their first proposition to the French plenipotentiaries was this : We will bind ourselves to nothing but direct shipment to your country, and we will allow you an indirect shipment as well as a direct shipment.

Mr. FIELDING. What is a direct shipment ?

Mr. FOSTER. A direct shipment is one direct through from one country to the other without any intervening port. That is all that you propose Canadian goods shall get. As we are now, the one method we would have of putting our goods into France would be on vessels that run from here direct to French ports. But you stated with reference to French goods coming into Canada that they could come on a direct line from the French port to Canadian ports, or you could tranship them by a British port.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the exact terms in our intermediate tariff when we were desirous of encouraging trade by way of Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, when my hon. friend criticised as he did to-day the treaty of 1893, by saying that we allowed indirect shipments from France whilst we confined the Canadian article to direct shipment, I am pointing out that in their proposition to the French plenipotentiaries they proposed to do the very same thing. But it goes still further :

If, in the case of any article which, when imported into France, is now subject to the duty of the general tariff, there being no minimum tariff rate, France should hereafter place such article on the minimum tariff list, then such article when imported direct from Canada into France shall receive the benefit of the minimum rate so established.

That is, there is no limit put in the case of articles from France, they can come any way and in any direction from France ; but with reference to Canadian goods going to France they must go by direct shipment. So they have violated the rule of their criticism of the treaty of 1893 in the very first memorandum they placed before the French plenipotentiaries, and which they were willing to carry out. For my own part, I would think that the intermediate tariff has rather militated against the negotiators on behalf of the Canadian government. Naturally enough, if you lay your whole hand open to the people with whom you propose to negotiate by giving a reduced rate on all the range of articles which you have in your tariff, and publish it to them beforehand that you are willing to do that for concessions, naturally enough the party with whom you undertake to negotiate, seeing your whole hand laid bare, will be more insistent in his demands and will have greater success than if you had not given the whole list of articles upon which you were prepared to make a reduction. But even that was not sufficient. They had to go below the intermediate tariff, and they had to make a reduction in a separate schedule over and above these in order to get the treaty with France. So I think the intermediate tariff has not done much good. On the contrary, I am satisfied it has been rather harmful than otherwise in the negotiations of this treaty.

Now let me for a moment come to the actual resultant of these negotiations. As my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said, there are 152 items in schedule A which, in whole or in part, are allowed into France under certain conditions. Now I am quite sure that the average member of parliament, and certainly the average man outside of parliament, taking up this printed schedule, would say to himself: All these things are gained by us in this treaty of 1907 ; that is what we get for Canada as an entrance into the French market. Why, at first sight I thought so myself, until I came to examine them. When we look into it closely what do we find ? Of these 152 items, 21 are not minimum tariff items at all, they are general tariff items. They were open to the commerce of Canada ever since 1892, as they are open to-day, and they are no more open to Canada to-day or after this treaty shall have been ratified, than they were before the treaty was commenced to be negotiated. They are general tariff items. The Minister of Finance has explained with

reference to them why they were put in, and his explanation is a reasonable one. But they do not bulk as any thing gained; they may be possibilities, they may be long deferred contingencies, but they are not actual gains, and they bring no advantage at the present time as counting in this treaty between France and Canada.

Well then twenty-three of these same items are exactly as they were in the treaty of 1893, exactly the same schedules and exactly the same rates. That is not the result of the negotiations of this year; that is the position taken by the French government, taking 1893 as the basis and enlarging the scope. Three of the items are in part those that were established by the treaty of 1893. You have altogether forty-seven items which count as nothing to the advantage or benefit of the present negotiations over and above what we had under the treaty of 1893. That leaves 105 new items or sections of items. Let us look into them and see what we have. In the first place we must carry this idea with us always that France is an ultra protectionist country, and that the tariff that exists at the present time, minimum and maximum, is a very strong protective tariff and designed to do as little damage as possible to the principle and operation of protection in France—just as little harm as it possibly can do. We must also take into account that we do not get a single special favour in all this schedule. I do not say that the minister said we did, but the schedule as it is put out rather carries to the average mind the idea that it is a favour that we are getting because, within the pages and the covers of that schedule, there is nowhere a distinct intimation of the competition that we are to get from the favours that other countries get equal or superior to our own. We have to take these two things into consideration. Taking these two things into consideration and reading through the items I do not see that we have very much cause for congratulation as to the trade arrangement that has been made and which we are asked to ratify. Let us look at some of these advantages. Horses are put into this schedule but horses can only go into France, if they are five years old and over, at a taxation of $30; under five years of age at a taxation of $20 and colts at a taxation of $10. It is for commercial men and exporters of live stock to say whether or not there will be very much trade between Canada and France in horses where you have to take the exceedingly long transit into account and meet at the end a tariff of $30 upon the kind of horse which we would probably export from this country to France. Then you have cattle, oxen, cows, and the like and before they can go into France under the tariff they have to pay 1⅘ cents per pound live weight. If the live weight is 1,000 pounds the duty upon the cow or ox will be $18, if it runs up to 1,200 pounds it will be $21.60, and if it is 1,500 pounds it will be $27. Now, when Canada is looking for markets abroad for her cattle, will she be likely to secure the trade of a market to which she has not very ready access, where she is bound up to direct shipment and where, when she gets there through all these difficulties, she meets a competition which she can only enter into after she has paid from $18 to $27 per head for every head that she proposes to get into that market. Therefore, it is a matter for experienced men and a matter for the experience of the country to find out how much trade is open in that country. When we come to poultry it is exactly the same as it was under the treaty of 1893. What do we find in reference to poultry? For fourteen years it has been on the tariff of 1893, and I turn up last year's record of our trade and I find that there is not a single dollar's worth exported to France. You come next to fresh meats, but before you can get fresh mutton into France, after a long and tedious method, you have to pay 3 cents for every pound; pork, 2⅖ cents; beef and other meats, 3⅕ cents; salted meats, pork, ham and bacon, 2 3-5 cents, and pork butchers' produce, 5 cents; dead poultry, 2 cents; and so on for other articles of meat. When you look up the exports under the treaty of 1893 in most of these articles they are almost nothing or are so small as to be insignificant items in the trade. When you come to eggs of poultry or game you have to pay half a cent a pound for eggs going in. You have the long distance but there is another consideration that comes afterwards, and we have to take that into account before we conclude as to how much of an egg trade we will do with France, and that is the condition of this competition which we have to meet. Condensed milk pure goes in and has gone in since 1893, but there was no export of condensed milk pure last year to France although that item has been in the tariff treaty of 1893 for fourteen years. Well, if you want to get this in you have to pay a very large duty. If there is sugar in it you have to pay a much larger duty. Cheese is an item which is included in the present tariff, but every pound of cheese which goes into France will have to pay from 2 to 3⅕ cents. Salted butter has to pay 2 cents per pound to get into the market under the minimum tariff. If you go through other articles of the farmer you get down to the long flour and grain schedule and that is no minimum tariff at all. That is the general, the high tariff that has been open to Canada ever since 1892, and when you come to look into it what do you find? Of wheat grain $60,000 worth was all that went into France last year after all these years of trade between the two countries. Six-tenths of a cent per pound has to be

paid on it when it goes in. Of flour $6,348 worth was all that entered into France last year. When you come to oats, $435 worth were exported to France; oatmeal, nothing; barley, grain, nothing; barley, meal, nothing; rye, grain, nothing; rye, meal, nothing; maize, nothing; buckwheat, nothing; meal—I have not the figures for meal; beans, $72,000 worth. Chickpeas have been free since the tariff of 1893, and all the chickpeas that went into France were $102,125 worth. The other cereals that went from Canada to France under the treaty schedule amounted to $9,092.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the tariff remains the same.

Mr. FOSTER. The tariff remains absolutely the same. Take table fruits which have been on the favourable tariff ; apples and pears for table use, cider and perry amounted altogether to $209,131. And when you come to pineapples which are on the list, it does not appear that that product of Canada has found entrance into France to any extent at all. Take coal, coke, and cinders ; these have exactly the same minimum and general tariff, but although a great deal of coal has been taken into France I find that our exports of coal and coke, and cinders to France last year amounted altogether to $1,712. These articles which have been in the treaty of 1893 and as to which we have fourteen years experience, I find amount to very little in our trade with France. Can we expect more from the other articles which are now put in the schedule. The Minister of Finance says : we place them there because some time in the future there may be a diminution of the duty on these articles and then Canada will have the benefit. I do not quarrel with that at all ; I think that was fair foresight ; it was the part of prudence and of good negotiation to place these articles in the tariff, provided you did not pay too heavily for it. But the Minister of Finance knows full well that for every single item that was put into schedule A he had to pay an equivalent to the French plenipotentiaries in giving ingress for French products to Canada. This has to be taken into account, and there is no doubt about it that by the padding of the list in that way, that for a large number of articles with regard to which there is at present no prospect of exporting to France you have had to allow the French negotiators to get a still larger number than they otherwise would of their products into this country, almost every one of which has a more or less established trade and a market at present here. I think the discount has been pretty heavy in that respect, and that we have paid possibly a good deal more than it is worth. For instance, when shall we export 'cast-iron, foundry iron and forged pig, containing less than 25 per cent of manganese,' to France, if we have to pay a duty of $2.60 per ton upon it. It will take us a long time to create a trade in wrought iron when we have to pay from $12 to $18 a ton duty upon it when it enters France. Under this tariff sheets and plate iron will have to pay from $12 to $18 per ton and I do not think there is much prospect for trade in these articles. Iron and steel wire will have to pay from $12 to $36 per ton and iron rails $10 per ton; it does not seem much of a prospect that in the near future we will make iron rails and send them three or four thousand miles across the Atlantic and pay $10 per ton duty and make much profit upon them in the French market. Steel in bars will have to pay a duty of from $9 to $14 per ton, steel in sheets from $12 to $16, and $19, and $26, and $27 per ton; there is not a very alluring prospect of trade with France in these articles under these conditions. Of course there is a grand opening in copper ore which is on this schedule, but when we look into the tariff we find that copper ore is admitted free into France. It is the policy of France to let it in free and they take in 98,000,000 francs worth of it, but when we come down to the first item where a tariff of $18 per ton is placed upon 'rolled or hammered copper in bars or plates' we find that the import into France is almost infinitesimal. Who supposes that there is any immediate market for us in France for these sizes and makes of copper which have to pay a duty of from $18 to $180 per ton ? In the same way with lead, the ore and the matts of a certain kind of lead go into France free and they do import quite a quantity of it, but when you come into the higher manufacture of lead products, then there is a heavy duty. The same with nickel, the same with all the metals. So that I do not think there is much chance for doing a trade speedily with France in any of these metal products. Now, with reference to individual items, there is starch which is placed in this list as a prospective article of commerce. But it will have to pay a duty of one and a half cents per pound, and when you get it over there you find that 40,000,000 of people only import about $60,000 worth of starch from all countries in the world. Then there is 'isinglass and glue manufactured from the tendon of whales.' Now, there is something for Captain Bernier and the 'Arctic.' Perhaps it was in prospect of something like this that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knowing that he had been frightfully extravagant in fitting up the 'Arctic' and running it for three years, proposed to get the benefit of manufacturing isinglass and glue from whales tendons which this model and swift vessel will probably gather up in quantities in these frozen seas and bring down here to be put through a process of manufacture. But when you have got them to France in the shape of glue you have to pay a duty of three and a half cents for every pound. Then, incandescent electric

lamps are included in the list, but you have to pay from 31 cents to 62 cents per pound for everything connected with them and the importation into France is exceedingly small. Then you have on this list: 'Yarns of phormium, tenax, abaca, and other vegetable fibres ,' which grow on our hillsides and pastures in Canada, and when you get them manufactured into yarn they can get into France when you pay a very large duty per pound on them. For the present we may relegate these to the category of the products of Canada which include 'capers, and olives, and pineapples,' which we are fortunate enough to have been able to get in this tariff list. But when you come to paper you get it into France at a cent and a cent and quarter per pound ; and certain qualities of paper have been on the favoured tariff list of France for years, and if you look up the trade reports you will find there was not one dollar's worth of these exported to France last year.

Well, top-boots and shoes for men and women have been in the treaty since 1893, and last year, after fourteen years of existence of that favoured tariff, the same exactly as is provided for in this treaty, the enormous export of $1,473 worth of boots and shoes was made into France from Canada, so far as I can gather from the returns. Gloves and mits are in much the same category. And so, if we go through all these articles, outside of what I have mentioned, we shal find that the tariff upon them is very large, and that it does not seem possible under that tariff to do very much business in the future, in the near future at least.

I leave that part of the subject and call attention to this fact, that after you get into France with these articles, you meet competitors. There are thirty-four countries which possess the advantage of the full minimum tariff of France, and these comprise all the great trading countries of the world. So that when you get into France, you find that before you get in, with a partial list on the minimum tariff, thirty-four countries are in there, with the advantage of the full minimum tariff, and have been there, many of them, since 1892. Over and above that, you find that thirty other countries outside of these thirty-four have a partial minimum advantage in France, some of them more than we have, others less. That is what you have to compete with after you get there, and under what conditions? Many of those countries that have the advantage of the full minimum tariff lie alongside of or are not very far distant from France itself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Thirty-four countries alongside of France ?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that. My right hon. friend is too swift; he sometimes goes too slow and sometimes too fast. Thirty-four countries have the minimum tariff, and many of these countries, not all, —because I am aware that Asia is not in Europe—lie contiguous to France itself. What does that mean ? It means that when we have to pack our goods from three thousand to four thousand miles by routes which are not very diversified to get into France, we find that we are in competition with the great countries of the world having the minimum tariff and having to pack their goods only from ten to three hundred miles, and with the best possible communications by rail and water in constant operation between those countries. It was in 1893 considered a great thing if we could get an entrance into the French market for our cheese—why? Because at that time Switzerland was not on the minimum list. There was a trade difficulty between France and Switzerland. Switzerland had to pay 15 francs, we will say, whereas the minimum tariff would be only five francs, and Sir Charles Tupper did his best to get our cheese into France under the minimum tariff, because it would have been a great advantage to us inasmuch as Switzerland was practically shut out. But to-day Switzerland is in the enjoyment of the full minimum tariff, and she and Italy are the great providers of cheese for the French market. So that propinquity has to be taken into account, and we must remember that our greatest competitors here are those who lie very close to the French market and have varied and diversified means of direct communication, both by rail and water.

Mr. PATERSON. Are you for or against the treaty ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not making my speech.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Sir Charles Tupper tried to get the minimum tariff on cheese. Is it not correct that the French government was willing to grant it, and it was the hon. gentleman who refused it ?

Mr. FOSTER. What a wonderful thing my hon. friend has unearthed. If he were a little more correct and looked after this matter as carefully as he does his travelling expenses, he would not have made the statement he has made here to-night. He would have found that the French government was willing to let Canadian cheese into France at the minimum provided Canada would give a quid pro quo, and Canada did not give the quid pro quo.

Mr. BRODEUR. What was the quid pro quo ?

Mr. FOSTER. Does that help my hon. friend's statement ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is the master of quibbling, but he made a state-

ment, and he made it on insufficient information.

Mr. BRODEUR. What was the quid pro quo ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will not bring me down any information; he can go and hunt his information for himself. There is also this to be taken into account: the country that has the full minimum tariff of France will be in a much better position to compete in that country against the country that goes into the market with a partial minimum list. That is apparent to any man who does business or is acquainted with business. A large range of goods is at his disposal for export to the French market; he can afford to go to greater expense to push his trade and put greater enterprise into it; and we meet, as I have said, thirty-four countries that have the advantage of the full minimum tariff of France, many of them the foremost countries of the world in matters of trade.

There is something else: we have to give more than mere schedules of possible articles. There is this difference, and I commend it to members of the House. Take the list of goods selected by France for entrance into the Canadian market, and you will find it an exceedingly well-selected list. I doubt very much if you will find any padding at all in that list. I have gone over it carefully and have looked into the trade returns, and there are very few of the ninety-nine items for which France obtains entrance into this market in which she cannot do a present trade; I may go further and say in which she is not at present doing a trade with Canada or in which, under this treaty, she will not do a fairly good trade in this market. There are a large number of items in the Canadian schedule 'A' but of these three-fourths you will find have no present entrance into the French market. The difference between the two schedules is that the Canadian articles are largely articles in which the best that can be expected is to do some trade in the distant future, as the Minister of Finance has himself acknowledged, but of the articles selected by the French plenipotentiaries, nearly every one is a French specialty, which has already made its way or will very easily make its way into this market. This I think is an important distinction. Then there is this other distinction. Read the list of duties on the French articles coming into Canada and the highest duty is about 32½ per cent, and the lowest 5 or 10 per cent. the average being somewhere between 20 per cent and 25 per cent. That is a very important point: French products entering Canada under this treaty are subject to an average tariff of between 20 per cent and 25 per cent. I cannot say positively what the average on the articles in the Canadian schedules having an entrance into France will be, I wanted to get the information from the minister but have not been able to do so. I venture to say it is very much higher on the average than the duty on goods entering this market under the treaty. More than that, as I have said before, most of these articles of French export are specialties of France. France is a wonderful country in more respects than one. Of all the manufacturing countries in the world, she has the most artistic and complete manufactures. Whilst many other countries manufacture rougher articles up to a less degree of excellence, if you want to find the most finished of manufactures produced in the most artistic and perfect manner you find them in France, and so she builds up not only her brawn and her muscle in her manufactures, but her skill and makes these artistic specialties; these appeal to the world and bring their price and these specialties will find an entrance into every great market in the world, no matter how high the tariff, because they are matters of art and high taste and great skill in the completion of manufactures. Examine the list and you will see that it is made up largely of those things that will find an entrance here and become more and more firmly established in proportion as Canada grows more wealthy and more artistic and is better able to spend money upon the gratification of her artistic tastes. Thus you have these goods coming into Canada at a low rate fortified by the fact that they are largely specialties, which create a demand for themselves. Therefore the way is opened for a future large trade by France in Canada whilst the future does not seem to be so well opened to Canada for her manufactures in France under these schedules.

Then there are twelve items in schedule C on which, as the minister said and the schedule shows there has been a very great reduction from the last treaty, so that there is a very small tariff rate. Some of the items in schedule C, the French imports, embroideries, ribbons of all kinds, manufactures of silk or of which silk is the component part of chief value, etc., will be articles which under the exceedingly small rates that have been placed upon them will find a large market in this country, and their competition will be most pronounced. But, Sir, we have given more than this. We have to count in estimating the cost of this treaty, not only the advantages we give to France and the revenue which we lose, but also what we pay to other countries for the sake of getting this arrangement with France. The Minister of Finance has spoken of that to-night. He seemed to think that we got an advantage from these other countries. We get no advantage so far as I can see from these other most-favoured nation countries because of the negotiation of this treaty; we have all the

advantages that we can get from the most-favoured nation countries now.

Mr. FIELDING. What more can we get.

Mr. FOSTER. What more can we get? There is just the point. There seems to be little chance of getting more, but what more do we give? We give to every one of these most-favoured nation countries all the advantages and diminutions of tariff rates that we give to France in this arrangement that has been negotiated. That is you have to let in similar articles from all most-favoured nation countries; you have to add all of this to the price you are paying for the treaty arrangement with France. My hon. friend said: But we get compensation. I want to make it clear that there is no compensation at all because of this treaty arrangement; we have got all the compensation now. If you do not ratify the treaty you will have just the same benefit from these countries as if you do ratify it and every country gets entrance into Canada without any compensation for all the goods of the schedules B and C. This is a matter of some moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance thought it was a matter of some moment and last year, when explaining this, he thought it necessary to advance an argument on this point. What was the gist of his argument? We know there are most-favoured nation treaties; we know that if we make a treaty with one country we have to give all the advantages of that treaty to another; therefore he said it is well for us to make a lot of these arrangements together and get favours from as many countries as possible, in order that we may not have to compensate one at our own expense for what we get from the other. But the minister did not carry out this theory. He made this treaty with France whilst with all the other most-favoured nations he has made no treaties. He has, so far as I know, undertaken no negotiations or if he has they have not come to anything. Therefore we are mulcted in this and so the people in Canada, manufacturers, traders, business men, the industrial section of Canada, taking capital and labour into account, is to submit to the added competition from every most-favoured nation country and other countries who give nothing in return for this. That seems to be unfair.

For my part, I have very little faith in or desire for most favoured nation clauses. I think that a bargain that I make in a business matter between myself and another had better be made between us two and not on the ground that a third, or a fourth, or a fifth party shall be able to share the advantage of our arrangement. I think the position of the United States is far more logical and businesslike—no entanglement of most favoured nation treaties, but simply saying to the other party to the proposed agreement: We will sit down and make our own bargain and enjoy the benefit of it, and if we want to extend it to other parties, we will make bargains with those other parties. In times past, most favoured nation treaties were made for other than commercial reasons. The most favoured nation clause now is really an entanglement of commercial relations between countries. We are getting deeper and deeper into this complex system. The Minister of Finance, another year, may go to Italy and make an arrangement with that country, and it will contain a clause that every thing that he gives to Italy, and for which he gets a bare equivalent, will have to be paid for further by whatever advantage France, Japan and every most favoured nation gets in our market because of the negotiation with Italy. And, with our general tariff, and our intermediate tariff, and our preferential tariff, and our tariff that is neither intermediate nor preferential but special, and all our most favoured nation clauses, we are getting into a muddle with reference to our tariff and fiscal relations which may cause us a great deal of trouble in the future. Just now we are having some trouble with Japan—I hope not any thing which will result in worse than temporary discontent and disagreement. But there is no particular reason why, because we want an arrangement with France and are ready to allow, as a quid pro quo, French silks and fabrics to come into this country at a reduced rate, that we shall make a present of that advantage to Japan while Japan gives us nothing in return. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) slid very easily over that part. But if he will take up the trade returns, he will find that Japan exported to this country pretty nearly as much silks as did France. I think that France sent us about $650,000 worth and Japan about $470,000 worth. The moment this treaty goes into force the silk trade of Japan benefits, but Japan gives Canada not a single yen of advantage in return for the benefit she receives from us. All these conditions should be taken into account when we are considering this treaty.

Now, let me sum up. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) wished to know where I stood on this treaty, I stand as an examiner of this treaty, examining it under great difficulties, because of the laziness, or inability, or indisposition of hon. gentlemen opposite to give information that they properly ought to give. If my health suffers under the strain to which it has been put in my efforts to gain this information, I will lay it to these hon. gentlemen. I say, I stand as an examiner of this treaty. I would rather that the treaty should be made between France and Canada than

not. I would be willing to go a good long way for any thing like a reasonable exchange. But, when, before a single line of that treaty can be known to any one in Canada, hon. gentlemen opposite and their press begin to jubilate in thunder tones from one end of this country to the other over the mighty thing which these gentlemen are supposed to have done, I think it requires a little coolness and a little of the critical faculty to examine this treaty, in order to bring us to a proper frame of mind to cause us regard it from a business point of view. My view is, so far, that we are paying pretty dearly for what we get. We are paying, in the first place, in revenue. The Minister of Finance says that we shall lose about $400,000. He does not know, but, he makes a sort of haphazard jump at the conclusion that the loss will be $400,000. We are given no elements of a calculation to enable us to judge whether that is the right amount or not. It may be difficult to make an exact calculation. At any rate we stand to lose a considerable portion of the revenue we have at present. And revenue is what the Minister of Finance dearly loves. It is revenue that keeps these hon. gentlemen where they are. It is the immense expenditures they make from immense revenue which they get from immense taxation imposed which keeps them where they are; that pays the grafter and the middleman and the person who charges extravagant prices; that pays for the silver pitchers on the icebreakers and all that kind of thing. Revenue is important to these hon. gentlemen as well as to the country, and, first, we must face a loss of revenue. But more than that, you sacrifice what you have called one of your foremost principles since you gave up the worship of the unrestricted reciprocity god and became fervent worshippers of preference to Great Britain. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), before the election of 1896, was a great preferentialist. During the canvass, when he was in London looking for votes, he pledged himself, as leader of the opposition, and as a public man of character and standing, that when he went to England, he would try to arrange for a mutual preference between Great Britain and Canada. He got the votes and got the position by making that pledge. But when he went to England and mounted the platform at Liverpool, the first thing he told the British people was that he did not want any preference and neither did Canada ; that it was a bad thing to have a protective tariff and that he hoped Great Britain would never fall into that error ; that every thing that Canada gave in the way of preference was given because of her love and devotion to the mother country. And in the tariff of 1897 he went right back on mutual preference, as he has gone back on every other pledge he has ever made in this country on the political platform. I have a string of them several feet long. They are in store for the right hon. gentleman and some day I propose to have a little comment on them, but I merely mention this one for the present time. Having gone back on mutual preference, he took the one sided preference and put it into his tariff, 12½ per cent and the year afterwards 25 per cent, and shortly afterwards 33⅓ per cent. See how I love the mother country, how I love this British preferential tariff. Well, Sir, was it saner methods, or what ? In a little while, individual items in this British preference were cut out. Last year we had a final ?—no, but we had the last paring down until this one, and when the last paring was done, I doubt if the British preference was more than 10 per cent on the average all the way through. If it was more, will these gentlemen tell us what it is? Now take up this schedule and look it through, and you you find that your intermediate and your special have brought down the British preference to an equality in many cases,and not more than 2½ per cent upon nine-tenths of the articles therein mentioned, and to as high as 7½ per cent on some. I doubt if, when this goes into force, the preference will be worth 6 per cent instead of 33⅓ per cent.

Yet we have the right hon. gentleman himself standing up in the great council of the empire, in the Imperial Conference, and telling them there that we have resolved here in Canada to give up the fetish, the worship of reciprocity and all that kind of thing. He says:

> There was one time that we wanted reciprocity with the United States, but our offers were negatived, and we have said good-bye to any more offers, we have put our hopes upon British trade now.

That is what he told the assembled magnates of the empire under the shadow of imperial London. We have put all our hopes on British trade now. He goes on:

> But there are other nations—France is one and Italy another, with which we could have better trade. . . . France has a minimum tariff and we are prepared to exchange our intermediate tariff, if they will exchange their minimum tariff with us.

That is the principle on which he was going, a minimum tariff, for an intermediate tariff. That is exactly what the Finance Minister did when he brought in his machinery of the intermediate tariff.

> France has a minimum tariff and we are prepared to exchange our intermediate tariff, if they will exchange their minimum tariff with us. But while giving this intermediate preference, we maintain a system of lower tariff to the mother country, and to all our fellow British subjects all over the world.

They do, but instead of being 33⅓ per cent, instead of being 25 per cent, instead of being

12½ per cent, it is pared down now to an equality or in some instances to a very small percentage of preference, taking the average of the articles that are mentioned in these schedules, and a very small percentage taken on the whole. The right hon. gentleman went on to say :

Dr. Jameson made the point that if we were to enter into such an agreement with foreign nations, we would debar the possibility of giving a preference to the mother country. Nothing of this kind. Our tariff is not so constructed, and cannot be so held. If we were to make an agreement with France, which I doubt whether we could, France would understand the position; she would take our intermediate tariff, knowing at the same time there was a lower differential tariff under all circumstances for the mother country and the British dominions.

But the right hon. gentleman was not frank in telling what this preference would be shaved down to after the treaty with France was made. Perhaps he did not know at the time. He spoke as though no other tariff arrangement could be made with France except by an interchange of the minimum for the preferential tariff. But Mr. Moor asked :

I would like the premier of Canada to assure us on this point. By that amount which you reduce it to any foreign power, you would reduce your preference with the home land?

Mr. Deakin. And with us.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I do not admit that we would reduce it, it would remain as it is.

There is another promise of the right hon. gentleman.

I do not admit that we would reduce it, it would remain as it is, but the man who trades with us in Great Britain knows that he may have a competitor, not upon the same lines, but upon reduced lines from our general tariff.

Not upon the same lines, and yet there is item after item in these schedules where competition will bear, and bear heavily, upon Great Britain herself. Now what are we doing by further diminution of the British preference? There is the country to which these gentlemen have been saying we must look for our sales in this country, it is the great market of Canada. What was another article of faith of these gentlemen ? That if you wanted a country to buy from you, you must buy from that country as well. Now what is happening with regard to Great Britain? That the balance of trade, so far as traffic between this country and Great Britain is concerned, is absolutely adverse to Great Britain, whilst with foreign nations the balance of trade is with the foreigner, and we have to take the money balance from Great Britain and pay it to the foreigner to liquidate our bills. Yet you are accentuating that, you are accentuating what to-day is a danger that is menacing Canadian trade and Canadian stability. Nothing is more impressive than the extreme and rapid rise of the adverse balance of trade against Canada in the last five years. It is remarkable, and it is being commented upon, and you may refine upon it as you like, it is a distinct menace. And yet, Sir, you are proposing a treaty which, though it may have little advantage in itself, will have this absolute trend and consequence, that it is giving to countries whose balance of trade is already adverse to Canada, greater ease of entry into this country to increase that adverse balance and to pile up the debit against you. Look at Japan. Japan to-day sends in here more than a million dollars worth of goods. How much do you send out ? And yet the next year, you are going to add to the exports from Japan, and to the advantage of the exporters of Japan, on silks and fancy goods to a large amount by giving them the advantage of this treaty. Are we following up with equal diligence our exports to those countries? It must stop somewhere. We must find exports somewhere to balance our imports. The result of this treaty, and of giving the most favoured nation treatment, will be to accentuate this menace and not to diminish it.

You are also paying for this treaty by valuable favours given to most-favoured nations without receiving any compensation therefor.

You are giving for a largely unimportant and impossible list in schedule A, two lists in schedules B and C, which are very valuable; and you are subjecting the industries of this country to increased competition in certain products that will tell hardly on lines of business already hard pressed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already taken up more time than I should. But somehow or other, both with the Minister of Finance and myself, this seems to be a question which takes a good while to get over. I have endeavoured to examine this as far as I possibly could in a cool and critical way. I want this House to see exactly what it is doing before it does it ; and when we come to the Bill and to examine the different items, I hope we shall have information from the members of the government that will enable us to get a little further into the treaty than we have been able to do heretofore.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To reach a conclusion.

Mr. FOSTER. At least to reach a conclusion. Let us in this House examine this treaty with particularity, diligence and information enough to know just exactly what it means and not go into it from wrong ideas or insufficient information. If, when we have got through that examination, this treaty commends itself to me as being good as between Canada and France I shall vote for it. If it does not, I shall not.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, as it is getting rather late and as any remarks I may have to make may be somewhat lengthy I will move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 15, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Gustave A. Turcotte, Esq., for the electoral district of Nicolet.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Chartered Bank of British Columbia.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 60) respecting patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 61) respecting patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Haskett. —Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 63) respecting patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited. —Mr. Macdonald.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. G. PORTER (West Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 64) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act. He said: The Bill is identical with a Bill which I introduced last session. Its object is to make the law of the Dominion similar to the law of the province of Ontario with reference to the sale of deteriorated milk to cheese factories. Under the Ontario law, if the milk arrives at the factory in a deteriorated condition, and the seller of the milk can prove to the satisfaction of the court that the deterioration was without his knowledge or connivance, that is a good defence; under the Dominion law that is no defence, and the object of the Bill is to make the two laws similar.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRANTS WITH CONCEALED WEAPONS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to amend the Immigration Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill relates to a matter which I had the honour to bring before the House at the opening of the session, namely, the carrying of knives and other concealed weapons by Italians and other foreigners. I have in the hands of the law clerk of this House a Bill to amend the Criminal Code in reference to the same matter; but this Bill is based on the principle that an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure. Its purpose is to make provision for stopping at the port of entry all immigrants who may be undesirable from the point of view of carrying concealed weapons and also for deporting all foreigners who are committed of criminal assault in Canada. The first clause says:

> It shall be the duty of some suitable person to be appointed by the medical officer for that purpose, in the course of the examination hereinbefore provided, to search the person, clothing and baggage of each immigrant for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is in possession of any of the following weapons, namely: a weapon commonly known as a dirk or bowie knife, or any weapon resembling it or which is not of a character or kind calculated to be solely used for an inoffensive purpose; or any weapon known as a pistol or revolver, and to take possession of any such weapon, and transmit it to the minister, with a report of the name of the immigrant, his occupation, the name of the country from which he came, and his address there, together with the name of the ship, and place of embarkation and port of entry; and if, upon investigation, the minister is satisfied that the immigrant is not a person of good character he may order the deportation of such immigrant, and the provisions of section 33 of this Act shall apply to the case.

A number of the weapons included in this Bill are not included in the Act for preventing people carrying concealed weapons. The second clause provides:

> It shall be the duty of every peace officer to search any person whom he has reason to believe to be possessed of any such weapon; and if any such weapon is found in his possession, the peace officer shall forthwith take him before the nearest justice of the peace or magistrate, who shall proceed to investigate the facts and make a report to the minister in the matter together with the evidence; and, if the minister is satisfied that such person was an immigrant to Canada within two years previously and had in his possession any such weapon, or if any such immigrant is found within two years of his arrival in Canada in possession of any such weapon, the minister

may order the deportation of such immigrant and section 33 of this Act shall apply to the case.

In reference to the Bill I wish to say only a few words. I would like hon. members to think over this matter, which is becoming more serious every day. On the day I spoke in this House on this subject there were three columns in the daily papers of the city of Montreal in regard to a request from the chief of police for sixty more detectives in plain clothes because of the number of people who had recently been knifed by Italians. Only the other day a Glengarry man was stabbed to death by Italians near Whitestone, Ontario. And here is a much graver case; on December 23 last, the daily papers in Toronto and Montreal had despatches giving an account of a fight on a train. I read the headings as given in one paper:

Bloody battle occurs on a train—Forty Italians on Montreal train fight with razors and revolvers.

The despatch shows that the row continued while the train was passing from Vaudreuil to St. Henri, that a number of shots were fired and knives and razors freely used. All the rioters but three escaped when the train slowed down at St. Henri. The three who remained aboard were arrested on reaching Montreal. One of them was taken to the hospital critically wounded. The other passengers were in a state of terror and danger. The train crew were, of course, utterly helpless. It is to prevent this kind of thing that this Bill is moved. The difficulty arises from a condition of our law which allows these weapons to be displayed for sale. A man sees exposed for sale in the second-hand stores, hardware stores and others, rows of revolvers. Our law prohibits a man from going into a drug store and buying poison unless he is a good character, known to the druggist, and unless he signs a receipt for the same. I think that this Bill, if I am fortunate enough to have it go to committee, might be amended by having some such clause inserted. I am open to conviction on the subject, and I think a discussion will lead to a remedy for the bad conditions now existing. Certainly, the use of the stiletto, so common in Italy should be prevented on Canadian soil. I find an Associated Press despatch in the newspapers of December 9 last, saying that the Italian government, under the influence of the King himself, is making efforts to put down the use of the knife in that country. The article goes on to say that not less than 10 per cent of Italians lose their lives by the stiletto. And Greece is in as bad a condition. I commend to hon. members the following editorial utterance from two of our leading daily newspapers concerning this growing evil. The 'Globe' says:—

41½

The moral of such a situation for other places is the necessity of making the administration of justice thorough and of keeping it so all the time. There is no virtue at all in spasmodic activity. Crime should never be allowed to become rampant. Every criminal should be run to earth as speedily and as certainly as possible. If he is convicted of murder he should be capitally punished; if he is convicted of some crime of violence short of murder he should be flogged. For such people imprisonment has no terrors. They easily accommodate themselves to the penal conditions, and when their term of confinement is over they emerge more skillful and more hardened criminals than before.

The only punishment they really dread is intense physical pain, and the safest way to inflict this is by flogging. This kind of punishment is not necessarily inhuman. It should be spread out over a considerable time, administered in comparatively small doses, and graded to suit the physical strength and temperament of the convict. It is of the nature of poetic justice in cases of brutal injuries to the criminal's victim, and it is peculiarly effective as a deterrent. If crimes of violence are to be stamped out, pain-producing punishments will have to be inflicted.

The Montreal 'Star' of January 14, says:—

The trouble is, of course, that the first things which the unarmed immigrant will see, when he gets to shore in Canada are shop windows full of weapons for sale. From this, if he be a discerning man, with a deductive mind, he will infer that he had better buy a knife or a gun at once; for it is plain that he is in a savage country where the inhabitants go armed. Obviously, it would be no more than fair play to the immigrant to remove from his sight these signs of our 'savagery,' which the police will subsequently tell him are very much exaggerated. If he comes to the country unarmed, we ought not to insist in this way that he arm himself, only to punish him later for having taken our advice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIOINS.

ENCOURAGEMENT TO LITERATURE.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked—(Translation)—

1. Is the government aware of the following article which appeared in 'La Patrie,' of the 24th December, 1907:—

For Literature.

The Prime Minister of Australia has just obtained from the government of that country a subsidy of $2,500 that will form the nucleus of a public fund intended to give aid to poor literary people. It is quite probable that such subsidy will be voted yearly.

In that connection, the 'Canada,' that excellent review which defends so well Canadian interests, both in London and all through England, suggests that our government should imitate this example.

In truth it is a fact so far we have grovelled in the narrowest materialism. We build rail-

ways and wharfs, which is all very well; but what have 'the powers that be' ever done for literature and art? All countries have their subsidies for the encouragement and development of the fine arts. Now Canada is a nation, so it is often stated, and it is high time that she should begin to think of the idealistic phase of her constitution.

The small sum of $2,000 would scarcely add a straw's weight to our national burden, but it might be very useful for some one who, instead of running after a fortune along the highway of business, would wish to immortalize his country with some masterpiece. This is more true of Canada than perhaps of any other country. We have no literature yet, simply because we do not encourage those who write. The government would certainly be doing a useful work were it to create a substantial fund for this purpose.

2. If so, does the government purpose, this very year, to set aside an amount from the public funds for the purpose of creating a fund for the assistance and encouragement —either by means of purses, or prizes, or voyages for study—of the poor literary persons in this country?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister)—(Translation). The question has not yet been brought to the attention of the government.

PREMIUMS ON IMMIGRATION.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked—(Translation) :

1. Does the government of Canada still give premiums on immigration?
2. If so, in what countries does the government offer premiums on immigration?
3. To whom are such premiums paid?
4. What amounts are paid in premiums, and how much per head?
5. How much money has the government paid out in premiums on immigration since 1900?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.
2. Provision is made for the granting of bonus with respect to immigrants from the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Austro-Hungary, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland.
3. To the steamship booking agents in the United Kingdom, to certain selected booking agents in continental countries, to specially appointed agents in the United States who work on commission, and in the case of juvenile immigrants from Great Britain to the philanthropic societies and persons bringing them out.
4. In the case of immigrants of prescribed classes from the British Isles, France and other European countries the premium of bonus which the department is authorized to pay is £1 per head for adults and ten shillings for children. In the case of immigrants of the farming class from the United States, $3 per male, $2 per female adult, and $1 per child. In the case of certain juveniles from the United Kingdom $2 per head.
5. $690,609.11.

WHARFS AT MONTMAGNY BASIN AND CAP ST. IGNACE.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked—(Translation) :

1. When does the Minister of Public Works intend commencing the construction of the wharfs, the money for which has been voted, at Montmagny basin and Cap St. Ignace?
2. Have tenders been called for?
3. If so, to whom have they been accorded?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1, 2, and 3. Contract for wharf at Montmagny basin has been awarded to Elzear Boulanger & Fils; time set for completion is December 30, 1908. Plans and specifications for proposed wharf at Cap St. Ignace are being prepared and the work will be advertised for tender as soon as possible.

TO REPLACE THE GARRISON AT HALIFAX.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked—(Translation) :

1. Is it true that the Canadian regiments garrisoned at Halifax are to be replaced by troops from Great Britain?
2. If so, will such troops be paid by the Canadian government?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The rumour referred to in the question has not the slightest ground.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE—DISTRICT OF QUEBEC.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked—(Translation) :

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware that the government of the province of Quebec has passed an Act permitting the appointment of an additional puisne judge for the Superior Court of the district of Quebec?
2. If so, does the government intend making such appointment, and when?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

An Act such as is described has been passed by the Quebec legislature, but has not been brought into force.

MANITOBA LANDS IN HANDS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. SCHAFFNER—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. How many acres of odd numbered sections in the province of Manitoba are there still in the hands of the government?
2. How many acres of even numbered section in the province of Manitoba are there still in the hands of the government?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. About 9,642,500 acres.

2. About 9,354,500 acres.

The lands comprising the areas given above are chiefly unsurveyed. All Crown lands in Manitoba are subject to the provisions of the third section of Chapter 99, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, under which the Provincial Government of Manitoba becomes entitled to the lands which may be classed as swamp upon survey and examination.

INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANT SHIPS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. Have any complaints been made to the government concerning the treatment of immigrants by shipping companies bringing people to Canada?

2. Has the government any inspectors or supervision of any kind to protect the health, safety, and supplies of wholesome food, with proper sleeping accommodation of immigrants on ships sailing to Canadian ports?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. Yes, except with respect to food supplies; these being under the control of the Imperial Board of Trade. Canadian government officers inspect sanitary and other conditions of all steamships carrying emigrants and sailing to Canada from British ports. Canadian government medical officers inspect all ships carrying immigrants, on arrival at Canadian ports. Further than this the steamship companies are required by the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act to give bonds for the due fulfilment of the provisions of that Act in respect of air space and other sanitary conditions as well as supplies of wholesome food, water, etc.

CANADA-AUSTRALIA SUBSIDIZED STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. How long did the government subsidize the Canadian Australian Steamship Company doing service between Australia and Vancouver?

2. What yearly subsidy did the government contribute?

3. Is the government providing for the service in the estimates 1908-1909?

4. If not, for what reason?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. A subsidy has been granted to a line of steamships between Australia and Vancouver since 1893.

2. The annual subsidies paid by the Canadian government have been as follows:—

1893-94	$121,666.67
1894-95	121,666.67
1895-96	121,666.67
1896-97	121,666.67
1897-98	121,666.67
1898-99	121,666.67
1899-1900	121,666.67
1900-01	121,666.67
1901-02	121,666.67
1902-03	131,025.63
1903-04	116,806.00
1904-05	194,666.66
1905-06	186,973.43
1906-07	135,382.00
1907-08, to Sept. 26	72,897.65

3 and 4. A contract was forwarded to the contractors for signature which has not yet been accepted, nor has the Australian government come to terms with the contractors.

MR. GONZALVE DESAULNIERS.

Mr. ROBT. N. WALSH asked:

1. Has Mr. Gonzalve Desaulniers, barrister, of the city of Montreal, been employed as translator or in any other position or work by the government during the present parliament, or since 1896?

2. Has the said Gonzalve Desaulniers during the present parliament or at any time since 1896 been employed by the government to represent them as counsel in any court of justice, or in any other capacity?

3. In how many of these cases have his services been required?

4. What amounts of money have been paid him by the government, at what time were they paid, and for what services, since the year 1896?

5. How much was paid him for the work of translation, and how much for his professional services?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

Gonzalve Desaulniers was sessional translator in the House of Commons from 1896 to 1904, when this class of clerks was abolished.

Amounts received as sessional clerk from 1896 to 1904 inclusive, are as follows:—

1897	$ 126
1898	994
1899	783
1900	992
1901	825
1902	1,194
1903	1,211
1904	686

Since 1904 he has done some translation for the House of Commons by the page. The account is as follows:—

1905 (at $1 per page)	$220
1906	204
1907, to 31st March	75
1907, from 31st March to 31st December	135

MATERIAL FOR QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. At the time of the accident to the Quebec bridge, what quantity of material had the

contractor or company on hand, but not in construction?

2. What is the nature and value of such material, and to whom does it belong?

3. Has any portion of this material been claimed, or shipped back to the United States, or elsewhere, by the contractors or others?

4. Was this material included in the material and supplies paid for with money obtained under government guarantee?

5. By what authority was such material taken over, or shipped back?

6. Has any action been taken by the government in connection with such supplies and building material on hand, pending the report of the commision?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

	Lbs.
1. Finished material in storage at Phœnixville, on land leased to the Dominion of Canada.. ..	14,755,399
Finished material in storage on land at or near Quebec.. ..	21,306,113
Raw material at Phœnixville...	2,981,787
Total raw and finished material..	39,043,299

2. (a) Structural steel (b) $1,467,790.40 (c) Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5. Answered by number three.

6. No.

THEFT FROM BONANZA POST OFFICE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What investigation was made, and by whom, into the theft of common and registered letters from the post office at Bonanza, Yukon?

2. How many letters were stolen or concealed, and how many ultimately recovered?

3. What was the result of the investigation?

4. Who was then, and who is now, the postmaster at Bonanza?

5. Will the Postmaster General lay the report of the investigation on the table of the House?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1, 2, 3 and 4. An investigation into the case referred to was made by the postmaster of Dawson, Yukon, under date December 10, 1903, and it was ascertained that the postmaster of Bonanza, having reason to be dissatisfied with what appeared to be negligence on the part of his assistant, J. S. Burpee, dismissed him on July 27, 1903. After his dismissal Burpee removed from the room where he lodged and a Rev. Mr. Wyatt, who took possession of the room, discovered four sacks filled with mail matter. Upon a warrant being obtained, Burpee's trunk was searched and it was found to be filled with more letters.

Eighty-six registered and 3,318 ordinary letters were found to be in Burpee's possession but none of these had been opened or tampered with.

Burpee was arrested and given a preliminary hearing. He was then committed for trial before the territorial court. Burpee's counsel asked for and received a grant to have him tried for insanity, and he was declared insane, and handed over by the court to his brother for safe keeping.

Mr. W. M. Woodburn was the postmaster at Bonanza at the time and he has since been replaced by Mr. A. J. Peck.

There is no objection to the report of the investigation being brought down to the House.

EMPLOYMENT OF HENRY C. HUNTER.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. Is one Henry C. Hunter an employee on the government system of railways?

2. What are his duties?

3. What is the date of his entrance into the service of the government?

4. What is his salary?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Henry Hunter was engaged by the general manager, temporarily as purchaser of ties, owing to the impossibility of securing supplies this year; the response in answer to invitation for tenders was about one half of the requirements.

2. Answered by number one.

3. November 14, 1907.

4. One hundred dollars a month.

HOLDING OF TRAIN AT TATAMAGOUCHE.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. On whose authority was the regular Intercolonial Railway accommodation train held at Tatamagouche for three hours on Thursday evening, November 14, 1907?

2. On whose authority was the same train held at Denmark for about the same time on Saturday evening, November 23, 1907?

3. At whose request were the above trains held?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. No. 90 way freight train was held at Tatamagouche, by authority of the superintendent of the Oxford, New Glasgow division of the Intercolonial Railway.

2. Answered by number one.

3. At the request of a number of passengers, who were desirous of returning to their homes on the respective nights, as there was no later train for Pictou, on these dates. The train had no connection to make at Pictou, and there was no extra expense to the railway.

PAY OF MILITIA.

Mr. CLAUDE MACDONELL asked:

1. Was a commission or a board of officers appointed by the government to inquire into the question of the pay of officers and men of the permanent corps? If so, when?

2. Has the said commission or board of officers reported?

3. If so, when was such report made, and what is the reason for the delay in bringing the report down to the House?

4. If the said commission or board has not reported, what is the cause of the delay, and when is such report expected to be made?

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

1. No commission or board of officers has been appointed by the government, but on July 16, 1907, the Minister of Militia, departmentally, ordered a board of officers to assemble about October 1 to consider the report upon certain questions in regard to pay and allowances of the permanent force and active militia.

2. No.

3. See reply to 2.

4. Board has not reported, owing to pressure of work in the department. It is hoped that report will be ready before close of financial year.

ESQUIMALT NAVAL STATION.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. Has the naval station at Esquimalt been taken over by Canada? If not, when will the transfer be made?

2. When transferred, to what purpose is it proposed to devote the station?

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

1. No. Probably very shortly.

2. Under consideration.

GARRISON AND EQUIPMENT AT HALIFAX AND ESQUIMALT.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. How many officers and men of the permanent corps are stationed at Halifax?

2. How many officers and men of the permanent corps are stationed at Esquimalt?

3. Are the number at Esquimalt considered to be sufficient to man the forts and efficiently maintain the station?

4. Are there any large guns at Esquimalt not yet placed in position? If so, why?

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

1. Sixty-eight officers and 1,219 non-commissioned officers and men.

2. Thirteen officers and 149 non-commissioned officers and men.

3. The strength of the present garrison, and the disposal of its armament have been settled with the full knowledge and concurrence of the Imperial government.

4. Yes, just where they had been placed by the Imperial troops. Their further disposition is subject to correspondence with the War Office.

SALES OF TIMBER LANDS.

Mr. J. D. REID asked:

1. What timber lands, if any, have been sold or leased since January 1, 1900, in township 8, range 3, west of the fourth meridian?

2. To whom have said lands been sold or leased?

3. If leased, on what terms were the said lands so leased, the price, and kind of timber to be cut, and how long does lease run?

4. What becomes of the dry fallen timber on said lands?

5. Has the purchaser or lessee the right to cut and sell the dry timber on the said lands?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Sections 10 and 14 (Berth 1027) were granted under license.

2. Granted to Messrs. William and James Rutherford, but since assigned to Mr. William Rutherford.

3. (a) Those provided in the timber regulations which include the payment of a bonus rental at the rate of five dollars per square mile per annum, and royalty at the rate of fifty cents per thousand feet B.M. and all lumber manufactured and sold.

(b) A bonus of $105 was paid.

(c) All timber ten inches and over at the stump.

(d) License is a yearly one renewable if conditions of license and regulations are complied with.

4. Licensee has right under his license to cut dry fallen timber ten inches and over in diameter at the stump.

5. Yes, if it is ten inches in diameter at the stump.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, tenders and contracts, in connection with building piers at Port Maitland, Ontario.—Mr. Lalor.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, orders in council, contracts and tenders, with the names and amounts of each, in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, respecting the construction of a breakwater at Petit Rocher, on the southwestern side of Baie des Chaleurs, as detailed on page 74 of the report of the Minister of Public Works for the year ending March 31, 1907.—Mr. Taylor.

For a return showing the number of applications made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the privilege of crossing railway tracks with telephone and telegraph wires and with water mains each, over the said period from February 1, 1904, to January 1, 1908; the total number of applications granted over said period; the total number of applications refused; the date of each application; the date each application was granted; the length of time from the application to the granting of same; and what time should elapse before the board should give its decision.—Mr. Barr.

For a copy of all correspondence, reports locations, records of payments made on payments returned, homestead entries, cancellations thereof, of any order, direction or other authority given to any homesteader or person who had entered for homestead to re-enter after cancellation of entry or default thereunder, any evidence of sale by Peter Luenson to Fred Heintz, and any correspondence, affi-

davits, memoranda, or other documents by the department or any of its officers with W. L. MacKenzie, Peter Luenson, Fred Heintz, Alex. K. Thom, Wm. R. Gardner, Thos. J. Oliver, or any other person in regard to the northeast quarter-section 32, township 36, range 16, west of second meridian, Saskatchewan.—Mr. Porter.

For a return showing all commissions of inquiry appointed between 1896 and 1908, the dates of appointment thereof, the names of the commissioners appointed and the secretary and counsel, or others appointed to assist them, the purpose or object of each such commission, the date of report of each such commission, what legislation, if any, has been enacted in consequence of such commissions and reports, the cost of each such commission, including salaries, travelling expenses, witness fees, fees of counsel, and other assistants, and for printing, distinguishing each separately.—Mr. Porter.

For a return showing the names and residences of all persons in the province of Prince Edward Island to whom fishing bounties were paid between December 31, 1895, and January 1, 1908, together with a statement of the amount paid to each person, the date on which it was paid, and the name of the officer or person by whom the sum was paid.—Mr. A. Martin.

For a complete list of the publications in Canada enjoying the newspaper rate.—Mr. Cockshutt.

For a return showing what lands have been sold, leased, given as homesteads, transferred or set apart in any way by the government to each, individuals, companies, syndicates, or other organizations in the Peace River valley, or along or near tributaries thereof, in the northwest of Canada; and when each area was allotted; the terms between the government and the various parties or organizations concerned; what prices per acre were realized from these transactions; with whom the government conducted negotiations in each case; the regulations governing the securing of land in the Peace River valley; and how far it is from Edmonton to Dunvegan.—Mr. Sam. Hughes.

For a return showing the various services on which Mr. Shepley, K.C., has been engaged by the government since 1896, and the amount that has been paid him for salary and expenses for each.—Mr. Foster.

IMMIGRATION BONUSES.

Mr. WM. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford) moved :

That in consideration of the great congestion that at present prevails in the labour market in many of the industrial centres throughout the country, it is highly expedient that assisted immigration, excepting only the agricultural and domestic servant classes, should immediately cease, and that no further bonuses shall be paid to individual agents or companies for sending or bringing in such immigrants. Further, that the time has come for the strict enforcement of the law that requires that only the financially, morally and physically fit shall be allowed to enter this Dominion as settlers.

Mr. OLIVER.

He said : I look upon the question dealt with in this resolution as one of the most important that is before the Canadian public at the present time. There is no question that is more discussed by thoughtful men than the present position of our immigration matters. Before entering upon this discussion, I desire, as a personal matter, to refer to what took place in the House I think on December 17, when I was unavoidably absent. On that occasion the Minister of the Interior saw fit to make use of my name very frequently, and seems to have made a personal attack upon myself and my utterances. At the same time, he read a private letter that was never intended for publication, and also a letter that was inclosed in the private letter. Now I am not as old a parliamentarian as the hon. gentleman, but I think when he reflects on the course he took on that occasion he will not be very well satisfied with himself. The letter was written some two and a half years ago, it was written as a confidential letter to the hon. gentleman, inclosing one that had been sent to me by a constituent who asked me to place it before the department. Now I may have been too confiding in the hon. gentleman on that occasion. It is true, he had not been in the position very long, not quite a month. The hon. gentleman was known at that time as the independent Mr. Oliver of the west, who was free to criticise the government when they were wrong and to support them only when he thought they were right. It was with this confidence that I addressed the letter to the hon. gentleman shortly after he assumed office. I have nothing to hide and nothing to regret with regard to that letter. The hon. gentleman was pleased to place upon it a construction that it does not bear upon its face, that never was intended, and he has wrenched its plain meaning to suit his own purposes. After doing that, he proceeds to hold me accountable also for the letter that was inclosed therein. I may say Mr. Speaker, that I am accustomed to do business with the various departments of this government, and whether I have been too confiding or not with those departments, I have frequently inclosed to almost every one of them letters that I have been asked to forward by my constituents, with a view to negotiations, with a view to discussing with the ministers certain matters ; and I think, without exception, until this occurred with the Minister of the Interior, those letters have been returned to me with the reply, as this one should have been, and I supposed it had been, until the hon. gentleman placed it in the 'Hansard.' Whether the hon. gentleman thinks he was warranted in placing a private letter of mine in the 'Hansard,' and also the inclosure, which was not addressed, mind

you, to the hon. gentleman himself, but addressed to me, I leave to the hon. gentleman's sense of honour ; and I here and now ask the hon. gentleman to return me that letter that he wrongfully holds. That letter is not his property, it belongs to me, was addressed to me, but for purposes of his own he suppressed that fact in giving it to this House. He does not say that that letter was addressed to the member for South Brant, no, he makes the House believe that it was addressed to himself, and he proceeds to hold me responsible both for my own letter and the inclosure. That may seem to be good politics to the hon. gentleman, but I think he will see before long that it will get him into trouble, even taking his own speech and his own policy as the basis of it.

Then there are statements in the letter that must be met. Not the statements of the hon. gentleman, for I was falsely interpreted by the minister, the interpretation he places upon it is absurd upon its face, because he proceeds to say that I proposed to empty the tenements of Europe into the city of Brantford and into the surrounding country. This hon. gentleman does not find any such words, either in my letter or in the inclosure, they are not there. My letter simply gives a very qualified endorsation of the statements—if the minister will look at it. I said: 'In my opinion they are fairly reliable.' That is as far as I would go. 'Fairly' is a qualifying word, it means that the statements are not entirely reliable, or else the word 'fairly' would not have been used. Then the minister proceeds to interpret this other letter that was inclosed, and he puts his own construction upon that, as he told me quietly afterwards himself when I complained of the manner in which he had treated me. In the first place, this letter was from an information and employment bureau which existed at that time in the city of Brantford, on Colborne street, and had a placard in front of it to that effect. An information and employment bureau is surely not an unusual thing in a town or city of any size. It is as much in the interest of labour as it is of capital, and was for the purpose of securing employment for men and women who were out of employment, just as much as it was to find labour for the manufacturer.

It was not there in the interest of the manufacturer, as the hon. gentleman tried to make the House believe. It was there in the interest of all classes in this country, in the interest of the unemployed, in the interest of those who are seeking work and if a man wanted a hand he could apply there also. I repeat that it was in the interest of all classes and I do not know that I have anything to apologize for. But, the hon. gentleman proceeds and says that I propose to open this country to the tenements of Europe because the letter states that they could handle a few from the congested districts. The word 'few' is there. A few could be handled, a few could be placed in the city of Brantford. I was requested by my constituents to forward that letter to the government, or to the proper authority. I considered that the Minister of the Interior was the proper authority and I forwarded that letter to him in a moment of confidence. The hon. gentleman, up to the present time, has retained that letter. It was submitted to him simply as a basis of negotiation. It was not until he placed it on 'Hansard' that I recollected that I had not received it back and I ask the hon. gentleman to return that letter as he certainly should do. I saw the other day that he laid down the proposition that letters produced here are the property of the House and he probably produced it so that it could be claimed as the property of the House and not returned to me, I being the proper owner. The hon. gentleman was unfair in that when he had read a few lines he changed the word 'information' bureau into 'immigration' bureau. How does he account for that ? He misrepresented me as advocating an immigrant bureau when it was only an information and employment bureau that was concerned. How does the hon. gentleman explain that part of it ? He puts the word down there and then he proceeds with his argument. I do not profess to be a parliamentarian ; I am only a newcomer in this House, but I think it was a very unusual course for the hon. gentleman to place in 'Hansard' a resolution that I am moving for the first time to-day. Although it was not called for at the time the hon. gentleman undertook to foreshadow what was coming. On what ground did the hon. gentleman take that course ? I think that this attack was inspired from outside of the House. It was coincident with the visit of a certain gentleman to this city and he was inspired to make that attack, but he has exploded the bomb prematurely and this letter will prove a boomerang before we get through to-day.

Mr. D. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) can discuss a speech made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) on some previous day in this House in connection with this resolution ? The speech made by the Minister of the Interior was not in connection with this resolution at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman's point of order is a little late. It should have been taken when the Minister of the Interior was discussing a resolution which was on the order paper.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has to do with the point of order that has been raised ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has to do with it exactly what it purports to have to do with it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am asking Mr. Speaker if it has any connection with it ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not gather exactly the point of order raised by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross).

Mr. D. ROSS. As I understand it the Minister of the Interior, in discussing some matters in reference to immigration, made some reference to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). In connection with an entirely different matter—with a resolution on the Order Paper—he immediately begins to discuss a previous debate. I do not think that is in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Before you rule, Mr. Speaker, may I say that it seems to me that the difficulty is that the Minister of the Interior anticipated this motion and dealt with it at the wrong time. Now, the hon. gentleman who has the motion on the paper and who is obliged to deal with it and discuss it is answering the arguments which were improperly addressed to this House on that motion before we reached it.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask you your ruling on the point stated by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that I had no right to place before the House the facts I did on a previous occasion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is perfectly clear you had not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I can hardly rule the matter out of order.

Mr. OLIVER. My action in placing before the House certain facts and arguments on a certain point——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this a point of order ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am answering a question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member is speaking to a point of order he has a perfect right to proceed.

Mr. FOSTER. That point of order has been decided.

Mr. SPEAKER. If he is seeking to rise to another point of order he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. He gets somebody to do that for him.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, he does not need to. He does not have to take refuge behind the privilege of parliament.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The resolution I am discussing was placed in 'Hansard' by the hon. Minister of the Interior. Surely that cannot be attributed to myself and the hon. gentleman should not complain if I proceed to discuss a resolution placed by himself in 'Hansard' ahead of time.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire now to rise to a point of order as to whether the remarks I made on the occasion alluded to were or were not ahead of time or out of order as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. FOSTER. That has all passed into oblivion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that that point of order cannot be raised at this time.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have no desire to make a personal attack upon any hon. gentleman opposite, but I am here to state my views on a question that I deem of the utmost importance. In so far as this personal letter is concerned I have said all I have to say except this much that these are matters which are between the minister, myself and my constituents and I, here and now, in order to save the time of the House, invite the hon. gentleman to come to the city of Brantford where we will have a union meeting, he will bring the private letter with him, I will pay all expenses and provide a good hall and I think I can assure him of a fairly good sized crowd and a warm reception. I want now to pursue the difficulty that the hon. gentleman has got himself into in holding me responsible for the inclosure. If you look at the utterances of the hon. gentleman opposite you will find that he had other inclosures upon that occasion and that he submitted amongst other things a resolution of the Manufacturers' Association. I think I should be privileged to say for myself in regard to the Manufacturers' Association that I have spoken of them in this House on more than one occasion and that I have been most grossly misrepresented. The hon. gentleman submitted, when he was discussing this resolution of mine, an inclosure from the Manufacturers' Association. It went a good deal further in the direction of bringing out skilled immigrants to this country than anything I have said. It was inclosed to him by Mr. J. M. Stewart. Perhaps some of you will ask : Who is Mr. J. M. Stewart? He was at one time secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, to-day he is the chief organizer of the Liberal party in the city of Toronto. The hon. gentleman holds me responsible for my inclosures. Does he hold Mr. Stewart and the Liberal organization of the city of Toronto responsible for their inclosures ? The hon. gentleman does not know that he is applying one thing to me and another thing to his friends. I am not and I have never been a member of the Manufacturers' Association. I have repeated this on the floor of

this House on several occasions, but when I take up a copy of the press in the city of Ottawa what do I find in relation to the attack the minister made upon me on that particular date ? Look at the 'Free Press' Ottawa, of December 19, and see what it says in regard to the hon. minister's attack upon myself :

Mr. Oliver did not have to travel far afield to prove at whose door lies the responsibility for the presence in Canada of these unemployed. He was able, without any difficulty, to place that responsibility where it belongs, namely, upon the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, of which Mr. W. F. Cockshutt, the member for Brantford, who is now showing such energy in sympathizing with the unemployed, is so prominent a member. Indeed, the minister was able to put upon record a letter from Mr. Cockshutt himself, written two years ago, endorsing a scheme to flood the city of Brantford with mechanics and other labourers.

I have three times upon the floor of this House contradicted the statement, (and I now repeat the contradiction), that I am not now or ever have been a member of the Manufacturers' Association, but notwithstanding my repeated denial the Ottawa 'Free Press' in this and other articles persists in attempting to hold me up to ridicule because I am now taking a course antagonistic to that which was taken by the Manufacturers' Association. I am not responsible and have never been responsible for any of their acts. I stand here to represent my constituents and to endeavour to do my duty by those who returned me to parliament. I think I can truthfully say, that so far as I know since my entry into public life or before that, I have not been a party to bringing one single skilled mechanic into the Dominion of Canada. I have always stood for the interests of labour, and when the Minister of the Interior and his press endeavour to hold me responsible for the congestion in the labour market that now exists, I tell him to his face that he must find some other shoulders on which to place that responsibility ; he will have to look to Mr. J. M. Stewart and others of the Manufacturers' Association. I am not here to condemn the manufacturers, they are a respectable body of Canadians. But perhaps I had better remind the Minister of the Interior that the members of the Manufacturers' Association are not all my political friends ; perhaps I might as well remind him that there is a gentleman in that association who knew that document was in the minister's office because he helped to put it there, and that gentleman is my political opponent Mr. Harris, of Brantford, who was vice-president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association at the very time this document was sent out, and who as a member of the executive was responsible for what that document contained. Now then, which does the Minister of the Interior believe is responsible for having flooded the Dominion of Canada with unemployed persons ; is it his political friend Mr. Harris or is it I ? Mr. Harris as a member of the executive knew what was in this document and when he backed Mr. Stewart in sending it to the minister he became responsible—according to the minister's dictum at any rate—for its contents. However, I do not think it is at all likely that the congestion of the labour market is to be attributed to that document, because I saw a recent statement by the secretary of the association to the effect that only some 500 men had been brought in under their auspices. I do not think the labour market has been flooded by either the action of the Manufacturers' Association or by that of private individuals. Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy of this government to increase our population rapidly and to look to the quantity rather than to the quality of the immigrants. The minister told us it was against the policy of the government to bring skilled mechanics into Canada, that the government did not do it and that they did not propose to do it. However reluctant I may be to do so, this is I think an opportune time to place on record a document from one of the officers of the Interior Department, and which was addressed to me, without any solicitation and without any knowledge on my part. It was evidently sent to me because this official had seen certain newspaper statements. I am suppressing for the present the date, and the address, but the hon. gentlemen can have those if he wishes to. The communication is addressed to W. F. Cockshutt Esq., Brantford, Ontario, Canada, and reads :

Dear sir,—I see by reports of various newspapers that numerous members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association are in need of skilled and unskilled help. As representatives of the government here we have many inquiries from skilled mechanics in nearly all branches of the trade desiring information about opportunities for their line in Canada, and having no specific information we must be governed in our replies by general terms and conditions. I believe that if the secretary of your association would supply the government offices from time to time (of which the inclosed is a list) of the needs of your association, that it will be of great practical assistance in securing some of the needed help. Say for instance in this form: That there are so many carriage blacksmiths, so many boilermakers, lathe men, moulders, carriage builders, and so forth wanted. If we had such a list as that in our hands we could give definite assurance to men that they could get work and then refer them to the headquarters of your association in Toronto or Montreal or other large centres for distribution. I make this as a suggestion as we are quite often at a loss what to say, not having any definite information respecting the needs in numerous lines of work for which we have inquiries here. I am directing this communication to you as I believe that you are the president of the association.

There it is again :

Or was, the last information I had. I know in any event that you will forward it to the proper authority in the event that you are not at present the active executive of the association. I will be glad in any event to hear from you your opinion respecting this suggestion.

This is duly signed by one of the agents of the Minister of the Interior in Europe.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to tell us from what place that letter is sent, the date, and who signed it ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I might reply in the words of the Minister of the Interior the other day, that for state reasons I prefer not to give it. There is no objection to giving the date ; it is quite as recent as the communication of mine which the Minister of the Interior used ; it is dated June 5, 1907 ; not quite six months old.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. From what city was it sent ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. If the Minister of the Interior makes a request I shall give him the full information ; if he wishes to see it privately—

An hon. MEMBER. Send him a copy.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is a copy I am using just as the Minister of the Interior uses copies, but I have the original and if he wishes to place the name and the address and all the rest of it on 'Hansard' I am prepared to do. It is for him to say.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman is making his own speech ; if he wishes to place the name and address on 'Hansard' I have no objection. If he does not choose to do so I have no objection either.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. If the minister wishes me to place it on 'Hansard' I shall do so; if not I prefer for reasons of state as well as for personal reasons that the name shall not be given. I leave it to the minister to say whether I shall publish the name or not.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure that to the department, or to the House, or to myself, it is absolutely of no consequence whether the hon. gentleman does or does not place it on 'Hansard.'

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Minister of the Interior is very brave about it. I am to understand that he takes my word for it that this letter is from an accredited agent of the government and that he is offering to flood Canada with mechanics skilled and unskilled.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Would my hon. friend permit me to say that it is in the public interest that we should ascertain what is the policy of the government on this question which is a most important question in the politics of to-day; and I think the House has a right to know whence and from whom that letter came.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I will be very glad to accommodate my hon. friend and I have no objection to show him the letter personally. But I do not wish to get the signer of it into trouble with the department and that is my principle reason for not publishing the name. I have no personal interest either one way or the other to suppress anything with regard to it. The minister apparently does not want the name published and I judge that he takes my word that I have read a true copy of the original which, in the words of the minister when he was accusing me, is an offer to flood the country with mechanics skilled and unskilled, and suggests that a list of the mechanics required in Canada should be hung in every government office in Great Britain. So much for the letter incident which I regret and which I hope the Minister of the Interior regrets, and when I have sufficient confidence in him to address a private letter to him in future we will have another set to if he makes it public, but I promise that won't be for a long time to come.

The resolution which I have placed on the Order Paper sets out with what I think will be acknowledged by all to be a self evident fact, that is, that congestion exists in this country in the industrial centres. The same 'Free Press' from which I read a few moments ago, contained an editorial in the month of December in which it attacked the hon. member for North Toronto and myself, and had on its front page glaring articles in regard to the congestion of labour in the city of Toronto. One of them was headed, 'The Black Flag May Fly'; another was that food was being distributed ; another was that there were many unemployed. And in the city of Toronto to-day, and to a less extent in every other city and town of an industrial character in Canada, there is and has been for many months a condition of congestion. I think I was justified in placing this resolution on the order paper in the early days of the session, because from what we find in the speech from the Throne, it is evident that the government were not taking notice of what was going on in the country. Here is what they say in the speech from the Throne in a tone of rejoicing :

The stream of immigrants coming to Canada continues to increase in volume, the year now drawing to a close showing a larger number than any preceding year, and it is gratifying to observe the many coming from the British Isles.

In the face of that statement the hon. gentleman knew or should have known that in every town and city of Ontario there was congestion in the labour market. It was

known to myself away back in the last summer, and I wrote to a booking agent in the old country who was sending people to my district warning him that he had sent all that it was desirable to send. But this government made no attempt to prevent the congestion. They are now beginning to put in motion the law which requires that a man coming to Canada should have $50 in his pocket. Why did they not exact that condition long ago? I understand that the law originally provided that an immigrant should have $25, but even that was not enforced. Men landed in our town last summer who had not enough money on them when they arrived to pay for the first meal. That was no uncommon occurrence. I believe it occurred in many towns and cities in Canada. In some cases these men had wives and families, and were thrown upon charity even in good times. The proper precaution for the minister to have taken was to have enforced the regulation which called for the immigrant having in his possession a certain amount of money. I have copies of all the literature sent out by the Immigration Department, and I think the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) was quite correct the other day when he said that it was like advertising patent medicines. While the government have threatened prosecution for misrepresentation with regard to the conditions in this country, the government is itself an offender in this respect, because it sends out documents with glowing pictures and descriptions of what has been done in this country, but which cannot be realized once in a thousand times. I do not mean to say that a case cannot be found equal to the one suggested, but I do say that the department should only cite the fairly average case, and not attempt to deceive British or European people with the idea that money can be picked up in the streets of Canada, and that all a man has to do to get rich is to come here. The man who gets ahead in Canada, even in fairly good times, has to put his hand and brain to work, and do his daily work in a thrifty, methodical and persevering way. Our climate does not lend itself to getting on with too little work. We have a hardy climate, and many immigrants cannot labour at their calling throughout our winter. But the government have so extended their immigration policy that it now embraces not only those classes that I have referred to in my resolution, domestic servants and farm labourers, but also gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway surface men, navvies and miners. I wonder who cannot qualify under that regulation. Some of those who are brought into this country by the hon. gentleman as agriculturists are like the one I heard of recently out west, who was sent out to hitch a horse up to a cart, and he put him in the shafts with his head towards the cart, so that when he went forward he backed up, and when he backed up he went forward, this is of course, an exaggerated case. Many of the so-called farm labourers brought to Canada have scarcely any knowledge of agriculture, and come to this country totally unqualified for the work for which they were sent out. They have no knowledge of how to drive a plough or a mowing-machine or a reaper. For this reason there is much discontent on the part of our farmers with the help they have on the farm. Many of these so-called agriculturists who are brought from Europe never saw a large farm in their life. They perhaps worked a garden on a small scale, but they are perfectly unable to handle the ordinary agricultural implements used in this country. But almost any man can qualify under the extended list which I have read; and the minister pays for these people at the rate of $5 per head, and I believe a similar amount is allowed to the booking agent, so that about $10 a head is paid for every man, woman and child brought into Canada, and I am informed that $2 a head is paid to every man who locates in this country. We learn from the Minister of the Interior, in answer to a question put to him to-day, that nearly $700,000 of the money of the people of this country has been paid out in bonuses alone for bringing in immigrants. Now, this policy is not a new one, but it is one that has caused and is going to cause this country a great deal of anxiety. The hon. minister charged me the other day with endeavouring to flood this country with skilled and unskilled mechanics. I want to call his attention to the fact that over two years ago, when I pointed out to him that he paid too much attention to numbers and too little to quality, he retorted that I stood for a small Canada, and, like a great many men on our side of the House, for an undeveloped and nongrowing country. I do not now and never did stand for a small Canada; but I say that Canada can grow fast enough without growing at the expense of all that is true and best in citizenship, in religion, in morality, and in commercial enterprise and success. And this government, with the same recklessness which has characterized their financial policy, has entered upon an immigration policy that will hand down a legacy to posterity the harmful effects of which three generations will not be sufficient to overcome. I do not hold the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) himself wholly responsible for that. He entered upon a department after a gentleman even more unscrupulous than himself in this respect, one guided——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) should not use the word 'unscrupulous' with reference to any member of this House.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I did not use the word in a disrespectful sense or with any intention of offending; but, as the word itself is regarded as objectionable, I take it back. I wish to point out that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is the successor of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) who had established in this country what had become known as the Siftonian policy. That policy had two guiding principles. The first was: grow rapidly; and the other was 'Have regard to political results.' The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) keeping in mind these two principles, proceeded to plant in our Northwest—and I have studied this question at close quarters in the Northwest—colonies in every constituency where they could do the most good. And when I say 'good' I mean the most political good for the government. The hon. gentleman placed these colonies throughout the Northwest, and they are there to-day, doing good work for the government. The more uneducated, and the lower in the scale of civilization in some instances, the more they were appreciated and desired. But this country has its eye upon those who have been carrying out that policy, and they have called a halt, and called it in tones which cannot be disregarded. The effects of that policy have been seen within the last six or eight years in the Northwest, but they are now spreading rapidly throughout Canada. There is not a town or city throughout the Dominion that is not feeling the effect of this policy of bringing in immigrants regardless of their quality and fitness to become citizens of this country. When we speak about this, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that they stand for a growing Canada; that 300,000 immigrants have been brought to our shores. Mr. Speaker, it is not a good policy to bring to this land, men, women and children who cannot be placed in suitable conditions and will not become fused and assimilated in one Canadian citizenship. But such considerations as these have been thrown to the winds by this government. To-day, in the Northwest, the British and Foreign Bible society are selling the old book in forty-five languages, and still the field is not covered. And this policy has been pursued until within the last week or two; but now the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has called a sudden halt and has provided that immigrants shall come only from the countries that have direct communication by steamship with Canada. He sees the evil of the policy that has been pursued. What is the cry in every church meeting in Canada to-day? Money for missions. For what missions? For home missions. We do not need to send money abroad to carry on foreign mission work, for the foreign missions are at our door. Under the policy of this government there is work for the foreign missionary in every town and city in Canada. The cry in every Christian church, regardless of denomination is for money to keep up with the work that this government has loaded upon us. The cry is Money! Money! to send in men to keep pace with this foreign mission work within our own boundaries. And if this country succeeds in fusing and assimilating the people that the hon. gentleman has been instrumental in bringing here into one great and sound citizenship, it will be owing to the devotion, energy and perseverance of the Christian church, and not to the wisdom of this government's policy.

This is not merely a question of capital and labour, as hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe. It is not merely a question of whether the labour market is fully supplied or not; it goes a great deal further than that. It is a question that goes to the very fountain of our citizenship, of our social and moral and religious life as a people. The government embarked upon a policy involving the very greatest danger, and now we are face to face with the perils which might have been foreseen from the first. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) brought a certain evil to the attention of the House this afternoon. But this is only one phase of this great question, the practice of many of those brought in by the government of unlawfully carrying concealed weapons. The hon. minister may dispute my statement that there are undesirables in every community. But let him ask the people of any town or city in Canada, if they are not undesirables amongst them who have lately come in. There is not one of these places but can name these undesirables that have appeared only within the last year or two. Many of these undesirables are carrying concealed weapons as the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) has said. Attacks with the long knife are matters of daily occurrence in Canada—an offence that was almost unknown here ten years ago. The way to deal with these people is on their entering the country, and not after they have come here. These weapons should be taken from them before they are allowed to come within our borders and partake of the privilege of residence in this Canadian community. And none should be allowed that privilege unless they are such as can become good citizens of Canada. Have any such precautions been taken? None. Consider, for instance, the 'farm labourers' whom the minister brings in. The history of many of these men is that they go on a farm for a month or two, prove themselves unsatisfactory, are discharged and drift into the towns and cities. And there you can see them by the hundred, yes, by the thousand to-day. They are not qualified for the work of the farm, and, instead of driving the plough, mower or reaper, or even using the pitchfork and smaller implements of

the farm, they are wholly unfit for any part of the work, and so drift into the cities to become a burden upon our people. In many cases they are displacing our good old-time workmen. Men who have held positions for twenty years have been supplanted by the people introduced by the hon. gentleman. And why? Simply because they will work cheaper than our own workmen will. Should the standard of life in this country be lowered, or should it be maintained? I say we are entitled to keep it at the highest notch. Therefore, I sympathize with our friends from British Columbia when they stand for holding that as a white man's country.

We had a law which called for the possession by each immigrant of at least $25, and that requirement, I understand, has been raised to $50. It is stated in the press, however, that many of the Japanese coming into British Columbia were furnished, just before arriving, with $25 in crisp Canadian bills in order that they might pass the inspection at the port, but as soon as they landed they returned it to the man who had lent it to them. Whether that statement is true or not I do not know, but it has been made in the press and I have reason to believe from what I have seen that that part of the law has not been satisfactorily carried out. I further believe that the requirements of the law respecting the moral character of the immigrants to this country have not been enforced. Crimes of violence are increasing in Canada. That is a very regrettable thing. We have been for years noted as a law-abiding, God-fearing country where crimes of great cruelty, of great violence, were very rare, but if you look at almost any paper now you will find that crimes of a serious nature are being committed by newcomers. What does that mean? That many men are entering our gates who are not morally fit to be allowed to enter. They have been the outcasts of the communities from which they came and have reverted to crime almost the moment of their arrival here. We have that case at Brampton the other day when a man who had not been in the employment of a farmer a month, committed one of the most serious crimes it is possible to commit. Thus it goes on throughout the country, especially in some of the larger cities; crime is multiplying at a tremendous rate. Men are being held up in the streets of cities where such a thing was formerly unheard of, and the long knife comes out on small provocation. Our courts are filled with many serious cases. This is a very regrettable condition and it has been caused in large measure by the laxity of this department in allowing to come into this country those who were morally unfit to enter.

There is the further case of physical unfitness to enter, men who never could do a day's work, who are not strongly enough built, who have been accustomed to the slums and dark places of the earth and have not had a fair chance in life. We are sorry for them, but can we afford to open our gates to every one of this kind and admit them, to the danger of a citizenship that it has taken a hundred years to build up? There is something more than numerical increases to be considered. We want to go in the right direction and I wish to emphasize as my policy to-day, and it is the same policy that I have advocated since I came into this House: Grow slower and grow better, lay a foundation that we will have no cause to regret; bring in such citizens as can be assimilated into one common, general people and will make now and hereafter the very best class that can be brought into any free country. We have 160 acres of land to give to every settler. Is that not enough to induce them to come in? Is that not enough to justify us in asking that they be qualified to take up that land, occupy it and cultivate it in a skilful and proper way? But this government has not done that; they have gone beyond all that was reasonable and their whole course has shown that they desire to grow, regardless of the results; they wish to count heads so that at the end of the year they can make a great showing on paper. Just in the same way in their trade policy they have recklessly sought to make a showing regardless of the disasters they have caused and of the foundation on which their policy stands. I do not wish to hold this government responsible for anything but what they have done, but I would quote a line from a great English authority, Lord Bolingbroke, who once said:

> No man suffers by bad fortune but he who has been deceived by good.

So I say to this government, you do not suffer by the bad fortune which has come upon you now, in reference to your immigration or trade policy, except in so far as you have been deceived by the good luck you have had in the past; you have had good luck; you have prospered nominally and on paper, but your fortune has been not nearly so good as you supposed.

The government have become kind enough to say now that they will divide with the opposition the honours of the present financial stringency, and the Minister of the Interior showed a like regard when he said that they were willing to divide with the opposition the honour of bringing in more skilled and unskilled mechanics than are required. Up to the present time all immigration has been due to the policy of the government, but now, when there is a cry that the wrong kind of immigrants are coming in, that there are too many of them and that they are living on public

charity, when many serious phases have presented themselves, the minister generously says: You are responsible; you helped to bring them in and we are ready to hand over part of the honour to you. That is very kind and generous, but we accept only that part of it for which we are responsible, and so far as I am concerned from the time I entered the House I have endeavoured to enjoin upon the minister the necessity of bringing in only the kind of immigrant who will become a moral, law-abiding, God-fearing citizen of this country. When I say that, do not take it that I stand for a small country or wish to keep out any nationality who will become proper citizens. I trust I have enough Christian charity in my heart to wish to have the doors of this country open to all those who are worthy by their past life and records to come in—and when I say worthy I mean that they have implanted in their hearts those instincts that will make a man of any nationality, colour or creed a true man in the true sense, a man ready to do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. Such men will succeed in Canada. But this government have thrown all this policy to the winds; they have shown a disposition to sacrifice everything that is best in our citizenship in order that the end of each year they may make a glowing showing on paper—and this they have been able to do.

I, therefore, think it is high time that the Minister of the Interior should inaugurate a policy of retrenchment, in so far as immigration into this country is concerned. It is too late to remedy a very great evil that has taken place in Canada and which it will take us years to overcome, but it is not too late to see to it that in future only those who will make desirable citizens and will be finally fused into one great common people, should be admitted to the citizenship of this country. I therefore have much pleasure in moving:

That in consideration of the great congestion that at present prevails in the labour market in many of the industrial centres throughout the country, it is highly expedient that assisted immigration, excepting only the agricultural and domestic servant classes, should immediately cease, and that no further bonuses shall be paid to individual agents or companies for sending or bringing in such immigrants. Further, that the time has come for the strict enforcement of the law that requires that only the financially, morally and physically fit shall be allowed to enter this Dominion as settlers.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sure the House is very much indebted to my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) for having placed before the House and the country the views of the opposition in regard to immigration. I think that on that point it is desirable that there should be a clear-cut statement; and as it appears that my friend has been delegated to make that statement on behalf of our friends of the opposition, we can very well deal with it and we are quite willing to have the country judge as between his policy and ours. My hon. friend occupied some little time at the beginning of his discourse in discussing a letter which he had written some years ago and which I had read to the House, when I made some remarks a few days ago. It struck me at the time that it was rather unfortunate for us on this side of the House that my hon. friend was not here on Monday, because had he been here I am sure, judging by the tenor of his remarks to-day, that he would have voted with the government on that question. The question was as to access by members of the House to original documents. The government took the position that being in custody of original documents referring to the titles and securities of private individuals, it was necessary to maintain that custody, and the government could not place them at the disposal of the House. But my hon. friend was not here, and he now takes the position very strongly, not only that original documents should not be placed before the House, but that even copies of documents should not be placed before the House. He goes further, and takes the ground that a document which was in all particulars a public document should not be disclosed to the House by reading a copy of it. I am sure my hon. friend would have voted with the government on Monday had he been here.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman is misquoting me. I made no objection to showing the letter to the House, if the hon. gentleman wishes I am prepared to show it yet. But the hon. gentleman did not want it, and that is the reason it was not shown.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman and myself are at cross purposes on this point, as upon others. He is alluding to a letter which he read to the House, I am alluding to a letter which I read to the House and to the reading of which he objected as being the disclosure of a private letter. It was not the disclosure of a private letter, it was placing before the House knowledge of the contents of an essentially public letter which the House was entitled to know. The House was entitled to know that my hon. friend was in accord with the policy of the government to a great extent two years ago, just as I pointed out that he was in accord with the policy of the government to-day by the resolution which he has placed on the Order Paper. It seems to me that he is carrying his opposition too far when he objects to evidence of his own consistency being placed before the House. Now in regard to this letter, I do not know that it is wise to take up much time in discussing it again. But I think it is only fair that it should be demonstrated that the document

was absolutely public, that it was proper to place it before the House, and that when my hon. friend says that he wrote and addressed that document to me confidentially and personally, he was to some extent aside from the fact. In order to refresh the memories of the members of the House in regard to the contents of this document——

Mr. HAGGART. Is it marked private and confidential ?

Mr. OLIVER. Absolutely not. So that they may know how far my hon. friend has travelled.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the original ?

Mr. OLIVER. This is a copy, it is such a document as we are always prepared to place before the House. If the hon. gentleman should say that it is not a correct copy, let him bring in the original. I wish to read the document to the House for the purpose of showing that my hon. friend is not warranted in the statements he has made in connection with it. The letter was written on House of Commons paper, and was dated at Ottawa, May 9, 1905. It was addressed to the Hon. Wm. Oliver, M.I., Ottawa. Now my hon. friend may claim that this document is not in my possession by right, inasmuch as it is addressed to the Hon. Wm. Oliver; but inasmuch as it is further addressed to the Minister of the Interior and as I was Minister of the Interior at that time, I think the House will admit that I am warranted in saying it was addressed to me in my capacity as Minister of the Interior.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is not the letter I referred to as being wrongfully retained by the Minister of the Interior, the letter I said was wrongfully retained by him was the one from the information bureau addressed to myself.

Mr. OLIVER. I will deal with that point in a moment. The letter reads :

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of the inclosed correspondence from the proprietor of the Employment and Information Bureau of Brantford——

My hon. friend accused me of using the word 'immigration' in the place of 'information.' I wish to inform the House that the word that appears in this letter is 'information,' and in reading that letter as it appears in the 'Hansard' the word is 'information.'

—in which he makes a special request to me to endeavour to forward to our city the various classes of help that are at present urgently needed in that city and district. Would you oblige me by kindly noting the matter and advising me at your earliest convenience as to what method, if any, we can pursue to attain the required ends.

I ask the House, Do these words bear out the statements my hon. friend made a moment ago that he merely transmitted that to me privately, informally, and without endorsation of its purport ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Read it all.

Mr. OLIVER. (reading) :

The letter, I believe, contains fairly correct information, and Mr. Hall, the proprietor, furnishes several letters of reference as to his standing and ability to place the various classes of labour required.

'The various classes of labour required,'

Hoping to receive an answer from you at an early date, or if convenient to wait upon you in connection with the matter, I beg to remain yours very truly.

This is a perfectly proper letter to address to the Minister of the Interior on such a subject; but I submit with all due deference, provided I am within the rules of the House in saying it, that the wording of the letter does not bear out the position which my hon. friend took a few minutes ago in regard to it. I may say further that my hon. friend does not suggest in this letter that the inclosure be returned.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I asked for an interview, which was never granted. I expected that my hon. friend would grant the interview, and it was overlooked on my part that the letter was not returned, because the interview was not granted.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, that is my hon. friend's apology to the House for his action and I do not think it is an adequate explanation of the statements which he placed before the House a few minutes ago. Now, in regard to this letter which my hon. friend says is in my possession improperly, I have here a copy of the letter and again I must ask the indulgence of the House while I refresh the memory of hon. members with regard to the contents of this letter as having a bearing upon what my hon. friend said a few minutes ago. The letter is dated May 5, 1905, and is addressed to W. F. Cockshutt, Esq., M.P., Ottawa, Ontario, and is as follows :

Dear sir,—Referring to conversation with you some days ago regarding the immigration question as in connection with Brantford, I beg to advise, as proprietor of the Employment and Information Bureau, in this city, I have experienced considerable difficulty in supplying the demand for men, boys and girls.

Mr. Cockshutt, in his letter to me, asked me :

What method, if any, we can pursue to attain the required ends.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in the hearing of the members of this House if I could, with a knowledge of the English language, place any other construction upon Mr. Cockshutt's letter than that he desired to forward the

views and interests of the Information and Employment Bureau of Brantford by supplying the demand for men, boys and girls in that city. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the English language does not admit of any other construction. The writer goes on :

Help in all the various branches is scarce, and I have many applications for mechanics, moulders, farm hands, servants, factory hands, &c., &c., which have remained unfilled for the reason that labourers are not to be had.

At present, the call for men, especially, is greater than we can commence to meet. We have openings every day, for which, had we but the available material, we could furnish men with.

Then follows a list of wages paid in different employments and as my hon. friend is anxious to have the original of this letter in his possession I will trespass upon the time of this House in order to place it in full upon 'Hansard' :

Skilled labour at from $2 to $4.50 a day; common labour, $1.25 to $2 a day; farm work, $15 to $30 a month, board and washing included. The wages we would offer to boys are as follows: clerks, $2.50 to $10 a week; factory work, $2.25 to $7.50 a week; farm work, $5 to $15 a month, board and washing included. For girls there are always places as clerks at from $2 to $7 a week; factory hands, $2.50 to $6 a week; servants, $7 to $15 a month.

The above is by no means an exhaustive list, but will serve to give you a fair idea of the class of people we could accommodate.

You will note the calls for help are many and varied, and with our present limited facilities, cannot be adequately answered. But, could we fall back on and rely upon the Immigration Department, for help, we could not only supply the wants of many who now suffer inconvenience owing to vacancies which cannot be filled, but an avenue might be opened whereby we could aid a few of our less fortunate fellows, and thus in a measure help to relieve the congestion of some of the overcrowded tenements in the great centres from whence come many of our immigrants.

You will, I am sure, agree with me that an immigration agency would be a good thing in this city. Brantford, as you know, is a growing city, whose watchword is 'forward,' and with the onrush of business and the ever increasing prosperity of the citizens now here, the class of people required, as above enumerated, is lessened, and Toronto the seat of the nearest immigration office, being some seventy-five miles distant, there is a wide radius of country round Brantford, which could be better reached from here.

I hope the above may elicit from you some interest; failing, however, in securing your approval and support, I would be glad if at least some arrangement might be entertained whereby I could obtain from the immigration agency help needed, as mentioned.

I might add that I have written too, to the Hon. Wm. Paterson, who should also be interested in the matter, being himself, practically a Brantford man, and I trust the same may warrant both his and your approval and support, which I shall greatly appreciate.

Hoping the above may receive your usual thoughtful attention,

Yours very respectfully,
(Sgd.) PROPRIETOR,
Employment and Information Bureau,
Brantford, Ontario.

There are a few points that I would like to notice in regard to this letter. When I read the letter to the House on a previous occasion I took the liberty of saying that in so far as this letter disclosed in itself there was no more information as to who was the Brantford Employment and Information Bureau than as to who composed the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is that so ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is so, I have read the whole of the letter and there is nothing within it to show.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. May I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the name of Mr. Hall is given in the letter which I inclosed and his name is stated as being the only proprietor. He says so himself.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely, but my hon. friend gave me the name of the proprietor of this Information Bureau.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you would not give the names of the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. OLIVER. No, what I said to the House and what I say again is that in so far as the letter which my hon. friend inclosed to the department is concerned, it discloses no more who are the members of that Employment and Information Bureau than do the records as to who are the North Atlantic Trading Company. Now, I will carry the parallel just one step further and I will say that there is just as much warrant for suggesting that my hon. friend is a member of that Employment Bureau as that this, that or the other man is a member of the North Atlantic Trading Company. My hon. friend has taken exception, in his recent remarks, to my further allusions, in the remarks I placed before the House a few days ago, to his attempt in regard to the emptying of the overcrowded tenements of the great centres of Europe into the city of Brantford. He took exception to that. I have read his letter. I have read his correspondent's letter. It is for any person who chooses to read both letters to judge whether my hon. friend is responsible or assumes responsibility for the suggestion or not. I receive a letter from my hon. friend. He is a member of this House of parliament. On Monday we were told that a member of the House of Commons had a right practically to do as he pleased, that everything that was at the disposal of the

government was at his disposal. I received a letter from the gentleman inclosing another letter to me, urging upon me that I shall give it immediate attention, stating that the matters contained in it are pressing and urgent and declaring that I will oblige him by noting at my earliest convenience what steps we may take to attain the required end. He vouches for the standing and ability of this immigration bureau, and then he says he is not responsible in any way for the statements contained in that letter which he forwarded under these circumstances.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister uses the term 'immigration bureau'; I want to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that it is described as an 'information and employment bureau,' and that only.

Mr. OLIVER. That is right, if I used the word 'immigration bureau' I ask 'Hansard' to correct it, because it is called the information and employment bureau. Now that my hon. friend has drawn my attention to it I want to point out that part of the purport of the letter which he inclosed to me, and which letter he endorsed as well as the writer thereof, was a request that the writer of the letter should be made an immigration agent and that an immigration agency should be established in the city of Brantford. That was one of the subjects with regard to which my hon. friend suggested an interview. I regret it was not possible for me to hold an interview with my hon. friend, but if I did not hold an interview with him it was not because of any lack of attention to his letter. His letter was a strictly departmental letter and on the 20th of May, 1905, it was answered as a departmental letter as follows:—

Sir,—I have had referred to me your letter of the 9th instant to the minister inclosing correspondence from the proprietor of the Employment and Information Bureau, of Brantford, in which he makes special request to you to endeavour to forward to Brantford various classes of help that are at present urgently needed in the city and district.

My office will not fail to do what it can to make known the need that exists at Brantford for various kinds of help, but I may tell you that the great majority of our immigrants make up their mind before leaving Europe or the United States that they will go to the Northwest and settle on the farm lands offered by the government there, or in the towns which are springing up as a consequence of the growth of the farming community in western Canada, and that it is difficult to dissuade them from this intention and to avail themselves of the openings in various employments such as are referred to in the present correspondence. The Immigration Department of the province of Ontario might do something in the matter, and I think it would be well for the proprietor of the employment and information bureau of Brantford, to write as fully as he has written to you to Mr. Thomas Southworth, director of colonization, Toronto.

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. D. SCOTT,
Superintendent of Immigration.

W. F. Cockshutt, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

In view of the position taken by the department on the face of this letter, there was no object to be gained by granting to my hon. friend the interview suggested. He received his answer and it states the policy of the department, which then and before and since has been to secure settlement of the western lands. In that reply it is suggested that if the hon. gentleman wants to relieve the congestion of the overcrowded tenements in the great centres whence come many of our immigrants he should apply to Mr. Southworth, Ontario immigration agent in Toronto, when probably he will learn of something to his advantage. Nothing can be clearer than the policy of the department, and nothing can be clearer than the policy of my hon. friend. I said a few moments ago that my hon. friend objected to being consistent. He was consistent in that he wanted immigrants. I did accuse him of being to some extent at one with the government in that he wanted immigrants and the government wanted immigrants.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is a serious offence to be accused of agreeing with the government.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman objects to it.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is a pretty serious offence.

Mr. OLIVER. I know it is, but it is my hon. friend, and not I, who is finding fault. He was at that time with the policy of the government so far as the need of immigrants was concerned, but his policy differed from the policy of the government in that he wanted to empty the overcrowded tenements of Europe into the city of Brantford and the other cities of Ontario, when the policy of the Dominion government as stated to him in black and white over the signature of an officer of the department was, to settle the Northwest, to cultivate the prairies, to fill up that western country in order that there might be employment and business for the commercial and financial interests of Eastern Canada.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does the minister think it is fair to say that I wished to empty the over-crowded tenements of Europe into Brantford in the face of the fact that the letter distinctly says that 'a few' of these could be handled ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think my hon. friend likes this letter and I must say that I failed to find the words in the letter which he refers to.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. May I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to them.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is in the last paragraph but one, beginning:—

We could aid a few of our less fortunate fellows and thus in a measure help to relieve the congestion.

Perhaps the minister has left that out of his copy.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend stand by his present position, that he is responsible for these words he read?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman has placed the record on 'Hansard' and I am prepared to stand by the letters and meet them as I have done.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I am very glad we have found where the hon. gentleman does stand, and we find he does endorse——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I did not say I did endorse; I said I stood by the letters as they were.

Mr. OLIVER. Then we have not found out where he does stand yet.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. He certainly does not endorse and never did.

Mr. OLIVER. It is surprising that my hon. friend should have sent such a letter, and should have taken so much trouble discussing it before the House, and have taken the opportunity of correcting me, as he says, in regard to the terms of the letter, and yet he says he does not assume any responsibility for it. He is willing to use such words in the letter as he may to relieve him of the unfortunate position he is in, but he is not willing to be held responsible for the words in the letter. Now, he must accept the letter or he must refuse to accept it. He must accept the letter as he did a few moments ago, and he must be held responsible for the words he quoted: that he was willing to assist 'a few' of our less fortunate brethren and thereby relieve the congestion in these European centres. I ask how are we to construe the word 'few' when it is applied to the teeming millions of these European cities. It was to be a few, but it was to relieve the congestion. The few that would relieve the congestion would be a great many if dumped into the city of Brantford. I have spent so much time in discussing this letter for the purpose of showing that my hon. friend, who at one stage of his remarks might have been supposed to be addressing a prayer-meeting, was not keeping within the limits of fact—that he was denying before the House the words written over his own signature and was using that denial as an attack upon the policy of the government.

Mr. OLIVER.

Another word I would like to have, in regard to a Mr. J. F. M. Stewart, who wrote to the department on the 25th of June, 1906, and signed himself as secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. The hon. member for Brantford has informed the House that Mr. Stewart is a prominent Liberal and is now engaged in active Liberal work. He probably is; I am quite willing to accept the word of the hon. member for Brantford when given across the floor of the House, in which I differ from a great many of my hon. friend's colleagues when asked to accept the word of members on this side. But I will draw the attention of the House to the difference between the letter of Mr. Stewart and the letter of the hon. member for Brantford. Mr. Stewart writes:

I beg to inclose you herewith a resolution passed by the executive council of this association at its meeting held on the 21st instant, having reference to the importation of skilled workmen.

Mr. Stewart was the paid secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and as such he transmitted a certain document to this government; but he did not say that it was pressing and urgent; he did not suggest advice at my earliest convenience as to what method, if any, we can pursue to attain the required end; he did not suggest an interview so that the matter might be forwarded more quickly; and perhaps it is for that reason—I do not know—that he is not now secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Perhaps our friends of the Manufacturers' Association did not find that enthusiastic support for their policy from Mr. Stewart that was given them by the hon. member for Brantford in the letter which he wrote.

In regard to the letter which my hon. friend read, as he said, from an officer of the Immigration Department in England, and as to the responsibility for that letter

---

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I said in Britain, I think, not England.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, Great Britain. We are not asking the hon. gentleman to divulge any confidence; we are not asking him to lay on the table original documents that should not be placed there; we are not asking him to disclose private information. But he has had the opportunity of laying that information on the table of the House; he has had the opportunity of stating to the House who the writer of that letter was, so that the House and the government might judge whether he was an employee or not. The hon. gentleman has not seen fit to take that opportunity; but he has seen fit to read a letter to the House, and to put a construction upon that letter which I am bound to say is not warranted in any particular; and he has declined to

place the House or the government in possession of the name of the writer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I offer for the third time to give the hon. gentleman the name and address if he wishes it.

Mr. OLIVER. Why does not the hon. gentleman give it ? If he has it, let him give it. But I do not ask him to divulge private confidences. I do not take the position of a detective looking into his pockets or using a microscope to see whether the signature is genuine or not. It is for the hon. gentleman himself, on his own sense of responsibility, according to his own knowledge of the fact, to give or withhold the information. Let him do it now, or let him say that he has no warrant in the letter for the inference he drew from it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman has now gone so far that it becomes necessary for me to give the name of the writer. I withhold the name simply to shield an employee who perhaps went beyond his duties. This is the original letter. It is written on the letter paper of the Department of the Interior of Canada Immigration Branch, and it is dated 26 Guild St., Aberdeen, June 5, 1907, and is signed by the agent of the government, John McLennan.

Mr. OLIVER. We have now the information which the hon. gentleman seemed to think it was undesirable to give. There is no reason why that information should not be before the House or before the government. Mr. McLennan has certainly been unfortunate in his statement. He evidently does not understand the position of the government as he should understand it. It is a pity it should be so. As the head of the department I am very glad to be informed that such a letter has been written, as the matter can be dealt with. There is no fault to be found. But I want to call attention again to the fact that there is not in that letter one word to indicate that Mr. McLennan was in any shape or manner going to use his position to advocate or suggest the removal of skilled mechanics from Great Britain to Canada. All he did was to give a civil answer to a civil question, and, as an officer placed in Great Britain to encourage immigration to Canada, to allow that information to pass through his hands.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This is not a civil answer to a civil question. There was no question asked. In the letter the agent says : 'I see by reports in various newspapers.' That was his statement. I never wrote to the man ; I do not know him from Adam. He wrote to me, taking his cue from the newspapers.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has the advantage of having the letter, which I would be very sorry to ask him for or to place before the House.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is in 'Hansard.'

Mr. OLIVER. Not knowing the correspondence which led up to it——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There was no correspondence leading up to it.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say again that Mr. McLennan exceeded his authority in going even so far as he did, in writing that letter. At the same time, I want to point out that his letter, although indiscreet, is not a letter in any degree placing the department in the position of suggesting, or inducing, or advising, skilled mechanics to come from Scotland or England to this country. It is a letter merely offering the facilities of the office for the people who want the labour and the people who have it to sell to come together; that is all. Now, that is going further than the department desires its officials to go; but, at the same time, there is no warrant for what my hon. friend has suggested, that Mr. McLennan has been in any degree aiding or advancing the movement of mechanics to this country. I could read to the House correspondence that has passed between the department and booking agents in the old country illustrating cases in which we have compelled these booking agents to change the nature of their advertisements on threat of cutting them off of the bonus list. The correspondence can be brought before the House at any time—that is, copies of the correspondence can be brought before the House at any time—and by it the House will be fully informed concerning the position of the department in this connection.

Now, as regards the general question, I said in the beginning that I assumed my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) to speak for the party to which he belongs. He declared vociferously against immigration. He wants Canada to grow slowly. In taking that position, he is certainly voicing the best traditions of the party of which he is a member. There is no doubt that, under the more or less able administration of that party, there was very little immigration, and Canada certainly did grow very slowly. Not only the government of that party did not achieve success in connection with its immigration policy—although it had an immigration policy—but also, owing to its policy, while people did not come into Canada, people went out of Canada. The United States census which was taken shortly before this government came into power showed that there were, approximately, one million native born Canadians then resident in the United States. If these figures meant anything, they meant practically that all these people had gone to the United States, at any rate within the previous thirty years ; that there had been a drain on the life blood of Canada of its people—and of those who were

amongst the best of its people—of 30,000 native born Canadians a year for a period of thirty years, under the able adminstration and the immigration policy, during the greater part of that period, of our friends of the party to which my hon. friend belongs and whose policy again he has voiced on the floor of the House to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister state, according to the mixed census statistics of 1901, the number of native born Canadians in the United States ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not that information available.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the minister a question—I do not often interrupt him. Would a period of thirty years to which he has referred not include the entire period when the liberals were in power, from 1874 to 1878 ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly that is where the mischief is done.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a comforting reflection for my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) and no doubt, goes all right in the school houses in Halton; but it is hardly acceptable in this House. Not only did Canada lose 30,000 native born Canadians a year, but, besides that, she must have lost approximately an equal number of people who came from the British Islands and, after residing some time in Canada, left for the United States. This one million native-born Canadians mentioned in the United States census did not include the progeny born in the United States of these people. Under the policy and administration of our friends on the other side during their long terms of office, Canada was bled white of its people. It is not a wonder that we had stagnation ; it is a wonder we were able to retain existence. And, when this government came into power, the great question they had to face was the question of immigration.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. minister tell us what is the difference of the emigration of native-born Canadians now as compared with what it was in the period he has mentioned ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am absolutely unable to give my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that information.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. But, if the hon. gentleman will wait until the next United States census is out, he will then know. But I want him to take a trip out to the Northwest and through British Columbia, and he will find there, in the towns, in the cities and on the farms, the Canadians who have left this eastern country within the last ten years; as, if he goes into the cities of Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, Washington, Oregon and many other states, he will find the Canadians who left eastern Canada during the years I have mentioned. How is it that western Canada is represented here in parliament almost entirely by native-born Canadians. It is because the people of western Canada, to a very great extent, are native born Canadians; it is because the exodus to the United States has been turned into our own Northwest; and we have the proof of it right here in this House to-day. That was not immigration, but it was a part of the result of the policy of the government in regard to immigration. It was a great question which this government had to face and which it succeeded in settling. The first thing to do was to prove that the Northwest was a good country, to get our own people satisfied with the Northwest through a proper and reasonable administration of that country. And, after that was done, the next step was to look for people to go into that country and fill it up. And to-day, the prairie country which lay, I might say, almost vacant when this government came into power is filling up. The production of that country in those days did not affect the markets of the world in any degree—it was a matter of merely academic interest whether there was a crop in that country or not at that time. To-day, owing to the increase of population and the increase of production because of immigration stimulated and directed by the policy of this government, a telegram announcing a drop of the temperature in the Northwest during the wheat-growing season affects the market prices of wheat throughout the world. We have the people, and we have the production. And the production is what has made this country rich, has doubled its revenues and doubled its trade. It is the success of the immigration policy of the government in filling up that western country that has created a demand for the manufactures and the products of these eastern cities, which has made openings for employment here, openings which our native population, up to the present time, have not been able to fill.

With factories running night and day, wages higher than ever before in the history of Canada, with a demand for men such as never was known in Canada before, still the demand for products created by the increase of that western country could not be met and there was, as I read to the House the other night, not only the demand made by the hon. member from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), who by his letter is my witness as to the truth of what I am saying, but the letters of hundreds of others, including a long list of municipalities and agricultural societies, all declaring that they wanted men, that they must have men, and calling upon the government, as my friend's friend called upon the government, to institute an immigration policy for this eastern country. In response to that demand the efforts of the depart-

ment have, during recent years, been turned towards supplying the demand in the east, as they were formerly turned towards supplying the demand in the west, and I think I may say with a fair measure of success. We have this year an immigration of upwards of 300,000 people; 300,000 people added to the population of the Dominion in one year! It is true that owing to the financial conditions, owing to an enormous number of people coming late in the year, there was, in the early part of the winter—we may say that there is yet—a certain over presence of labour in certain centres here in this eastern country. But I say that this is not the fault of the policy of the government. A policy which induces upwards of 300,000 people to seek homes in this country, of whom certainly four-fifths have found homes and are to-day prosperous themselves and adding to the prosperity of this country by their labour and their intelligence—I say that policy is a successful policy, and this government is prepared to stand on that policy, to take issue with our friends on the other side when they decry that policy and call attention to disadvantages which arise under it.

My friend (Mr. Cockshutt) has seen fit to object to the class and character of people who have come, particularly this year. Who are the people who have come this year? Two or three years ago, I remember, our friends on the other side complained about the people who were going to the Northwest. My friend complained of them to-day. Why, he said, they had to print the bible in 45 different languages for the use of the immigrants in that western country. Well, they do not have to print the Bible in 45 languages in order that it may be read by the immigrants who have come to eastern Canada during the past year, but he objects to them just the same. The large majority of the people who have come into eastern Canada this year are of what nationality, of what country, of what race and of what language? My friend took occasion to be funny this afternoon and told a story about the lack of adaptability of one of these settlers in the matter of hitching a horse. Who are these settlers whom my friend laughs at in this House, whom he called upon his friends on the other side to scorn and exclude. Who are they? They are the people of the race that stands at the head of civilized humanity to-day. These people whom my friend scorns are not Hungarians, Roumanians or Slavs, they are English.

Mr. WARD. Not all of them.

Mr. OLIVER. Not all of them, but the majority are English.

Mr. WARD. No.

Mr. OLIVER. The majority are English.

Mr. WARD. Show your reports.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and if I caught my friend's remarks correctly it is to the English especially that he objects to-day.

Mr. WARD. No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. minister is quite misconstruing me. I have always stood for a special amount of immigration from the British Islands. No such statement has ever passed my lips nor did I confine my remarks to this year. I said there are in every community a certain number of undesirables. I did not say this year ; I said they are there.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. I beg to say it has been the effort of this department to secure from the British Islands a fair proportion of their emigrating people. These islands are productive of people and there is necessarily a large movement of people from their shores every year. They go to all parts of the world. From year to year thousands and tens of thousands of them have gone to the neighbouring republic ; they have added to the wealth and to the intelligence of the republic to a very great degree. It has been our ambition to secure from these islands a fair share of their emigrating people so that at any rate we might get as many of them to seek homes under their own flag, in what I might call their own country, as seek homes in the country to the south. After years of labour we have, if not actually, approximately succeeded. I say it is an effort which is entitled to the endorsation of this House; yet because there happens at this moment to be a slightly unfortunate condition of affairs, for which we are not responsible, which we could not foresee, and the labour market is slightly overcrowded, my hon. friend, like the politician he is, forthwith seizes upon his supposed opportunity, drags in every allusion that he can possibly make to the discredit of the immigrant in order to discredit the government—and his words to-morrow will be spread all over the British Isles and used by our opponents to hinder the immigration of those people to Canada. My friend is welcome to the the kudos which he will get from the speech he has made to-day. I wish his party luck of the assistance that it will be to them, not politically, but in the credit they will receive because of one of them having given expression to such sentiments on the floor of this parliament in this Canada of ours.

I wish to inform the House a little with regard to the responsibility for the presence in Canada of some of those who for one reason or another are not at the moment able to find place and employment here. I have said to the House on a former occasion, and I repeat it now, that this department has had only one policy, the policy that will induce the coming to Can-

ada of the people who were suited for the conditions in Canada. I do not mean to say that other people are not just as good in their own way, but it is necessary, in order that they should be a success, that they should be suited for the condition which await them and, recognizing that certain conditions exist here, we have addressed ourselves absolutely and solely to people when they met those conditions. We felt that there was a need of men to occupy our vacant lands; there was need of men to assist in working the lands already occupied. In view of the stupendous railway construction now going on, it was necessary that we should have railway labour, and besides getting railway labour, many a deserving man would be placed in a position to occupy some of our vacant lands and become an independent land owner himself. There is besides a continual demand for domestic servants. We have addressed ourselves solely to the securing of this class of persons. It is in order to induce these classes of employees that we pay a bonus ; we only pay it on tickets which are taken by people of those classes.

My hon. friend has suggested to the House that we are responsible for the presence here as he said, of people who carry knives. Now I defy my hon. friend to show where we have paid a bonus of afforded inducements in any way to people of the class he mentions. We pay bonuses for the purpose of stimulating the energy of the booking and advertising agencies in the old country to get the classes we want. There is nothing to hinder undesirable people from coming here except our immigration laws. Thousands of pounds are subscribed in Great Britain in order to send people out here, and my hon. friend's suggestion is that we should lie quiet here and accept the undesirables who might be sent out by charity, and use no efforts of our own to bring out desirable people. That is not the policy of the government. The policy of the government is set out in our bonus regulations as an offer and inducement for special exertions to bring out the class of people we want. Then our policy as set out in the terms of our immigration law, is to exclude people that we do not want, within certain limits, and if they do come into the country, to deport them if they are subject to our deportation law. The one policy accompanies the other. It is not possible to carry on an aggressive immigration plan of campaign, without drawing along with it some undesirable immigrants. When we entered upon that particularly aggressive campaign we made provisions for checking the undesirable element, and we are checking them to a considerable extent. We have taken power, and are acting upon it, to check such undesirable elements, and we have the approval of the people of Canada in doing so.

Mr. OLIVER.

In conclusion, I want to place before the House some evidence, evidence that my hon. friends opposite will not deny, as to who are responsible for bringing out to this country people on misrepresentation. I will read an advertisement that appeared in the 'British Emigrant and Colonial News,' of the 13th of December, 1907. That was nearly a month after my hon. friend had announced to the world by his notice on the order paper that hereafter he was going to control the immigration policy of Canada. The advertisement reads :

The future for skilled mechanics lies in eastern Canada. Manufacturers are crying out for skilled help in all trade. Have vacancies for hundreds of skilled workers in all trades. This week's vacancies are: fitters, turners, joiners, labourers, tinsmiths, toolmakers, coatmakers, brushmakers, hammersmiths, chairmakers, cottonweavers, brassworkers, cabinetmakers, paper mill engineers, wood working machinists. Fresh vacancies from Canada by each mail. Girls ! Girls ! Girls ! Also families, high wages, assisted passages. Experienced and inexperienced machinists for straw hats, caps, whitewear, tailoring. Millhands for knitting, woollen and cotton mills. Chocolate dippers, &c., &c.

Apply with references to Louis Leopold, official labour representative, Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 15 Strand, London, W.C.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). The Minister of the Interior omitted to add the interesting corollary that the gentleman who was secretary of the association carrying on that propaganda has been selected by the hon. gentleman's friends as organizer of the Liberal Association in the city of Toronto.

Mr. OLIVER. The present secretary of the Manufacturer's Association is G. M. Murray.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not know their policy had altered in that regard; has there been any change ? It is even more of a quibble than the hon. gentleman has been indulging in all through his speech. It would be impossible for any other man to succeed in collecting the same number of quibbles in the same length of time as he has done this afternoon. He tells us that the government are not responsible for the conditions under which immigrants into this country have been coming into many of the large cities of Canada, receiving aid from charitable associations, notably the city of Toronto. It is rather a new doctrine out of the mouth of a cabinet minister that the Liberal party are not responsible for conditions in this country. I have understood from the minister himself and from every cabinet minister, from every member on the other side of the House who has spoken in the Budget debates during the last eight or ten years, that the financial conditions in Canada are wholly

due to this government that is, if we are in prosperous times ; but these very same gentlemen who in days gone by wrote articles to British magazines in order to run down and discredit the financial condition of this country, are the first, when any temporary check occurs in our prosperity, to announce that they are responsible for all prosperity but they are not at all responsible for any adversity. There is about as much sense in that as there is in a great many other statements the Minister of the Interior made this afternoon.

He was good enough to sneer at the tone of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and referred to his remarks as being more suitable for a prayer meeting than for the House of Commons. Well, if I were my hon. friend from Brantford I would retort that, if all reports are true, a good many remarks made by the Minister of the Interior are not very suitable for a prayer meeting, now so far as the letter is concerned, which occupied about two-thirds of the impressive and statesmanlike speech of the Minister of the Interior, dealing as a cabinet minister with a great question such as this, let me say that the letter was simply an ordinary letter from a constituent of my hon. friend from Brantford which he forwarded to the Minister of the Interior under a letter that has been read to the House, and the Minister of the Interior saw fit, when he knew the member for Brantford was not in the House, to use it for a personal attack upon that hon. gentleman, without having the courtesy to give him notice in advance that he proposed to make that attack. Possibly the best excuse that can be made for the minister is that he did not know any better, and with that I leave him

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to his remarks about originals, and his endeavour to bring up a previous debate in this House as to the production of originals, they constitute about as trivial a performance as I think I ever heard from the mouth of a cabinet minister. Why, the hon. member for Brantford offered to produce the letter. He offered to read the letter to the House and this hon. Minister of the Interior, who knew the purport of the letter to which I shall refer a little more in detail later on, had not interest enough in the policy of his own department to say that he wanted the name of the man who wrote that letter. He practically accepted it as the policy of the Minister of the Interior because he said that it did not make the slightest difference either to the House or to the country or to the department whether or not he knew the name of the officer who had written that letter. I will ask the House, I will ask the sober judgment of this House, whether under the circumstances it is not a fair conclusion that he regarded it as of no moment who had written that letter because he accepted that letter as expressing the policy of the department over which he presides. There could be no other reason why he should not be interested in the name of this official. If the letter were according to the policy which his department is carrying out then it would be a matter of no moment to this House or the department as to who wrote that letter. But if, as he afterwards endeavoured to make it appear, that letter does not carry out the true policy of his department, it would have been a matter of the utmost possible importance to him at least and to other members of this House as well to know who was the writer of that letter.

Let use see for a moment whether or not the letter bears the construction which he declares it to bear. The letter simply carries out the policy of his friend's friend, if I may use his own expression, Mr. Lazarus, and of his friend Mr. Preston. That gentleman, according to a statement of an officer of this government, has been retained in the service of the government, who is still receiving public money, was interested in the Canadian Labour Bureau which was bringing men into Canada by a secret propaganda absolutely opposed to the public propaganda which the government were placing before the people. The Minister of the Interior made the most solemn pledges to one of his supporters in this House within my hearing that there would be a thorough and complete investigation into the connection of Mr. Preston with the so-called Labour Bureau, into his connection with the Arundel Printing Company, and into his connection with many other matters which were debated in this House last session. The Minister of the Interior has not, up to the present time, made any investigation worthy of the name in regard to this matter, although we have good reason to believe—if we have good reason to believe the evidence of Mr. Jury—that Mr. Preston was a conspirator with Mr. Leopold, to carry on a secret propaganda absolutely opposed to the open policy of the government. The government, by refusing any investigation into the action of Mr. Preston in that regard, have made themselves co-conspirators with Mr. Preston in carrying out a secret propaganda opposed to their public policy. That is the only legitimate and proper conclusion that can be drawn from the action of the government in retaining both Mr. Preston and Mr. Jury after the revelations of a few years ago. This letter to which the minister attached some little importance in the end, although, in the first instance, he was ready to regard it as stating the policy of his department, presents precisely the same case. This letter is not in answer to a letter from my hon. friend from Brantford, but is an unsolicited letter from an officer of the department—not marked 'confiden-

tal'—hundreds of them may have been written by officers of the department in Great Britain to men throughout this country—written to Mr. Cockshutt under the belief that he was president of the Manufacturers' Association. I shall read the whole of it:—

Interior Department of the government of Canada.
Immigration branch,
Agent, John McLellan,
26 Guild Street,
Aberdeen, June 5, 1907.

W. F. Cockshutt, Esq.,
Brantford, Ont., Can.

Dear Sir,—I see by reports of various newspapers, that numerous members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association are in need of skilled and unskilled help. As representatives of the government here, we have many inquiries from skilled mechanics in nearly all branches of the trade, desiring information about opportunities for their line in Canada and having no specific information we must be governed in our replies by general terms and conditions.

What was the declaration of the policy of the government in regard to immigrants of that class as evidenced in reply to my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) who brought the matter of this Canadian Labour Bureau to the attention of the House two or three years ago? The reply of the government—I am not quoting exactly; I am quoting from recollection—was that they desired to offer no encouragement to immigration of that kind, and they proposed to confine their efforts to encouraging agricultural labourers, domestic servants and people of that class. Well, if this gentleman was carrying out the policy of the government what should he have said in continuing his letter? He should have said, if he was called upon to say anything, that in so far as these people were concerned the government saw fit to take no part in encouraging immigration of that kind to this country. The Minister of the Interior says in effect that this letter is the policy of the department. It is the secret policy of the department, I suppose. How does it continue:

I believe that if the secretary of your association would supply the government offices from time to time, of which the inclosed is a list; of the needs of your association, that it will be of great practical assistance in securing some of the needed help, say for instance, in this form, that there are so many carriage blacksmiths, so many boilermakers, lathe men, moulders, carriage builders and so forth wanted. If we had such a list as that in our hands we could give definite assurance to men that they could get work, and then refer them to the headquarters of your association in Toronto, Montreal or other large centres, for distribution.

Thus, the government of Canada, through its immigration offices in London, would refer these men to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association which is the object of violent denunciation by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior every time he sees fit to rise in this House. This is only the old story over again of the Minister of the Interior desiring to cater to the labour interest of the country who are opposed in that regard to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. He denounces vigorously the Canadian Manufacturers' Association whenever he arises in this House and then, through his officers in Great Britain, he is co-operating with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, that same hated and despised association, in bringing skilled mechanics to Canada by a secret propaganda against the open and declared policy of this government. That is the policy as revealed by this letter of which he makes so light. How does the letter continue:

I make this as a suggestion, as we are quite often at a loss what to say, not having any definite information respecting the needs of numerous lines of work, for which we have inquiries here.

We the government of Canada, through our immigration agents in the British Islands, are desirous of obtaining all this information in order that we may carry out this secret propaganda absolutely opposed to our open declaration of policy. That is the meaning of that sentence if it means anything.

I am directing this communication to you, as I believe that you are the president of the association or was, the last information that I had. I know in any event that you will forward it to the proper authorities, in the event that you are not at present the active executive of the association I will be glad in any event to hear from you, your opinion respecting this suggestion.

Very truly yours,
JOHN McLENNAN,
Canadian government agent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for that. I might refer to some of the hon. gentleman's extraordinary statements respecting the production of public documents, but there will no doubt be an opportunity before the close of the session of discussing that subject in a more fitting manner.

Let us look for a moment at the general subject of immigration. The Minister of the Interior cannot rise in this House to discuss any subject whatever without making what may fairly be called a stump speech. His former independence, because I am bound to say I never saw much of it, although he was elected as an independent—his former independence has so absolutely disappeared and political partisanship has so absolutely taken possession of every vein and fibre of his being that it seems absolutely impossible for him to speak for five minutes in this House with-

out introducing partisan politics. And so he was good enough to-day to go over the old story of the past when there was not much immigration to Canada, and when there was a good deal of emigration to the United States, and when he was asked the very simple question by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), a question which a Minister of the Interior acquainted with his department ought to have been able to answer, he displayed his amazing ignorance. Well, let me tell him that the emigration from Canada to the United States during the last fiscal year was very little below the figures he quoted for past years, because last year within two or three hundred of twenty thousand emigrants crossed our borders into the neighbouring republic. And that, mark you, after the great west of Canada had been discovered, after there had been bounteous crops; crops for which hon. gentlemen on the other side had claimed the credit as well as for the weather conditions which created them. Even the Postmaster General, speaking at Aurora, in the summer of 1907, claimed credit to the government for the good crops, for he said:—

While it is unnecessary for me to dwell at length on the causes of this prosperity it is but fair to remind you that the fiscal policy of the Liberal administration has given the farming community of Canada the good times which it is your happy lot to enjoy.

The Minister of the Interior was ready to make the absurd suggestion, that even the crops and the weather conditions are due to the men now on the treasury benches, and when they are not able to produce good weather they even spend from $3,000 to $5,000 of the country's money to secure the services of a United States rain maker in the Yukon. So far as emigration from Canada to the United States is concerned, there is not that improvement which we might reasonably expect, having regard to the advancement which the country has made and to the fact that bounteous harvests in the west have done ten thousand times more than all the efforts of the immigration department and of ministers to bring immigrants to Canada and keep them here.

Let us see whether there is not room for careful consideration of the problems that confront us in regard to immigration, and to this phase of the question the Minister of the Interior gave no consideration whatever. The people of the United States have had these problems in the past and they have them to-day. And notwithstanding the splendid system of the strictest possible supervision over immigrants which they have in the United States, by an Act of the last session of the congress, it is proposed to create a great commission to consider how the assimilation of one and a quarter millions of immigrants a year may be dealt with upon even more perfect lines than at present prevail. During last fiscal year 1,287,000 people entered the United States without any bonus and without any expense to the country. Not only that, but the head tax of $4 per head levied in the United States for the purpose of defraying the cost of examination and other costs attendant on the advent of these immigrants has resulted up to the present time in a surplus of $3,079,515.20; and the receipts for the fiscal year 1907 from this head tax amounted to not less than $2,782,-103. I am not prepared to say that we should adopt exactly a similar policy in every respect to the policy of the United States, and I am not prepared to say that the time has come in Canada when we should impose a head tax of $4 per head, but I do think the subject is one for grave consideration, and I do think its consideration leads one irresistibly to the conclusion that the time has come in Canada when we should cease to pay out enormous sums of the public money for immigration. We have in Canada at least as good a country as they have in the United States, and we can offer to the colonizing races in Europe just as great advantages as the nation to the south of us can offer. The United States has a remarkably complete supervision of these immigrants, and I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior now —he can answer later on if need be, because we cannot expect a minister to carry every detail of his department in his memory—I would ask: In connection with immigrants who come to Canada on steamship passenger lines, has the Department of the Interior the same full description in the manifest of these steamers which is insisted upon in the United States?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the information on the manifest is the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You think it is.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not absolutely sure but I think it is the same because in checking immigrants coming through Portland we use the same manifest as they do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the United States they have these data : The number of the man on the list, his name in full, his family name, his given name, his age, the sex, married or single, occupation or calling, whether he is able to read and to write, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the race of people to which he belongs, his last permanent residence, giving both the country and the city or town, the name and complete address of the nearest relative or friends in the country whence the alien comes, his final destination, giving both state and city or town, whether he has a ticket to such final destination, by whom was his passage paid, whether the alien has paid his own passage, whether paid by any other person or by any corporation, society, municipality or govern-

ment, whether he is in possession of $50, and if less how much? Whether he was ever before in the United States, and if so, when and where? If that is answered in the affirmative, then the year or period of years, where, and the date of his last departure from the United States; whether he is going to join a relative or friend, and if so what relative or friend, and his name and complete address; whether he was ever in prison or almshouse or institutions for the care and treatment of the insane, or supported by charity? If so, which? Whether he is a polygamist; whether he is an anarchist; whether he is coming by reason of any offer, solicitation, promise or agreement, express or implied, to labour in the United States; his condition of health, mental and physical; whether he is deformed or crippled, and the nature, length of time and cause; his height, complexion, colour of hair and eyes, and complete description; his place of birth, giving the country and city or town; seaport of landing; date of landing; name of steamship; date of examination. That is all to be filled in on the manifest, so that you have a very complete statement as to the immigrant on the manifest itself. More than that, the steamship company is required to put the immigrant through an examination, physical and mental, to ascertain whether there is any infirmity of his mind, whether he is an idiot or imbecile. In addition to that, the United States medical officer at the port of landing examines him and gets from him the report which has been made upon him by the surgeon of the steamship. But these are not to my mind the most important examinations which are made in the United States. They take these examinations as a matter of course, as examinations which are absolutely indispensable. Every immigrant, unless it is apparent at the very first blush that he should be allowed to land, is subjected to an examination by a board of United States inspectors, who go over all the details which I have alluded to in the manifest and obtain further details, keep a complete list of the questions and answers, and tabulate those statements. So that in respect of any immigrant who has been allowed to land in the United States, there is in the Immigration Department of that country, and without any cost to the country whatever, a complete and detailed history of each immigrant, not only in respect of his physical and mental condition, but in respect of all his previous employments and associations. It is manifest that a strict investigation of that kind must be of the greatest possible advantage in determining whether or not the immigrant in question is a man who will make a good citizen. We do not desire that this country shall grow slowly, but we desire that as it grows fast it shall grow along the proper lines, and we believe it would be better to grow more slowly than to grow fast along lines which will create difficult problems for this country in the future. Every country in the world is looking into considerations of this kind to-day, and the question of fitness for citizenship in every man who enters Canada is one that should be dealt with by the Department of the Interior. In that regard we have examples in the history of the United States from which we will do well to profit.

It must be manifest to every hon. gentleman in this House who has given the subject a moment's consideration that the problems of democratic government in any country cannot be successfully solved, that representative institutions cannot be carried out as they ought to be, if we are anticipating for Canada the great future which we are entitled to expect, unless the people entering this country are mentally capable of understanding the spirit of its institutions, of assimilating their life to those institutions, and of forming a progressive part of the community, and not being a drag on the advancement of the whole. That is what we must safeguard in selecting our immigrants, and it is for that reason that we should in the future look more to the quality than to the quantity of our immigrants. We need not fear for the future of this country. We have too great a country to have any apprehensions on that score. There is no doubt that not only the great west of Canada, but Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces will fill up with a fine population. But we do want to see that the men who come into this country are fit for our citizenship and our representative institutions, and that is a more important consideration in my belief than the consideration of inducing an enormous immigration into this country who might possibly in the early future give us problems which we have not now, and which we certainly should not desire to have.

Under these circumstances, I would like to inquire of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior whether it is the intention of the government to accept this resolution. I did not exactly understand from him, at the conclusion of his remarks, whether he assented to it or did not assent to it. He did speak somewhat vaguely of my hon. friend from Brantford having adopted the policy of the government. Well, we will let that pass. Whether the government have adopted our policy or we have adopted theirs is not a very important consideration. It is an important consideration that we in this House, having the responsibility of considering a great question like this, should endeavour to unite on some policy which will be carried out, and which will give to this country the best possible class of immigrants which we can expect. As far as I am concerned, I think my hon. friend from Brantford is entitled to the thanks of the House for having brought

this question to its attention, and I sincerely trust that the views he has so eloquently expressed will receive more consideration from my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior than that hon. gentleman seemed inclined to give this afternoon.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, there are just a few observations which I desire to make before the subject under the consideration of this House is disposed of. We have it on very excellent authority that 'out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh,' and as a few minutes ago we listened to the old familiar sentence, 'I have no fear for the future of this country,' I did not wonder, and I am sure that no member of this House wonders, that in the mouth of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat the word stump speech should have been used so frequently in the earlier part of his address. It was not all in keeping with the position the hon. gentleman occupies in this House that he should have referred to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior as a stump speech. If it was a stump speech, it was a good speech, so good that it has not only visibly disturbed my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, but even more the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) who precipitated this discussion this afternoon. I have every reason to believe that there has been a searching of hearts among hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and that searching of hearts has resulted in unkind looks being directed at my hon. friend from Brantford. However, so far as that is concerned, we will leave that for themselves to settle. Before passing to the observations of my hon. friend from Brantford, who introduced this resolution, I want to refer for a short time to the observations made by the hon. leader of the opposition. He laid special stress upon the letter read to the House this afternoon as coming from an agent of this government in Great Britain, addressed to the president of the Manufacturers' Association. That letter clearly was not intended for the hon. member for Brantford. Am I right in assuming that it was not?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have no objection to answering the question. The letter was addressed to me. But it went on to ask me, if I were not one of the executive of the association, or did not belong to it, to hand it over to the proper authority. I handed it over to the proper authority; and, after they had circulated it among the members, they returned it to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And my hon. friend produces here a letter which was not intended for him and to which he had no right. However, that apart, I wish to point out to this House and to the people of this country that, if my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) had wished to relieve the situation concerning which he expressed such anxiety, he would not have kept this letter in his pocket since about 6th June last. Had he desired to assist the workmen of this country and to prevent the inflow of people that would endanger the employment of skilled workmen here, he would not have kept this letter in his pocket for eight months, but would have promptly called the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that an officer of his department in Great Britain was carrying on work entirely beyond his duties and should be disciplined for it. I would ask my hon. friend if he has, even at this date, any excuse for keeping that letter in his pocket since June last without calling the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the facts. Or let me ask him whether he has ever, before to-day directed the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the receipt of this letter? I ask him to answer this question now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not blame my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) for laughing at my hon. friend from Brantford. I know the hon. member for Brantford is a little sore at the situation he occupies. Still, these two hon. gentlemen sit on the same side of the House and are members of the same party, and, notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friend from Brantford has been caught in an awkward position, I do not think his colleagues should laugh at him in open House. At the very worst, he should leave that for room No. 6. I would like to know whether my hon. friend from Brantford has an answer to my question. He has not. Then, I call the attention of this House and this country to the fact that this hon. member kept in his pocket for seven or eight months a letter which it would have been in the interest of the workmen of Canada that he should have brought to the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the end that the wrong complained of might be righted. Why did not he do it? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. It is for the reason that the hon. member for Brantford cared absolutely nothing about what happened to the skilled workers of this country but was particularly anxious about what should happen to the political party to which he belongs. It was the game of the professional politician, rather than the game of the friend of the skilled workmen, that the hon. member has been playing for the last eight months by keeping this document in his pocket.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I rise to correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston), not to answer his question. He says that I have been carrying this letter in my pocket. I do not know on what he bases that state-

ment ; he certainly has no knowledge of the facts. His statement is not correct. I have already said the letter was turned over—and I may say immediately turned over—to the Manufacturers' Association and it was returned to me only within the last few days ; and I have lost no time, practically, in giving it to this House.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The case of my hon. friend from Brantford is even worse than I had supposed it to be. He was willing that the information should be in the possession of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, in order that they might take some steps to carry out the views expressed in the letter. But he carefully concealed from the Department of the Interior the fact that such a letter had been written by an officer of the department. Let me repeat—and it cannot be too carefully noted or too well understood by the people of this country—that my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt), while professing to be the friend of the skilled workmen, had it in his power to help the interests of the skilled workman and absolutely refused to do so.

Now, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), who is not in his seat at the moment, has stated his position on this question. He undertook to say that this letter, written by a subordinate official of the Department of the Interior without authority from the minister or from any responsible official, embodied the policy of the government. I have only to say that if such a statement is not cheap stump-speech politics, I do not know how to characterize it. The hon. gentleman certainly knows that a letter so written did not and could not convey the policy of the department. The policy of the department in this matter on more than one occasion, has been laid before this House and this country by the Minister of the Interior ; and when the fact was brought to the attention of the department that representations of the kind referred to by my hon. friend from Brantford were being made by officers of the government they promptly corrected the error. The department has taken care at all times that representations of this kind, when made, should be set right as promptly as possible. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, during recent months, has been doing something in the way of inducing skilled workmen to come to this country. How is it that the hon. member for Brantford did not include the Canadian Pacific Railway in his denunciations this afternoon ? He knows that that company has been making efforts to induce skilled workmen to come to Canada, yet he says nothing about it. I am not going to find special fault with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for what they have done. But I point out that they were called to account by the Department of the Interior the moment they were discovered to be making these efforts. The department put them right, as the department would have put Mr. McLennan right, if my hon. friend from Brantford had had sufficient interest in the matter to direct the attention of the minister to what was going on.

I wish now to come to certain statements made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). He made a certain statement in this connection which convinces me that he, too, is amongst those who are ranged against the conduct of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) addressing himself to the Minister of the Interior and through him to the government says: You are responsible for bringing the people into this country and for this you ought to be condemned. But the leader of the opposition says in effect to my hon. friend from Brantford: You are entirely wrong, the government is not bringing these people into the country, and when you made the statement this afternoon that the government was responsible for bringing people into this country, you were entirely mistaken. My hon. friend need not shake his head, I am sure, if the leader of the opposition were present, he would confirm my statement that that is exactly the meaning he intended to convey. The leader of the opposition said that the government were not bringing these people into the country but, on the contrary, the good crops had induced them to come. This is a matter which will have to be settled by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and the leader of the opposition. I would like to inquire whether my hon. friend from Brantford is going to support his leader or is his leader going to support him. They will have a nice time of it if it ever comes to a vote on this question. One must necessarily be against the other because their views as expressed this afternoon are exactly opposite. Of course I suppose we should not hold them strictly to account, and that it is perfectly legitimate for a party such as is now in opposition to have one view here and another view there, as I shall take occasion to point out. It will be within the memory of a few people in this country that the leader of the opposition conducted a great cross-country tour during the last summer. I say a few advisedly, because there are a few of us who must necessarily keep track of these things. Speaking at Valleyfield in the province of Quebec, the leader of the opposition criticised certain peoples that were coming into the great Northwest. On the 2nd of September last, as reported, not in any Grit paper, but by his own organ—sometimes—the Montreal 'Gazette,' he said:—

Between the east and the west there is a vast stretch of territory that could not be peopled, and there was danger of the two sections of the country becoming antagonistic to each other. Under these circumstances he thought

it most unwise to crowd into the west as the government was doing a class of undesirable immigrants, Galicians, Bohemians, Doukhobors, &c., who did not understand our customs and did not readily assimilate either with the French or English elements of Canada.

It may be argued in defence of the leader of the opposition that on that occasion he was delivering a stump speech, but the leader of a great party should be careful even when delivering a stump speech, as very evidently my hon. friend was, because we remember that in this House, when pressed up against the lines on various occasions by some of my friends from the west, he was obliged to admit that the people coming into the western country were, after all, a rather desirable lot, and he did not feel that, standing face to face with these members in the House, he could take the position he so cheerfully took at Valleyfield in the province of Quebec. Perhaps he thought the people in the west would not find out what he really did say in Valleyfield, but the people in the west, like those in the east, are a reading people, and a man who sets himself up as leader of a political party in this country cannot undertake to say things in the east that he would not be prepared to say in the west. My hon. friend, if he were here, would immediately say: I have never made these statements. As to whether or not he has made them, he must settle with his friends; he is so reported by his friends. I heard him, I think the next night in Montreal, after I had read this report of his speech and I listened attentively to see whether or not he would correct the report of his speech in the 'Gazette' of that day; but he did not, on the contrary he went on to address himself to the people in Montreal in very nearly the same way. My hon. friend continued his series of meetings in Quebec and Ontario and then continued his pilgrimage to the west. Having arrived at Winnipeg, it is stated on what is fairly good authority, that there was a still further searching of hearts which resulted in some plain speaking, if report be correct—and I have no doubt whatever that it was plain speaking to the leader of the opposition, so plain indeed that he was obliged on the day after his arrival in Winnipeg to make a statement. I have no doubt whatever but that the leading members of the Conservative Association in Winnipeg drew his attention to certain statements that he had been making in Quebec. The next day Mr. Borden made a statement in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' as follows—and I want the House to pay particular attention to his words:—

While I am in the west——

He had left the east and had still hope that what he said in the west would not be read in the east.

While I am in the west I wish to say that in respect to the question of immigration, the report which represents me as referring to certain nationalities as undesirable is quite inaccurate.

That is, he says: While I am in the west. No doubt it is a reasonable inference that this declaration was only good during the time he was in the west, but when he returned to the east the same old declaration would hold good. I think that is a reasonable construction to put upon this interview which is published, not in a Grit newspaper, but in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' a paper which is friendly to him, so that he cannot claim to have been misrepresented.

The interview was reported by the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of the 18th of September last, and it is exactly in the words I have placed before the House. It is worth while calling the attention of the country once more to these words:—

While I am in the west I wish to say that in respect to the question of immigration, the report which represents me as referring to certain nationalities as undesirable, is quite inaccurate.

This afternoon the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said that a large number of people are really undesirable, and we are justified in assuming that his observations apply to all the people who went into the Northwest. I would like to hear from him as to whether or not he agrees with the statement made by his leader 'while he was in the west,' as to whether these people are a desirable people or not. I think it would be interesting to this House to hear him rise and state what his opinions are of the statement made by his leader in the city of Winnipeg, in view of the statement he has himself made to the House this afternoon. Now, I want the people of this country to be able to judge between these two gentlemen.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman is reading an extract from a speech of the leader of the opposition. The sentence he quotes may or may not be complete, I do not know. But from that sentence we cannot judge what the leader of the opposition says, and as the hon. gentleman has got the article in his possession, he might read a little more of it to show us exactly what the leader of the opposition meant.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend from Queens (Mr. A. Martin) shows a commendable spirit in coming to the rescue of the leader of the opposition. Let me assure him that the sentence I have read taken from the interview with the leader of the opposition, is absolutely complete. I am not speaking very loud, and it may be that the hon. member for Queens has not heard it, and for his benefit I will read it again.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is this a quotation?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is a quotation. I suppose if I were to say to the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson) that I was quoting from the 'Gazette,' he would say that the 'Gazette' does not on all occasions represent Mr. Borden correctly, and that on this particular occasion——

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Did the hon. gentleman make a quotation from the 'Gazette'?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did make a quotation from the Montreal 'Gazette,' from a speech delivered by the leader of the opposition at Valleyfield; but the statement I am quoting now is not from the Montreal 'Gazette,' but from another excellent organ of the Conservative party, the Winnipeg 'Telegram.' Now I want again to draw the attention of the House to the letter written by the hon. member for Brantford to the Minister of the Interior. It is worth while spending an afternoon to consider this letter. We were greatly entertained at watching the contortions of the hon. member for Brantford as he tried to escape responsibility for writing this letter. First, he said it was a private letter. Well, as a matter of fact it was not a private letter; so statement No. 1 is hurled through the window. Then he institutes a comparison between the letter written by himself and a letter written by a certain Mr. Stewart as secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to the Minister of the Interior. Now, the Minister of the Interior has pointed out the difference between the letter written by the member for Brantford and the letter written by Mr. Stewart. Mr. Stewart is content to write a note to the effect that he is inclosing certain resolutions passed by the organization of which he was then secretary. He was discharging a duty which he was paid to discharge. Was my hon. friend from Brantford in the same position? He was paid to discharge a certain duty. What was that duty? Was it the duty of urging upon the Minister of the Interior the desirability of emptying the over-crowded cities of Europe into the towns and hamlets of this country? But that is what he was doing. And I am justified in assuming that he was voicing the opinion of the Conservative party, inasmuch as the leader of the opposition came to the rescue of the member for Brantford, and declared in effect that it was the proper policy for the Conservative party to impress upon the Minister of the Interior the desirability of adopting such a policy as would empty into the cities and towns of this country the population of the over-crowded cities of Europe? He does not follow the example of Mr. Stewart, or rather, Mr. Stewart does not follow his example. It is worth while, for the information of the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. Martin) in case he did not hear this letter, to direct his attention to it once more.

Dear Sir:—

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman as I understand, is reading from the 'Hansard' report of a previous debate.

Mr. BRODEUR. The point of order is not well taken because it is always permitted to refer to a document without referring to a debate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no objection to his referring to a document, but he has 'Hansard' in his hand and he is reading from it. An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House rose to a point of order, he had no point of order, but I think that the point of order that I have raised is well taken.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think a letter can be referred to but a past debate cannot.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I cheerfully accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order but as I have the document here my hon. friend's objection is removed. I can very well understand the anxiety of my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the original or a copy?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, it is a certified copy.

Mr. TAYLOR. As my hon. friend is only trying to kill time until six o'clock I thought I would help him.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I want to direct my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the hon. member for Brantford was asked this afternoon as to whether he had any fault to find with this copy of a letter from himself and so satisfied was he of the correctness of the copy that he admitted that it was all right. I have this copy here. It has been referred to on several occasions. But, what I desire to point out in all seriousness is that this question is really an important question and should be discussed as such by every hon. member of this House. The question of immigration, as everybody will admit, is one of the most important questions that this country is called upon to consider. The policy of the Department of the Interior and of this government, during the years that they have been in office, has done much to people not only the western but the eastern part of the country with a good population. Here and there, it is quite true, there may be some undesirable people come in, but that is absolutely and teetotally unavoidable. I take it that the statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) this afternoon is absolutely correct, and it is that the people who have been

assisted to come to this country during the last ten or eleven years are a good class of people and are to-day citizens that this country might well be proud of and who will do their part in the upbuilding of this country and in making it a desirable country in which to live. Every member on this side of the House cheerfully re-echoed the words of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) when he said this afternoon that we have no fear as to the future of this country. On this side of the House we have no fear of the future so long particularly as the Department of the Interior pursue the same policy and exercise such care over matters of immigration as they have done in the past. They have adjusted themselves to various situations as these situations arose and I take it that that is the true policy for any government to pursue. Governments, like individuals, must be prepared to adjust themselves to situations as they arise from day to day, and if the conditions of five years ago do not obtain to-day the department, unlike the departments that this country was accustomed to fifteen or sixteen years ago, are alive to the situation. Previous to 1896 there was stagnation all over this land and why?—because ministers in those days were not attending to the business of their departments. They were too busy resigning from the cabinet and getting back again, they had no time to devote to the interest of the country, and is it any wonder, when the fact is known that the ministers in those days were so busy resigning and bolting and plotting for the destruction one of the other, that there was stagnation all over the land? But, a change has come about. There are live departments now-a-days and if I have any advice to submit to the government or to the Department of the Interior it is to be ever on the alert as to the character and quality as well as the quantity of immigration that comes to this country. I would say further that if five years hence different conditions obtain in this country from those which obtain to-day let the department be alive to the situation and adjust itself to the conditions which obtain then. If they do that and be careful, as they have in the past, I am quite sure that this country will continue to progress as it has during the last ten or eleven years. The resolution of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is in effect what the policy of the government has been during the past number of years, and it is comforting to those who sit on this side of the House, it is comforting to every man whether Conservative or Liberal from one end of this country to the other who supports this government, to find hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House coming down, even at this late date, and declaring that they too, as well as those who sit on this side of the House, are satisfied with this policy pursued by this government in the matter of immigration. That being so, I desire to place an amendment in your hands, Mr. Speaker, to the following effect:—

That all the words after 'that' to the end of the resolution be struck out and the following be inserted instead: The House approves the policy of the Department of Interior in confining its immigration operations to the encouragement of the coming to Canada of farmers, farm labourers, railway labourers and female domestic servants.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 16, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Railway Statistics of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ending June 30, 1907. —Mr. Graham.

HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) to amend the House of Commons Act. He said: This Bill has the same purpose as a Bill introduced last session or the session before. It is to provide that, in case the seat of any member of this House is vacated for any cause and the writ for the election of a new member is not issued within a prescribed time, it shall be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue the writ for a new election.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

YUKON—DOMINION REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked:

What was the total Dominion revenue and consolidated fund expenditure, and capital expenditure in the Yukon from March 31 to June 30, 1907?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Total revenue, $152,905.78; consolidated fund expenditure, $194,481.10; capital expenditure, including railway subsidies, $104,257.50.

MR. AUGUSTE ARSENAULT.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Was a person by the name of Auguste Arsenault employed until recently in connection with the customs service at Montreal?
2. Was said Arsenault tried on a charge of theft, found guilty, and sentenced on or about November 21, 1907?
3. Has the said Arsenault been, since his conviction, appointed to a position in connection with the postal service of Montreal or vicinity?
4. Is he at the present time in the government employ? If so, when was he reappointed, what is his present position and salary, and on whose recommendation did he secure his present employment?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.
2. He was tried on a charge of theft to which he pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to two hours' imprisonment, and to pay a fine of $15 and costs, November 22, 1907.
3. No.

MR. HORACE ST. LOUIS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has Horace St. Louis been employed in any capacity by the Department of Justice? If so, for how long, for what service, and at what rate of pay?
2. In what other capacity has Mr. St. Louis been employed since July 1, 1901, by other departments of the government, and what has he received therefor each year?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). No. But, since November, 1902, he has been employed upon the work of preparing the Revised Statutes, and has been paid for the first six months at the rate of $1,500 a year ; since then at the rate of $2,400 a year.
2. No other.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—HON. L. P. BRODEUR.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

On what dates since June 30, 1906, were advances made on account of travelling expenses to Hon. L. P. Brodeur, to Mr. Wiallard, his private secretary, and to Nap. Potvin, his messenger, respectively, for what amounts, and to what accounts were they severally charged; also, what refunds, if any, have been made on any of these several advances, and on what dates?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I see that this will cover a lot of details and would ask that the question be allowed to stand as a notice of motion. I shall be glad to supply the information as soon as the motion is passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. FIELDING.

TOWN SITE IN SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 10, RANGE 4, EAST OF FIRST, MANITOBA.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

1. Has the Finance Minister or any other member of the government had any application from, or negotiation or communication with, any person or persons respecting the construction of a post office or other public buildings at a town site in section 32, township 10, range 4, east of the first meridian, province of Manitoba?
2. If so, who are such persons?
3. Has there been any correspondence on such subject, and with whom?
4. Has there been application to any member of the government to do any drainage or other work at such town site? If so, by whom, and what was the nature of the work?
5. Has the government or any member thereof made any inquiry as to the probable cost of such drainage or other work, and with what result?
6. Has the government or any member thereof given any, and what answer or promise on the subject, or refused to do so, or is it still under consideration of the government?
7. So far as the government is aware, who are the persons interested in the town site property?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Though a reference is made in this question to the Minister of Finance, it relates mainly to the Department of Public Works, and I would ask that it be allowed to stand in the absence of the minister.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I have the answer here as regards the Post Office Department : I have received no application for a post office building at the site in question.

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM—LEASE TO ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. How many acres of the historic Plains of Abraham, Quebec, or lands adjoining, were leased for the erection of and use of the Ross Rifle Company or plant, either by original or subsequent lease?
2. To whom were said lands leased?
3. For how many years was the lease granted, and at what annual rental, and is lease renewable?
4. Was any clause put in said lease giving the government the right to reclaim the lands leased? If so, on what terms?
5. Will any scheme to dedicate and beautify the Plains of Abraham probably involve the expropriation of any lands so leased or interest therein granted without consideration to such lessees?
6. What will the net financial result to the country be in that case?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

1 and 2. By lease dated May 27, 1902, granted under the authority of order in

council of May 19, 1902, there was leased to Sir Charles Ross, for the use of the Ross Rifle Company, 19·1 acres, more or less, of the Plains of Abraham, Quebec.

3. For a term of 99 years from June 1, 1902, at a rental of $1 per annum, without power to assign or sublet the premises. It is renewable.

4. Possession to be resumed on non-payment of rent, or non-performance of covenant.

5 and 6. I have no knowledge of the matter referred to.

GEODETIC SURVEY—EMPLOYMENT OF MR. JAMES M. MENZIES—ERECTION OF TOWER NEAR CHARLESTON LAKE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is James M. Menzies, B.A.S., in the employ of the government in connection with the Dominion observatory? If so, has he made a report of the work done for the season of 1907?

2. Have any towers been erected in connection with this service? If so, how many and where are they located?

3. Is it the intention to erect a tower in the county of Leeds at or near Charleston lake?

4. Has the said Mr. Menzies and staff done some work in that locality during the past season with a view of erecting a tower there?

5. Was one Colonel Mathewson, a member of the staff with Mr. Menzies? If so, did he represent the imperial government?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Mr. James M. Menzies was in the employ of the government, on the reconnaissance for the geodetic survey, from May 4 to September 30, 1907.

He reported from time to time to the officer in charge of the field work of the survey.

2. Four towers have been erected in connection with Mr. Menzie's reconnaissance, in the townships of Elizabethtown, North Elmsley, Packenham, North Crosby.

3. It has not yet been finally decided whether a tower shall be erected at or near Charleston lake.

4. Yes.

5. No.

SEED GRAIN FOR THE NORTHWEST.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask leave to refer to a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the question of the desirability of some steps being taken towards the supply of seed grain in the Northwest provinces.

Leave having been granted.

Mr. SIFTON. I have moved for leave to move the adjournment for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the government the question of seed grain in the Northwest provinces. I have done so not for the purpose of expressing any positive opinion on the subject myself, for I am not sure that I am competent to give a reliable opinion as to the position, nor do I feel disposed to recommend any particular course. I have rather brought the matter up for the purpose of calling the attention of the government to it, and for the purpose of enabling the members who represent the Northwest provinces and who are more familiar with the facts of the case than I am to express themselves and give the government the benefit of their views. I received some correspondence, a short time ago, which led me to suppose that the question of supply of seed grain in the Northwest provinces, particularly in the province of Saskatchewan, was a serious and urgent question. I had occasion to be in the city of Winnipeg a short time ago, and, regarding the question as of great importance, I asked a couple of gentlemen to meet me there who, I thought, would be well versed in the situation. The result of that conference would lead me to the conclusion that the subject is of very great and very urgent public importance. I do not wish to be understood as expressing the opinion that the position of the people in those provinces at the present time is a needy one, or that they are under the necessity of asking for charitable assistance. That is not the position which I desire to bring before the government at all. On the contrary, all things considered, I think the position of the people there is an excellent one, especially in view of the extremely unfavourable nature of last season. I think the position in which they find themselves is a great tribute to the agricultural capabilities of the country. But the position seems to be this, that in considerable sections of the country, the grain suffered from the frost, and the result is that in those sections there is no grain at all which is fit for seed. In other sections of the country, there was a considerable portion of first-class grain, where the shipping arrangements were favourable, and from many of those places the grain has been shipped out, so that even in those districts, there is not a sufficient supply of first-class grain for seed. I am told that the fall season was extremely favourable, and that a large quantity of land, much larger than in any previous year, is in a condition for seeding when the season opens. I am further told that unless some steps are taken to assist the farmers in securing the necessary seed wheat, the probability is that a considerable portion of the acreage, perhaps running into some hundreds of thousands of acres, will not be seeded at all, and that as to a considerable portion of the remainder, the probability is that it will be seeded with inferior seed.

Now as I understand the position, it is not that the people need or desire anything in the nature of charitable assistance. If

matters were as they ordinarily are, that is to say, if ordinary channels for securing financial accommodation were open as they have been in previous seasons, I do not think any assistance would be required. But the position at the present time is that a farmer in a remote portion of the country may be in a good financial position, he may have assets and very few liabilities, and yet it may be entirely impossible for him to secure the necessary amount of cash to buy the seed grain which he requires. Generally speaking, he might get it at the bank or on a temporary advance from a loan company, but under present financial conditions it is impossible for him to secure advances in that way. Neither the banks, as I understand it, nor loan companies, are in a position to tie up a large amount of cash in transactions of that kind; and I have been assured that the position is such that some arrangement will have to be made, not for furnishing charitable assistance, but for financing the operations necessary to secure the seed grain requisite to seed the land that is ready for crop.

It has been suggested that the provincial government would be willing to assume the responsibility of disbursing and securing repayment of the necessary fund by providing the necessary legislation and local machinery, if the federal government would advance the money, the provincial government making itself responsible for the repayment of the money. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I am informed that members at least of one of the provincial governments will shortly be in Ottawa for the purpose of discussing the question. For myself, I do not suggest that under any arrangement the assistance should be anything less than a loan, repayable at a convenient period, with interest sufficient to prevent the government from suffering any loss in the transaction. But I am quite sure from what I have heard that the situation is one that demands the urgent and immediate attention of the government. I do not need to say to the members of this House what it would mean to the Dominion of Canada if half a million acres of land ready for crop should be left idle during the next season for lack of seed. It would be equivalent to the uncompensated destruction of $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 of capital. It will be seen at once that the peculiar circumstances of the case, the occurrence of a season in which the grain is damaged and at the same time the occurrence of a period of financial stringency when ordinary small financial operations in remote parts cannot be carried on, these circumstances create a situation that is altogether unusual. I do not know that I need say anything further. I would like if members from the Northwest who are familiar with the facts would express themselves and I close with the hope that the government will give the matter its early consideration.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I have already called the attention of the House to the fact that the crop has been badly damaged by frost in certain portions of the Northwest. In some respects the damage was such as to render the grain which was threshed totally unfit for seed. Now it is well known that frozen wheat which has not been badly frosted will grow, and will give good results provided that all the conditions are favourable for the first two or three weeks after seeding. But the risks are very great, and the sowing of frozen grain should be discouraged in every way, not merely frozen wheat which has been specially referred to by the hon. gentleman, but frozen oats as well—I think they are less liable to germinate than wheat. But frozen grain is not to be encouraged, because the fact that some of it will grow may induce many settlers who have not had much experience to sow grain which is of no use at all. All are now agreed on the advantage of using only the best seed that can be obtained. As the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has just said, if the financial conditions had been normal I do not think that any intervention by this government would have been called for. The local merchants and banks would, as they have done in the past, in all probability have been able to see to it that no land went uncropped for want of seed, and that the seed which was available was of a good quality. But the financial stringency has created conditions which demand some assistance in order to ensure that good seed is sown, and that the crop has a fair chance from the outset, and that all the land which is prepared for seed should be sown the coming season. It will be in the memory of the House that the Minister of the Interior in reply to a question which I put to him on the 16th of December last regarding seed grain, stated that the government had the matter under consideration with the government of Saskatchewan, and that applications which he had already received for seed were being investigated by the Commissioner of Immigration. I trust that he will give the results of that investigation to this House, and I have little doubt that he will find them sufficient to justify him in asking this House to put him in a position to see that sufficient seed grain of good quality is placed in the hands of settlers in the Northwest. It was my intention if the government had not shown a disposition to move in this matter as early as possible, to have proposed a resolution that the government should make advances of money for this purpose, the amount to be based upon the acreage ready for cropping, suitable precautions being taken by the government that the money would be used for the purpose for which it was being ad-

vanced. Such advances should be certified as necessary, not only by the officers of the government, but also by the councils of municipalities or of local improvement districts which have jurisdiction in the districts concerned, or possibly the executives of the agricultural societies might be utilized, because they are men who have the agricultural interest of their communities especially at heart.

Advances might be made, repayable in equal annual instalments to be collected by the local authorities. In my opinion the money required for this purpose should most certainly come from the exchequer of the Dominion, no matter how it should be decided later on to expend it for the purpose for which it is intended. The course I have suggested, of advancing the money itself instead of distributing the grain has many advantages. The distribution of the grain in itself sounds badly, because in other parts of the world it conveys the idea of something in the nature of a charity. It would not be understood in other countries, as we understand it here, that the distribution of grain is merely an advance given against the security of the land which land in itself has already been a free gift to the settler. As the value of the grain becomes a charge against the land, so the advance of money would amount to exactly the same thing, because in either case the lien would stand against the land. If the money be advanced it can be spoken of simply as a business proposition for the purpose of enabling the owner to carry on his operations, the advance being justified by the improvements he has placed upon the land. The advance of money would also have the great advantage that each individual farmer could satisfy himself as to the price and quality of the seed, which cannot be done if the government undertakes the distribution of the seed; he can make his own purchase of seed grain and deal through persons in whom he has confidence. The endorsation in each case of the municipal councils or agricultural societies would ensure that these cases were dealt with on their merits, and that the party in power did not make political capital out of the distribution. This endorsation would also ensure in any case where money was advanced that the money would only be used for the purpose of securing seed grain.

Mr. E. L. CASH (Mackenzie). Coming as I do from a section of the country which is amongst the best agricultural districts in the west, I am deeply interested in the question now before the House. Heretofore the district which I represent has produced probably the best grade of oats that has been raised in any part of Canada. This year when the grain was first harvested our oats began to be shipped out as No. 2, then they graded it to No. 3, and then to No. 4, and I think that finally all these grades were rejected. There is one peculiar thing in connection with this, and that is that since our district has been graded as a frozen district and our grain rejected, a party who shipped out a carload of No. 2 oats of the season before had them also rejected. When I was at home recently a meeting was held in my town in which this question was discussed, and the majority of the opinion at that meeting was that the seed which we needed the most was oats. This, however, refers more particularly to the district immediately surrounding Yorkton in which reside larger farmers than we have further out in the country. The fact is that the small farmer in the country, the new people who have not their homesteads for any length of time, grow wheat, and while it is true that frost does not destroy the germ of wheat as it does that of oats, the wheat has been so badly injured that there has not been any wheat to speak of shipped out of that district this year. That remark would apply to the district extending from Yorkton clear through to the extreme north. There is practically no wheat for seed in that country. The consequence is that the small farmer, the man who really requires help more than the large farmer, has not any seed grain. Now, we will need an immense amount of oats in that country, and as the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) stated, the financial conditions at present are such that even a prosperous and well-to-do former is not able to procure a dollar at the bank. I do not know whether it is any better since I left home; I know they were promised that after the New Year money would be easier, but that did not turn out to be the case and whether or not the conditions have improved very recently I do not know. I will give an instance to illustrate what I mean when I say that even a prosperous farmer cannot borrow money at the bank. A farmer came to me and wanted to borrow $700 and I told him I had no money to lend, and I was surprised that one in his condition should have to ask for a loan. He told me he would be perfectly willing to pay 12 per cent on the money, and I said to him: I do not know where you can get it, but why do you need it? He said: I owe the bank $700; I own three-quarter sections of land, the land in that country is worth $25 an acre, I have improvements upon one-quarter section in the shape of buildings and my house is worth $3,000; I have the best horses in the district sufficient to cultivate my land, and my total debts, including what I owe on the land, as well as the $700 to the bank, do not amount to over $1,500, and yet the bank is crowding me for this loan of $700. Hon. gentlemen, you will understand that the banks prior to this time have held out inducements to the leading farmers of the district offering to loan them money at a

small rate of interest; money was plentiful and they wanted to get it out among the farmers and many of the farmers were induced to borrow under these conditions thinking they could repay the bank at most any time. Then, last fall the grain was frozen, the farmers were not able to sell their grain for anything worth while; they could not sell their horses for more than half their value and then the banks came down on them for what they already owed and refused to advance them any more money. I cite this in order to show that even a farmer who is in good fair circumstances is not able to raise any money to buy seed grain, so that many of our best farmers even will be compelled to ask the assistance of the government to supply them with grain this year. It is not that the farmers are in a bad way financially, but it is that they cannot realize on what they have got to sell. Now, the mode of supplying this seed grain will, I think, have to be left to the government, or rather to the federal government and to the local government jointly. I think of necessity the money would have to come from the Dominion government, but that its distribution and management should be regulated by the local government which is in close touch with the people. I think this is a question which should be thoroughly discussed in the House. I feel quite satisfied that this government has already taken up the matter and that they are debating it in their councils. I have had some correspondence with the Dominion government and also with the local government on this question, and I find that both governments are alive to the issue and are taking necessary precautions to have a sufficient amount of seed grain furnished for the west. As the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) stated, it would be a great calamity, not alone for the west, but for the whole of Canada, if by any neglect on our part now we had two seasons' crops ruined instead of one. It is sad enough to have one season's crop destroyed. We have suffered enough already, but our people are not discouraged; they know such things are liable to happen and they are prepared to go on and put in a much larger crop next year and try to make up for the failure they have experienced this year.

Mr. THOMAS GREENWAY (Lisgar). I realize the importance of this subject which my hon. friend has brought before the House, and the necessity for doing something to assist people who cannot get good seed even if they had the money as well as others perhaps who have not the money and will doubly require the assistance. But, Sir, my hon. friend speaking referred to the 'western provinces,' and if he will permit me I would like to stand here to-day representing a western province that it is not necessary to include in this resolution or in this suggestion. I had occasion the other day to read the proceedings of a meeting that was held in Winnipeg which was attended by the Premier of Manitoba who has charge of the Agricultural Department and who knows whereof he speaks in the matter of agricultural statistics. Mr. Roblin laid before that meeting the results of the agricultural operation of less than 50,000 farmers in Manitoba last year and I will, as I remember them, give you the figures he presented. He stated that the grain that was to be sold amounted to 30,000,000 bushels of wheat at an average of 80 cents per bushel making $24,000,000; 40,000,000 bushels of oats which I think he valued at something like $12,000,000, a quantity of barley the exact amount of which I do not remember, and in addition there was about $1,000,000 for dairy products and stock.

Mr. TAYLOR. And flax.

Mr. GREENWAY. I do not think he included flax; I think he referred only to the three cereals, wheat, oats and barley. The net result was that these farmers produced last year and had to sell—because he was careful to deduct what was necessary for seed and for feed—the net result was that they had produced last year and had for sale, grain stock and dairy products to the amount of $40,000,000. Now, Sir, I do not think that is a bad showing, and I wish to make this announcement in parliament in the interest of Manitoba which I like so well. There may be small areas in the province of Manitoba where the crops have been injured by the early frost and the seed in these districts may not be very good, but speaking in a general way I do not think that any assistance is needed in the province of Manitoba. Having had some experience in former years of what we did go through in Manitoba under conditions similar to those which present themselves now in the other provinces, I am heartily in sympathy with the statements which have been made in the House to the effect that something should be done for Saskatchewan and also for Alberta if need be. The gentlemen who represent these provinces can speak as to their necessities, but, Sir, I am quite sure—and I believe my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie will agree with me—that at the present time we have in the province of Manitoba plenty of seed. Of course I do not know what future prices may do to induce people to send it out, but, there is at the present time in Manitoba plenty of seed to supply the wants of our western neighbours. It might therefore be well that the question should be taken up soon, because prices may advance and the seed wheat that is needed in Saskatchewan and perhaps in Alberta may be shipped out. I want to say to the House that the province of Manitoba is in a good position; her farmers are in a good position; I have no doubt that some

of them feel the stringency of the times, but on the whole the results of last year were very satisfactory and the assistance required in this respect in any part of the province would be very small indeed.

Mr. WM. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). I think perhaps it would be just as well not to debate this question in the House at any great length, or to dilate upon the need for assistance to the farmers in the western provinces. However, as the hon. member for Brandon has seen fit to call the attention of the House to the matter, I may be permitted to say a word or two. I am pleased to see the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) once again in his seat in this House. Since this session opened the hon. member has been absent a great deal of the time and so it is a pleasure to hear his voice once again. There was a time when the hon. gentleman was always boosting up the western country, telling us of its great possibilities and what it was capable of doing, and it is perhaps a matter for regret that he should now thus publicly declare that the conditions of that great western country are not so prosperous as they once were. I fear his statement will not have the effect that we westerners would desire. However, if the conditions be such as he has mentioned, and if the people are in need of seed grain of any kind I for one am only too anxious that their wants should be provided for. The manner in which that can be best done is a thing that should be carefully considered. As to the province of Manitoba from which I have the honour to come, I agree with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) that there is no great need for financial assistance to procure seed wheat for the farmers. In the southern portion of the province of Manitoba we never had a better quality of grain than we had this year, but I am told that in the northern part of the province the wheat has suffered in some degree from frost. If the government are going to provide seed grain I hope they will not overlook the needs of the farmers of Manitoba, as they have done on other occasions, but that they will place in the hands of the government of Manitoba the money necessary to provide for the wants of the farmers in the northern part of the province. I believe that this matter could be better dealt with by the provinces themselves. They are in a better position than the federal authorities to ascertain what the people really are in want of. The legislature of Manitoba is composed of 42 members as compared with 10 federal members; the local members are scattered all over the province and 42 of them there are better qualified to know what is really required than 10 of us who have to be in Otttawa a great part of our time. I think also that had the provinces taken this matter up it would not have been advertised all the world over that there was any necessity for such a course being taken. However, if this government is going to deal with the matter at all they should not overlook the province of Manitoba, and they should consult with the local government of that province as to what is best to be done. The member for Lisgar has said that he feels sure that the province of Manitoba does not require any assistance in this respect, but be that as it may the Dominion government should make careful inquiries before jumping at such a conclusion. There is one peculiar thing about this discussion, and that is that some gentlemen on the other side of the House seem to have changed their opinions. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) speaking a few days ago in the House made the broad statement that there was not the financial stringency in the west that members on this side of the House thought existed. The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Cash) has to-day told us of some cases which were much worse than those I felt called upon to mention to the House and which called for the contradiction of my hon. friend (Mr. Crawford). I merely rose to say that if the government deals with the matter, all the western provinces should be treated alike. I am also of the opinion that it is probably a little premature to touch on the question so publicly because we have not got the exact data before us to enable us to intelligently discuss it. The Minister of the Interior will be able to tell us whether the governments of the various provinces have made any representations to the federal government on this question, and if they have, then when we are made acquainted with them we will be better able to decide as to which is the best machinery through which this aid can reach the different farmers who need it in the western provinces.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). I appreciate the importance of the subject which the hon. member for Brandon has brought to the attention of the House. I feel however that one is apt to be misled concerning the conditions of the west if he be not personally familiar with them. Speaking more particularly of my own locality I should say that what might be called the financial yield to the farmers this year, is just about the average. It is true that we have suffered materially because of frost, but it is also true that the prices have been much better than in former years. However, the fact that the frost has injured the grain has rendered necessary some such movement as that referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Sifton). The settler may be divided into two classes : the man who has his patent and the man who has not. The men who have not their patents may be again divided into two classes. First there is the man who has come in on the land this last summer and has simply done breaking and is prepared next year to put in the seed grain. He will not find himself in any way

in great difficulty for the simple reason that he has gone homesteading prepared to buy his seed grain at some season, and having taken the money with him in the first place, he is as well prepared to buy his seed next year as he ever was. The man in the second class of homesteader who has not his patent, is the man who will this year really represent the third year settler, and he is in a more unfortunate position. He has spent practically two years on his homestead; in the second year he has probably used up all his money getting various agricultural implements and securing his seed grain, having sown that grain possibly late in the season it has been injured by frost, and it would be very unwise that he should use that grain as seed.

The quantity of grain that he has raised is not very great, and consequently, if he does market it, its marketable value is not very great. Then, he is in the unfortunate position of being without means and without seed grain. That to my mind is the man who requires some such provision as this. As he has no means whereby the provincial government, if you will, could get any lien from him as security for a loan, he being practically worth nothing from a legal standpoint, and his property being protected from seizure or lien, the only party, it seems to me, that could deal with him and make itself secure in loaning him money is the Dominion government; and the only reasonable course for this or any other government to take is simply to make him a loan at a reasonable rate of interest, and at some future time collect the loan from him. The settler who has secured his patent has gone beyond the reach of the Dominion government, if you will, and it would have to go into the collection business on a rather difficult scale if it loaned money to him. If the course suggested should be taken, some arrangements could be made between this government and the provincial government whereby the provincial government would guarantee to the Dominion government the repayment of the money loaned. As regards the quantity of grain spoiled in that country by frost, it is difficult to estimate. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) will agree with me that in southern Alberta this question has not arisen at all, as the farmers there have had a better year than usual; but in northern Alberta, where we grow vast quantities of oats, this has been injured by frost. The early oats escaped entirely. There was a certain percentage quite as good as in other years, and a certain percentage, the damaged, fairly good to market. But this class of oats is not satisfactory for seed. We had an experience three years ago of sowing oats that seemed to be up to the standard, though slightly damaged by frost, and the result was that a crop was spoiled. Consequently the farmers this year will not take any risk, but must be absolutely assured that the oats they sow are immune from frost. Then there have been the late oats, which were practically ruined by the frost. We have these three classes of grain in northern Alberta. With us wheat is a minor crop. If this government undertakes to supply seed grain to the farmers in northern Alberta, oats will be required in greater quantity than wheat. I trust that something will be done to relieve the condition. The financial condition is not so terrible to the ordinary farmer. The farmer who has been there for years and is holding grain has good seed grain. But the homesteader who has not his patent, particularly the man in his third year, is in a position that requires the attention of this government.

Mr. J. A. HERRON (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, my district has been alluded to as being fortunate this year in its crop. I agree with the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) that we have been very fortunate in the southern part of Alberta this year. I think our grain crop has been very nearly up to the average, in some parts even a little above the average, though there may be isolated cases which should be taken into consideration by the government and where assistance of the kind proposed might perhaps be given with advantage. In the northern part of the province the crop this year was light, particularly the oat crop; I understand that if oats are the least bit frozen, they are not fit for seed. Wheat, on the other hand, even if considerably touched by frost, will give a very fair yield. As to the classes of men to whom assistance should be given, I do not think we should single them out, whether they have been there one year, two years or three years, or even got their patents. I think, if assistance is given, it should be given to those who require it, no matter how long they have been in the country. It might be given on the recommendation of local associations such as the agricultural societies or the local improvement commissioners, who are representative farmers in the different localities. As this assistance is urgently needed in many instances, I am prepared to give my support to the resolution.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, last fall I had the privilege of addressing the Canadian Club in Winnipeg soon after the frosts had visited certain parts of the Canadian Northwest, and on that occasion I made some reference to the desirability of some authority, whether the Dominion government, the provincial governments, or the agricultural societies, taking the matter up and seeing that the farmers of the Northwest, especially the small farmers whose grain was unfit for seed, should be provided with seed on some fair

basis. To my mind the federal authority is the proper authority to act in the matter. A great many farmers who went in last year and had five or ten acres broken up—and unfortunately they usually select the low, flat lands instead of the hills—lost their seed, and therefore have nothing to sow next spring. I do not know that there is much to be said about the matter. It is simply a matter of this government coming to the assistance of the people who are unable to get grain for seed next spring. They have not the ready money with which to purchase seed, and neither they nor their neighbours have grain fit for seed, and the only solution that occurs to me is for the federal government to step in and supply them with seed through some properly constituted authority. A great many farmers whom I saw said to me that their oats were only a little nipped by the frost and would be all right for seed, not knowing that oats which are merely touched with frost will not germinate and under no circumstances should be sown. I presume that the province of Manitoba, which has got beyond the frost period, could supply ample quantities of grain for seed. In the two new provinces, where the ground has been broken up to any great extent, especially on the east side or the south side of the lakes or on the hills, the grain has not been frozen. In the latter part of September last I saw excellent grain on the hills, while in the hollows immediately below, wheat and beans had been frozen two or three weeks earlier. I merely wish to add my word of commendation to the proposal that has been made, in the hope that those farmers in the Northwest who are found to be in need of seed grain should be supplied with it on some fair and proper basis.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Because of some experience of almost similar conditions in Ontario, I would like to say a few words on this question, for I think there are more things to be done than simply providing the grain. The next question is where the grain is to come from. I imagine that the country itself could supply a large portion of the grain that is needed. We have heard it said by some of the hon. gentlemen coming from that country that in their districts the frost did not do much damage, and I apprehend that the grain in that locality would be all right. We noticed from the government test that about 40 per cent of the oats will not grow, and about 60 per cent will grow. I presume some of it would be so bad that it would not grow. This indicates the necessity, when you use grain that is partially frozen, of sowing a double quantity of seed. I recollect that was done in the locality where I was raised many years ago. The grain was frozen year after year, much of the grain was not viable, but if you increased the quantity of seed you had a fairly good crop. I think it is necessary that the government or some one else should see to it that the grain that is needed to be used for seed should be tested, and a certificate given as to the percentage that will grow. It is a fact that oats seem to suffer more from frost than wheat. I remember seeing frozen wheat sown frequently and producing a fairly good crop, but oats will not do so well. However, as oats in Manitoba are not frozen, they could be supplied from that province. I think the farmers ought to be assisted, and that the government should provide parties to test the grain all over that country that is intended to be used for seed, and whatever grain is supplied by the government it should be tested and a certificate given along with it.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), that this is a matter of great importance, not only to the Northwest but to all Canada. I think the general opinion of those acquainted with the facts is that there will be a great shortage of suitable seed grain in the coming year. There is also difficulty in procuring a high quality of grain in Manitoba and the Northwest this year. Millers are buying up that grain as fast as they can get it, and within a month or two there will probably be no grain fit for seed except what the millers hold. It is important that steps should be taken at once to secure a sufficient quantity of grain for seed, and to have that grain distributed at points where the farmers can get it. That is more important than the question of advancing money. It is quite likely that a good many farmers will require assistance if they are to sow their land this year. The first thing to be done is to see that there is a sufficient quantity of suitable seed grain. I have heard it stated within the last few days by men who ought to know, that seed grain will have to be brought from the south of the line if we are to have sufficient good seed to satisfy the wants of the farmers this coming season. If that is the case, it is all the more important that what grain we have in our own Northwest suitable for seed should be secured. As regards the government advancing money to the settlers, I object to any class of people being spoon fed. If the government advances money directly to these farmers, we know that whatever government is in power will be beset by similar claims for assistance in the future. I think if the government decides, as they should in some way or another, to advance money to enable seed to be bought, they can find in Winnipeg and other western towns trust companies whose managers have a thorough knowledge of the country, and with sufficient resources, and I would suggest that the money be advanced through some such source and

be treated simply as a business proposition. Let these companies advance the money on security of the grain and crops, and let them do the collecting so as to make it purely and simply a matter of business.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatchewan). Within the last week I have returned from a trip to the west, and while I was there I took some pains to ascertain if there was any necessity for additional seed grain in my own riding. I saw quite a number of persons whom I regard as representative, and I can bear testimony that as far as my own riding is concerned there is no considerable demand for seed grain. I am not in a position to state that there will be none, I am not giving the result of my observation. There is danger, of course, of magnifying the situation as to the lack of seed grain, and there is also danger that some parties might endeavour to boost the reputation of their own district for good crops. I have received a copy of a resolution passed by the Battleford Board of Trade which points out the necessity for the distribution of seed grain amongst the farmers. But the object of the resolution is to call the attention of the government to the fact that in the district of Battleford there is plenty of good seed grain available for purchase. When the Minister of the Interior was in the west this summer he visited the districts south and west of Saskatoon, which are known as the Goose Lake country, and I accompanied him. He will bear me out in saying that in a journey of some fifty miles during which we got samples from nearly every farmer who was bringing grain into town, we saw what appeared to be first-class grain, very little indeed of which was frosted. If it is the intention of the government to purchase seed grain, I would recommend the Goose Lake district as being a favourable one for that purpose. I only mention this to show that it is a good district, not as being better than many others in the west. The fact is that in that district there is a great quantity of first-class seed grain for sale to-day. There are no railway facilities in the district, and the farmers for a distance of over a hundred miles southwest of Saskatoon are without railway facilities, and as they have had very good crops last year, they have a good deal of grain on hand. I am sure that if it becomes known that there is a demand for seed grain, the higher prices which may be paid for the special article will induce them to bring the grain in. I am impressed with the necessity of putting tested seed grain into the hands of the farmers, and not any kind of grain which the farmers may think will be good enough. That is a reason why the money should not be given to the farmer himself. No matter by what authority the distribution is made, care should be taken that the proper kind of seed is distributed. Unfortunately in some of the districts where there is need of seed grain, some of those who need it are not experienced farmers, and those who need it most are liable to buy almost any old stuff. I think I may say that in the district I have the honour to represent there is no demand at the present time which would necessitate the government coming to the assistance of the farmers. The government may have to deal with individual cases. I am glad attention has been called to the matter, and I think this discussion will do good in acquainting the members of the House generally with the facts of the situation.

Mr. J. CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). This is a matter of great importance to the whole of Canada. I am safe in saying that I have grown more crops in the Northwest country than any other person in this House. I have before me a copy of the report of the tests made by the seed grain department. This report covers the tests of some 641 samples. So far as wheat is concerned, the tests for practically the whole country where wheat is grown average pretty high. Wheat must be pretty badly frozen to prevent it from germinating when planted. My own experience is that I have planted wheat even when it was black, and have produced good crops from it. In the tests to which I have referred I notice that Manitoba is very high—almost 100 per cent. In the western provinces, of course, it varies more, but, where good results are not gained, I think it is often because the seed is not well cleaned. My experience is that where wheat is reasonably well cleaned, where the lighter grains are fairly well fanned out of it, almost any kind of wheat will grow. In that western country, wheat tests fairly high even in the frozen districts. That concerning which the people should be most particularly warned in relation to seed is not to sow frozen oats. Great care should be taken in the choice of oats. I have known farmers sow oats that were first-class for milling purposes, but that would not germinate. Oats will not grow if at all touched with the frost. Barley is not so much affected by the frost. I fancy there is not the danger from the want of seed in the western country that may now appear. Of course, I would not recommend farmers of the west to sow frozen wheat if they can get sound wheat. It is always preferable to sow the best seed you can get. But it may not be handy to get sound wheat, and I fancy that there will be little difficulty in getting a reasonable sample of frozen wheat. As to frozen wheat, there is one point that must be carefully guarded against. Frozen wheat, under almost any conditions is very liable to heat, and grain that is heated the least bit is practically destroyed for seed purposes. Farmers may have a fairly good quality of grain in their granaries, but, if it is heated at all it will

not grow. I know the case of a farmer in my locality who bought seed wheat for 150 acres. The sample looked all right. He waited until it should have come up and found that practically none of it had germinated. He had to resow with oats. In that case the wheat was heated. I think it would be well if those who engage in the purchasing of seed grain would look over the tests made by the seed grain department. If the government is taking a hand in buying seed grain, I can only repeat that if they want grain of good quality they should come to Manitoba, and particularly to the district from which I come. We have quite a quantity of very good wheat yet. But the situation will soon change. The millers and grain men are buying up the grain as fast as they can get it, and in a very short time there will be very little grain of first-class quality available for seed purposes. As to the financial situation to which reference has been made, I can only say that so far as the locality from which I come is concerned, the banking institutions have been quite liberal and reasonable in acceding to the demands made upon them. I need not repeat what I said on this subject the other day.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON (Selkirk). I am pleased to be able to say that in the Northeast portion of Manitoba we had very good crops last year—wheat all the way from 20 to 40 bushels per acre and oats from 30 to 50 bushels per acre. Still, I am aware that west of Dauphin there have been some failures. I was told of a farmer who had the threshers in to thresh his oats. When he took the first load down to the elevator, it weighed out only 9 bushels. He went back and stopped the work of the threshers. I can understand that there will be a large demand for seed oats. I agree with the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) that frozen wheat will yield as good results as sound wheat, the only difference being that more seed should be sown to the acre. I understand that in certain portions of Saskatchewan some of the farmers will be in want of seed. I do not know that I would advise the government to advance money direct to the farmers. Thirty-two years ago the Dominion government advanced $100,000 to the farmers of Manitoba for seed grain, the year after the crops were destroyed by the grasshoppers. Three years ago, I asked for a return showing the condition of those loans and found that about $30,000 of the money was still owing This shows the difficulty in the way of the Dominion government securing repayment of money thus advanced. If money is found to be necessary, the Dominion government should advance it to the provinces, and the provincial governments will take special care, by distributing through the municipalities, to safeguard the loans. This was the course pursued in Manitoba ten or twelve years ago. I know that Manitoba does not require assistance, but if the provinces to the west require it I would suggest that the advances be made to the provincial governments.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I agree entirely with the suggestion made by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) that, if this matter is to be dealt with at all, it ought to be dealt with in a business way. I have no doubt that there is a necessity for something being done, but I am quite sure it can be done on a business basis. The government should make some arrangement with a bank to lend to the grain buyers of the Northwest money to purchase the quantity of seed grain required. In every district there are grain buyers, men of responsibility and standing. These men know what seed will be required in their districts, and, if they could go to a bank and get money to purchase the grain and put it in elevator at their several points, then the farmers, of whom they are customers in the grain buying season, could come and get from the buyers the grain required for seed. The farmer would ask for ten, twenty, one hundred bushels as he might require and would agree to pay it back out of the first loads in the Fall. The businesslike way is to deal through the grain men, because they know the needs of the several localities, and besides it is to their interest to supply seed wheat, for otherwise they will not have business in the Fall. I was in the grain business for twenty-five years and supplied seed wheat to all parts of my own county. Farmers would come to me who were unable to sow their fields for want of seed, and I would supply it to them and they would pay me back in the Fall. I never lost a dollar through these transactions. The same thing could be done everywhere in the Northwest. The only difficulty is that the grain buyers may not have money enough to purchase the necessary grain for seed. Let the government make arrangements with a bank or banking firm to provide the capital necessary and the grain men will do the business and the farmers can repay the advances in the Fall. The government will run no risk for, though they guarantee the bank, they will be dealing with responsible grain men who are doing business at every point in the Northwest where seed grain is needed. And the grain men will be glad to do this business, because it is to their interest to have every farm in their districts yield a crop. All over the older provinces, the grain men have made these advances on their own responsibility and as a matter of business policy. They are all responsible men who are in the business out there ; many of them whom I know are responsible men, and they could make arrangements with their banks to advance money for this purpose.

Mr. F. C. SHAFFNER (Souris). I have no doubt that everything that is necessary has been said on this question. The point that most impressed me this afternoon is the absence of data in the speeches delivered. I am surprised that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), an old parliamentarian, in introducing this question gave so few data on which to base an intelligent discussion. I have listened very carefully to every speaker who has addressed the House and so far as I could learn there has not been one demand made upon any member of this House for seed grain. Personally I have had demands for post offices, I have had great demands for cars to move the wheat, great demands for the extension of homesteads; but I have had no demands that this government should take some action to protect the farmers in the matter of seed grain for next year. I know very well that there has been no demand from the constituency represented by the hon. gentleman who introduced this motion; in fact I quite agree with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) that there is no demand in the province of Manitoba that seed wheat should be supplied. I feel, however, that our sympathy should not be local, and if there is a demand in Alberta and Saskatchewan, I am prepared to support any measure that may be required. But I consider the method of distributing this seed wheat an exceedingly important question. I do not believe it will be wise to grant cash to the individual farmers, expecting them to secure the best possible seed wheat; I am of opinion that if we do that a great number of farmers in Alberta and Saskatchewan will want seed wheat—and so will many people who are not farmers. I think that if the Dominion government would supply the money, its distribution should be left to the jurisdiction of the local governments and perhaps, coming lower down, the municipalities should ascertain what farmers are in need of seed wheat, and that seed wheat should then be procured for them. One gentleman said that if the money was given to the farmers they could satisfy themselves as to the quality and perhaps the quantity of wheat they required. The quality is an exceedingly important question, and even if you placed the money in that way the tendency no doubt would be in some districts to sow wheat that is perhaps not suitable to procure a good crop under all conditions. As has been said here to-day in certain seasons we can sow wheat that is not up to the standard; that is when we have warm moist springs that wheat will germinate and produce a crop, but if we have a dry season it is not likely to. I agree with the gentleman who said that the wheat should be properly tested and given to the farmers rather than that the money should be given to the farmers. I think if the money were given the temptation would be for many farmers and many who are not farmers to buy more wheat than they required, and no doubt many would get wheat not up to the standard. Whilst the farmers of Manitoba will not benefit from this action, still I am in sympathy with the movement. I am sorry the gentleman who introduced the motion did not give us sufficient data to properly judge of the matter. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) is surely not tired of speaking in this House; we hardly ever hear him, and he is an old parliamentarian. This is an important question and he should have had better data to put before this House to-day; if he had not some members from that western country whose constituencies are affected, should have had better data to put before us, in order that we might know to what extent this demand is being made upon parliament. I have not heard that any one member has had any demand from his constituents that seed grain should be supplied to the farmers. However, the tendency is for all of us to speak well of our own country a very laudable thing. I may be permitted to repeat that Manitoba needs none of that help. I do not know why Manitoba has got off so well. A gentleman speaking on the other side of the House the other day said that Providence had nothing to do with these matters and perhaps, after all, Providence has had something to do with it and the Northwest is now getting some of the condemnation and this government is getting some of the condemnation that it deserves for the legislation they passed for that country three years ago. I am pleased to say that the only part of that territory which has not received that condemnation is that part represented by my hon. friend from Southern Alberta, whose district has escaped the frost, and who opposed the legislation referred to, so I cannot help thinking that, after all, perhaps Providence has had something to do with this.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) does not represent all the southern part of Alberta; I have the honour to represent many hundreds of thousands of square miles in that province myself.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You are all right too.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no frozen wheat in your district?

Mr. KNOWLES. In that part of my district which is in Alberta, they grow excellent wheat and oats and there is no frozen wheat that I ever heard of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Tories are frozen there.

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, that frost occurred about the time the hon. the leader of

the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was making his tour of the west.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. There was a frost about two weeks before we arrived, but from our advent in Manitoba on the 16th of December, until we left the west, there was never a sign of frost nor even a drop of rain; there was brilliant sunshine throughout the whole time.

Mr. KNOWLES. I withdraw my statement; I got the two frosts mixed up, the political and the weather.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Members of the government were there a few days before.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of the Interior was there two weeks before we were, and the hon. member accompanied him in his trip to the frozen district.

Mr. KNOWLES. I might take the same exception to that statement as the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) took to mine, that it is not in accordance with facts, although it is said in good humour and is not of importance. The Minister of the Interior and myself went through a portion of my constituency which is 350 by 204 miles in extent, and there was very little frost in the districts which we traversed. In fact the Moosejaw and Swift Current and Maple Creek districts escaped the frost generally speaking and had excellent crops.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You could not have gone very far into Northern Alberta.

Mr. KNOWLES. We went far enough to find that no harm, but rather good, had been done to us by the trip of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That was two weeks later.

Mr. KNOWLES. Since that has been brought up, the Minister of the Interior and myself were on different occasions in the same towns as the leader of the opposition. We went to hear him and heard the statements he made 'while in the west.'

Mr. J. D. REID. And did not dispute them, said they were correct.

Mr. KNOWLES. If the Minister of the Interior said they were correct he certainly made a statement in which I could not agree.

Mr. J. D. REID. He did not deny them when the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked any gentleman in the audience to deny them.

Mr. KNOWLES. That would have kept him too busy. I was going to reply to the suggestion of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) whose plan was that the money should be given to the grain buyers and they should handle this matter in a commercial way arguing that the grain buyers were men of such probity and commercial honesty that no man should take exception to their being entrusted with this great sum of money—because it will be a vast sum that will relieve the condition of affairs which has been brought to the attention of the House this afternoon. With all respect to the hon. members I think that is a suggestion which should not be entertained. The farmers have not that confidence in the grain buyers which my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) indicates. My hon. friend states that for thirty years he has been supplying people in his county with seed grain. We must remember that the grain buyers are not members of parliament, they are not in politics, they are not living in that intimate and friendly relationship which exists between a member and his constituents, and without saying anything abusive of grain buyers I might say there is the very gravest and most serious suspicion in the minds of many of the farmers with regard to the commercial honesty of the grain buyers. So I would raise my voice in protest against this proposal. The trouble will be to find a feasible, practicable and economical way of dealing with the very serious condition of affairs of which we have spoken this afternoon. One great point of difficulty will be to tell just how we are going to draw the line. I think it would be easy to say that the homesteader, being in a sense a ward of the government, having been encouraged by the government to come there, being on land which still belongs to the Dominion should receive encouragement and assistance from the government without question, and that such aid should be administered by the Dominion government. But what are you to do in such a case as that mentioned by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) who tells of a constituent of his with three quarter-sections of land, 480 acres, worth $25 an acre, figuring to a very large sum, $12,000, who cannot secure enough money from the financial institutions to go into the market to buy grain. The fault there seems to lie with the financial institutions. The problem is largely a financial one, how to finance the great industry of that country. It is a problem in which the Minister of Finance might help us by taking into consideration whether it would not be possible in some way to have control, by commission or otherwise, over the financial institutions, so that they shall not pursue the course they pursued last year. I know that banking is an intricate science, and I hesitate to make any charges against them, but two years ago, the banks were literally inviting people to go to them and take money and leave their notes. But recently, just as suddenly as you could right

about turn, if the notes were not paid at maturity—and they were drawn by the banks on short terms—the banks took the position that the farmer must first of all make payment of these notes, instead of continuing their former policy of allowing the loan to be continued in accordance with the understanding when the notes were made. They say the farmers must immediately meet the obligations. During the last few years, the banks were dotting the prairies with their branches. They went to almost every town ; when there were one or two elevators there they established their branches opposite to them, and would invite people to come and borrow money as well as to make their deposits; but they no longer do that, they took advantage of the confidence that the people had placed in them, they took advantage of the readiness of the people to do business with them, according to their invitation, and have got them into that position to-day where they can dictate what terms they like. I believe that the Bank of Commerce—and I do not wish to say anything against any bank, if anything my desire would be to be friendly to this bank—declared a dividend at their annual meeting of some seventeen and a half per cent on a capital of——

Mr. SPROULE. That was their net earnings.

Mr. KNOWLES. I did not understand it that way, I thought it was their dividend. In any event a bank which effects net earnings of 17½ per cent is surely doing an extremely profitable business and should be slow to unduly press the farmer. Anyway there is very little question that the banks are in very intimate association with these very grain buyers to whom my hon. friend from Leeds has referred, and the influence that has been brought to bear on the banks is not in the interest of the farmers but of the grain exchange, the railway companies, and similar highly financed concerns. It has been suggested that the money should be advanced to the homesteader. That gives an illustration of the many difficulties which this case presents. Are all homesteaders in such a relationship towards our country that they are sure, after receiving that money, to stay in the country ? I am not saying that in my riding there is a man who would do what is not right, but there are a great many homesteaders, say in Alberta who might take that money and not spend it for the purpose for which it was given by the Dominion government. Then would they be always sure to procure a perfect kind of grain when buying on the open market, perhaps from a friend or under pressure or in connection with a deal, because there is nearly always a deal out there when anything is purchased. Is there not a chance that they would thus procure wheat, and especially oats, of inferior quality ? Where will you draw the line ? Will you give assistance to the man with a farm worth $12,000 ? Will you appropriate out of the Dominion treasury money that belongs equally to the fishermen in Nova Scotia, the lumberman in British Columbia, the miner and agriculturist in Ontario, and every other province, money which belongs to many poor struggling people. Is it right that a man worth $12,000 should have money given to him that he may go out and buy wheat when that money belongs not to him or to the province of Manitoba, but to the Dominion of Canada ? Again there are no men in my county worth $12,000 who would want to borrow money, they would get along themselves. Is it reasonable to expect the hard-working people of the other provinces to finance men who are worth $12,000? Surely we can find some other egress from the difficulty than that. The railways have every motive to assist. I am sorry to say that a great deal of the good wheat has left the country, many of the good oats have come east. It may be possible to draw some of them west again, a most inconvenient and costly way of doing business. Might not the request be made by the railways of the government to contribute towards the relief of the situation by free freight on such grain, in placing at the railway station, free of freight charges, the grain necessary for seed? It must be remembered that the railways have every reason to assist in relieving this situation, as it is as much to their interest as to the interest of the government or the country at large.

Mr. TAYLOR. So it is to the grain buyers.

Mr. KNOWLES. That would mean that the interests of the grain buyers and the settlers are identical. I repeat that it may perhaps not be in order to discuss that as it would come up more regularly in discussing the report of the Royal Grain Commission ; but I think their interests instead of being identical are diametrically opposed. Thus I say, representing as I do, a very large wheat growing district, some very few parts of which may need aid, I see the vastness of the problem and the many millions required. While I am alive to these difficulties I am heartily in sympathy with the spirit of the proposition to grant assistance.

I understand the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) to say that it should not be administered through the provincial governments and if I heard my hon. friend from Macdonald aright (Mr. Staples) he was of the opinion that it should be done through the provincial governments.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said that the money should be supplied by the Dominion government.

Mr. KNOWLES. Exactly. I think the hon. member expressed his view as being against the administration of this matter by the provincial government.

Mr. LAKE. I did not express any opinion on the subject.

Mr. KNOWLES. Very good. I understood the hon. gentleman otherwise. In any event with regard to the dealing with the homesteader, who, I think, is the ward of the government, whose necessities are the most pressing. I am convinced that aid should be given, and if assistance can be given to those having title to their farms, I think this should be done through the provincial governments. I believe, in any event, I could in that respect agree with my hon. friend for Qu'Appelle if he had expressed the same opinion as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples).

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I would have preferred had some less public means been adopted to afford the relief that members from the west state it is necessary to be afforded to certain numbers of people in the west who are troubled by lack of good grain for seed than to have it discussed in the Dominion parliament. While it will draw the attention of the government to the matter, it will also attract the attention of a great many people not only in our own country but beyond the confines of Canada and possibly serious injury may be done from an immigration point of view. Sometimes speeches of this character which have been made by certain hon. gentleman in this House, have been utilized in the immigration literature of the United States very much to our own detriment and for that reason I would have preferred had some less conspicuous measure been used for the purpose of securing relief, possibly by quiet negotiations between the officials of this government and the provincial governments in order that money for seed grain might be provided for settlers who are in need of it. I do not think that this is the time or the place to enter into a discussion about banks or to enter into a tirade against the grain men. Some hon. gentlemen opposite, the other day, expressed their sentiments in a rather contrary manner to that which is expressed here to-day. They referred to the Canadian banks as the bulwarks of our country which have prevented the financial stringency from bearing as heavily on us as on the country to the south, owing to the superiority of our methods of banking. However this is not an occasion to criticise the banks for any remissness in regard to this financial stringency nor is it the occasion for adverse criticism of the grain men of Canada. I think it was a serious reflection on my hon. friend's colleague from Portage la Prairie, who was engaged for many years in the purchase of grain, to refer to them in such uncomplimentary terms. My hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) seemed to think that the tour of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to the west had not caused much trouble to the Liberals ; but I notice that as soon as the leader of the opposition arrived in the east a great cry went up from the western members of the Liberal party that the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) accompanied by his colleagues, must next year make a tour of the west to counteract the effect of the tour of the leader of the opposition. Speaking as my colleagues have spoken, of my own province, I am pleased to say is in a very favourable position so far as last years' crop has been concerned. Southern Manitoba, as one of my colleagues has rightly said, has had a splendid crop this year, although the quantity has not been as great as we have known in some years. But so far as quality and prices are concerned, it has been very remunerative to the majority of the farmers. The part of the province of Manitoba that has suffered the most has been the northwest part. In fact, one locality in my own constituency has, I think, been as hard hit as any other portion of the province. I heard the local representative of that district state in a speech in the local legislature last week that the farmers there were so hard hit that some of them would have to import their seed grain. But that did not necessarily mean that they were not in a position to purchase their seed grain. On the contrary, I think that nearly all the farmers in that constituency who were hardest hit by the frost are in a position to purchase their seed grain, although a considerable number of foreigners are located in that constituency, people who would probably be not in as good condition to purchase seed grain as many of the other settlers. In the province of Manitoba there is no great outcry on this subject. I have not received a single appeal or letter urging the question to be brought up in this House. Still I do not wish to take a merely provincial view of the matter. I wish to consider the interest of the other provinces where the people have been less fortunate. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has been on a visit to Winnipeg where certain of his friends whom he met brought this matter to his attention. He was not among the farmers who could have spoken authoritatively on the subject. I am going to give the hon. member credit of being animated by the most philanthropic motives in bringing this matter up. It may be, however, that some of his advisers were not animated solely by motives of that character, because we are led by past experience to believe that if seed grain is distributed ac-

cording to certain methods, through immigration agents for instance, it may be used not only for relieving the distress of the farmers, but also as a political lever in the next general election. If my information is correct, another member who has recently being touring his constituency, the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), has made pledges to the farmers there that he was going to secure for them seed grain. Whether or not he had authority from the government to make that pledge I am unaware. At any rate, some of his friends are making that a lever to advance his political interests, and I can see how the distribution of seed grain would be open to this objection if it were done by certain methods. I understand that in the province of Manitoba the municipalities have authority to sell seed grain and to take a lien on the first crop as security for payment. It is true there are many localities in the Northwest which are not formed into municipalities and they have not this advantage. But wherever it can be done, I think the distribution should be done through the municipal authorities, as they are in the best position to judge to whom the grain should be distributed. It would prevent the government being imposed upon by those who are well able to purchase their own seed grain, and it would avoid the distribution being used to the advantage of either political party. I think the government would be in a better position to furnish the seed grain than to allow individuals to purchase it indiscriminately wherever they pleased, and it cannot be too strongly impressed upon those supplying it that all kinds of seed grain should be thoroughly tested. It is known that grain, though frosted, will germinate; still the risk is too serious to sow inferior grain. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat objects to money being granted instead of grain, because the people might use it for other purposes than the purchase of seed grain. I agree with him that it is open to that objection unless it is hedged around with certain safeguards, such as requiring from the recipient a certificate that seed grain has been purchased to represent the amount of money received. I might also point out that the other system is also open to objection. I understand that in some instances seed grain that has been given in the past has actually been sold by unscrupulous farmers who wanted money more than the grain. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) has suggested the possibility, in the event of money being granted, of it being given to a man who might be worth $10,000 or $12,000. There is no necessity of giving such a man either money or seed grain, as he is in a position to buy his own seed grain, and the authorities who have the distribution in hand should see that no man who is rated as worth $10,000 or $12,000 should be given seed grain. I am very glad that the question, having been brought up, has been discussed with such moderation, and I trust that whatever grain may be distributed may be given to parties who are really in need of it. So far as my own province is concerned, I am glad to say that no great quantity is required, although I do see that the distribution may be made so as to be of advantage to the country at large.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, I had not the privilege of listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) this afternoon. I was not aware that this question was coming up, as there is no notice of it on the Order Paper or that any demand had come from the west for seed grain. However, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches which have been made by various hon. members from western constituencies. I agree with them that this is a very important question. Any question which can induce the hon. member for Brandon to spend an hour a month with us in this House must be an important question. However, I find myself in very much the same position as the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). I have heard of no demand for seed grain from the section of country which I have the honour to represent and I think it is to be regretted that this question has been brought up in the House with so little information before the House upon it. Surely there has been ample time for the government to have made a thorough investigation in the different localities and to have ascertained what localities required assistance of this kind. This matter was brought up in this House on Dec. 16 by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in a question put to the Minister of the Interior, and he was informed that the government had taken this matter up with the government of the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is the duty of the government, in view of what has transpired through the press and in view of the correspondence they have received, to make a full investigation in order to ascertain in what localities in the Northwest there is need for seed grain. For my part I have received no information from Southern Alberta to lead me to believe that the crop in that district has been a failure, and I have received no demand for seed grain from the constituency of Calgary. In answer to the hon. member for West Assiniboia, who has seen fit to introduce into this discussion something entirely foreign to it, I wish to assure him that he need not worry about the success of the tour of the hon. leader of the opposition in the west. I would recommend him to wait until the harvest comes, and then it will be time enough for him to make his boastful remarks.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would recommend my hon. friend to wait until our hon. leader

visits the west next summer and then we will show him what a reception to a leader is.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. member introduced this question in the discussion, and if it is worrying him it is not worrying us. He had better wait till after the results are seen, and then he may criticise the results. The leader of the opposition had no sooner left the boundaries of Alberta than Liberal candidates were placed in every constituency, and a canvass was entered upon all over the constituencies by Liberal speakers brought in from the outside. He suggests also that difficulties may arise in the administration of the scheme which has been suggested by the hon. member for Brandon. I think he had better consult his own friends, who were in power between 1874 and 1878 and learn how they handled the soup kitchens in those days. I would suggest that in the administration of this scheme there should be absolutely no discrimination. You ought not to discriminate between the man who has only just got his homestead, and the man who has only served one or two years for his patent. It is a well known fact that the nearer a man is to getting his patent, the greater are his borrowing powers. I would object therefore to the proposal to furnish seed grain to a man because he has been there for one or two years, and refuse it to a man who has been there longer, but who has had some opportunity of fortifying himself against the occurrence of this misfortune, if any. The test should be, does he need it, the date of his arrival there is immaterial.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Everybody regrets that there should be any occasion for such a discussion as this in the House, but since the occasion exists, it is perhaps just as well that we should meet it and discuss it fully. Everybody will agree that it is of the highest importance that every acre of land that can be seeded in the Northwest next year, should be seeded. The year has not been altogether favourable, and it will be doubly unfortunate if, for lack of good seed, there should be a partial failure during the coming year. This matter has been receiving the attention of the government for some time. It is well known that ever since last spring there was a prospect of a failure in certain parts of the west, and the possibilities were exploited in the newspapers of this and other countries to an unfortunate extent. But though the spring was late, the season progressed favourably, and up to a certain point there was an appearance—I say it advisedly—of the best crop that was ever harvested in that western country. But unfortunately the result did not justify the hopes that had been inspired by the favourable appearance, and owing to unexpected changes in the climatic conditions, there has been a partial failure. I spent a considerable part of the summer in the west, and believe, I am fairly familiar with the circumstances. It has been said by some hon. members that so far as Manitoba is concerned there is no need of any assistance, although there may be small areas or individual cases where there has been a loss of crop. There is no doubt that the provincial government, with the aid of its municipal institutions, is amply able to cope with any difficulty of that kind. I have no doubt that the government of Manitoba, and the members of parliament in this House who represent Manitoba, would much prefer under these circumstances that the province should deal with the conditions as they exist within its boundary. But in the province of Saskatchewan, a small area has been perhaps the most unfortunate of any part of the west. In the eastern part of Saskatchewan considerable damage has been done, there was a considerable loss of crop, and consequently there is a considerable need of assistance or of some measures being taken by the proper authorities to ensure that the land may all be seeded next year. In southern Alberta the crop of last year was all that could be reasonably expected or desired. In Northern Alberta there was damage done somewhat to the same extent as in the eastern part of Saskatchewan. Therefore we have to deal with the circumstances in eastern Saskatchewan particularly and in northern Alberta. The remainder of the country has yielded a fairly good crop, and with the enhanced prices is I think in a fairly good financial condition, possibly as good as it was last year. The returns of the crops grown show that while there is not as large a yield as last year, the prices received give an equal value with the crop of last year. That would indicate that if there was as much money received for the crop this last season as the season before there would be no special conditions to be dealt with on that ground. But unfortunately the lightning struck in certain places. In some places there is a total destruction, and in other places there is a serious partial destruction, and in still other places the crop is either normal or above normal. It is, as we say, 'patchy;' and while on the whole, the crop return was not discouraging, in individual cases and by districts there are conditions which require to be met. The man who has reaped a good crop does not give of his abundance to his needy neighbour, or the fortunate district to the neighbouring district where there is a lack. It is the business either of the individuals who are injured to care for themselves, or of the authority which represents them either municipal, provincial or federal to care for themselves. It is much to be de-

sired that Saskatchewan and Alberta should be able to deal with the situation as well as Manitoba is. If these two provinces could deal with the question provincially, it would be very much better than that the Dominion should deal with it. But in Saskatchewan there are two serious differences from the conditions that prevail in Manitoba. There is a much greater area of damage to be provided for, and at the same time there is no municipal organization to deal with the question. I think in the whole province of Saskatchewan there is only one, or possibly two, organized rural municipalities, the remainder of the country is organized into what is called local improvement districts, where taxes are levied for the purpose of improvement of roads, and for that purpose only. There is no such organization as pertains to a municipality that could undertake to raise money to provide for the purchase of grain and its distribution to those needing it. The same remark applies to Alberta, except that in Alberta I think there is no rural municipality at all. But in Alberta the damage has not been nearly so great. While this government has taken cognizance of the conditions, it was desirable in the first place to show that it was not the wish or the will of the provinces to deal with the matter as a provincial question. Everybody will agree that if that could be done, it would be very much better. Therefore we have discussed this matter with the provincial governments and I may say that up to this moment we have not arrived at a definite conclusion as to the measure of responsibility to be assumed respectively by the provinces and by the Dominion. Whether the responsibility should be apportioned in lesser or greater degree in any case, there will have to be co-operation between the Dominion government and the provincial government. As a result of negotiations that have been in progress for some time, the representative of the provincial government of Saskatchewan will be in Ottawa within a day or two, and the matter will be discussed, and, I hope, a conclusion will be reached.

In the case of Alberta, we are dealing with the government, and there is a possibility that, owing to the lesser area of damage and the lesser degree of damage, there may be a different arrangement arrived at than that made in the case of the province of Saskatchewan. But, while we are discussing with the provincial government the arrangement as to responsibility, we have been taking cognizance of the conditions in other ways. The commissioner of immigration has been in the west for some time with a view to inquiring on the ground into the conditions and familiarizing himself with the best means of meeting the conditions as he finds them. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) the seed testing branch of the Department of Agriculture has had this matter under consideration since harvest and has made a very large number of tests of grain. The results are available for use, in fact, they are published in the press, and they give, at any rate, a foundation of information that, I am sorry to say, in other respects, up to the present time, is, to a great extent, lacking. That is to say, we receive abundance of suggestion and advice, but very little accurate information; and it is information that we find most necessary and are most anxious to receive. However, the information is in process of being gathered; the arrangements with the provinces are being made; the railway companies are being communicated with, with a view to securing their best assistance in meeting the difficulty; and we hope that in due time, measures will be taken to that end.

One of the speakers on the other side of the House has suggested that there is a possibility of political advantage in the handling of this question. So far as my knowledge of the matter has gone, I am afraid that the political advantage is all with our friends on the other side. The question is so intricate and difficult, there is such a demand for satisfying everybody and such an almost absolute assurance of pleasing nobody, that, aside altogether from the fact that conditions are in themselves unfortunate, I look upon the necessity for action as being politically unfortunate as well. However, the government exists to govern and to meet conditions as they arise according to ability and judgment. We hope, measurably at any rate, to meet the conditions which exist. And we hope, after all, to get fair criticism from our friends on the other side for our efforts in meeting these conditions. I do not think our friends opposite are as biassed politically as they sometimes lead the House to suppose. I hope that, if we deal with this matter according to the circumstances and possibilities, we shall receive credit for having done so. If we can measurably meet the conditions with a measurable degree of satisfaction, I think we shall be doing, very, very well.

In regard to the financial and other questions that have been raised, I do not know that it is necessary that I should go into that side of the question particularly. But in connection with the supply of seed oats, the question is very different from that connected with the supply of seed wheat. Although there is a possibility of wheat which appears good not being good for seed, that is rather an extraordinary condition; and, in view of the very fine weather which prevailed during last fall, is not a condition we are likely to find difficulty with in the case of securing seed for the coming year. Therefore, so far as the wheat question is concerned, it is very largely a matter of finance and of detail.

But, in regard to the oats, it is quite a different affair. In the first place, the oat crop, although it was to a great extent damaged for seed purposes, was not damaged so seriously as a marketable commodity,—that is to say that there are thousands of acres that produced oats that were marketed at fair prices without there being a bushel of oats on all those thousands of acres fit for seed. But, of course, the farmers who grew the oats received the price of those oats, and are, or ought to be, in a position to procure seed in the place of what they sold, provided they can find the seed. In regard to oats, it is not so much a question of finance as it is a question of seed-testing and of securing the seed that will grow and placing it where it is required. In many cases where oats are required, the people who need the oats are able to buy them ; but in very few cases where seed wheat is required will the person who requires it be able to pay for it. It has been said that the man living on land which he owned, or to which he had a title, or which he had purchased, should be, or was necessarily, in a financial position to buy his own seed. Unfortunately, there has been a great deal of exchange of land in the west during the last two years. The rise in values has caused a great many purchases and changes of ownership to take place; and the man who has bought an improved farm, in many cases has bought it on time payments against which there stands a mortgage for perhaps almost the full value of the farm ; that man is in very little better position to pay for his seed grain than is the man on a homestead who has not the title to his land. Still, it is in the public interest, it is in the interest of every part of the Dominion, it is in the interest of every financial institution, of every commercial organization and every industrial enterprise in Canada—particularly in eastern Canada—that every acre of that western country that can be put in seed next year shall be put in seed. The welfare of these financial, commercial and industrial enterprises of this eastern Canada depends in very marked degree upon the continued increase in production of the western country. A falling off in production there would certainly be felt throughout this country very seriously. Therefore, without questioning who should do this or how it should be done—that is, without questioning too much who should do this or how it should be done—all I would ask the House to accept is that the government is aware of the conditions, that it is taking means to apportion the responsibility and to provide organization to deal with the case, and that it is to the interest of every part of the Dominion that that responsibility should be adequately met or as adequately met as possible. At the same time I ask the House to consider also the difficulties of the situation, the absolute impossibility of satisfactorily carrying out such an enterprise. I ask them to remember that it is a stupendous enterprise and I ask fair consideration in carrying it out.

I might say that this is not by any means the first occasion of such a difficulty as we are now confronted with. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) mentioned that thirty years ago there was a necessity for the supply of seed grain. That same necessity has arisen from time to time since in certain years and certain localities so that there is nothing new in the principle; but what is new is that since the last occasion when it was necessary to furnish seed grain, cultivation, production and settlement have extended so far and wide over that country that now, although the conditions are no worse proportionately than they were on previous occasions, yet owing to the expansion of the country and the extension of settlement, what was a moderate task on previous occasions is a colossal task to-day. I do not wish the House to think that there is any desire on the part of the government not to give its full confidence to the House in this connection, but I think I may trust to the members of the House to believe that while negotiations are in progress and matters are still in what I might call a formative condition, it is not desirable that the question should be gone into in too great detail.

Mr. STAPLES. Has there been any application from the farming community of the province of Manitoba for seed grain?

Mr. OLIVER. Not that has come to me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has made a very fair statement of the case, and I am sure that every member in the House would be impressed with the very great importance of having no part of the western country which is fit for seeding lie barren next year for want of a supply of proper seed. I agree entirely with what he has said as to that. There is one aspect of the case which has not been very much emphasized and which I would like to mention lest it should be forgotten, that is that the conditions which have brought about this difficulty in the western country have been of a very exceptional nature and we believe that they are not likely to occur again in the near future. There was a very late spring and a very early and severe frost. While we have had occasions like this in the past it is gratifying to know that as the years have rolled on these occasions have become less and less frequent and perhaps we may enjoy the expectation that that infrequency may become more and more marked. I entirely agree in what has been said as to the principle on which this relief should be

afforded. It should not be given, and it is not asked as a matter of charity; it is asked as a matter of necessary aid, under exceptional conditions. I was impressed as one gentleman opposite was impressed with the absolute necessity that the aid which may be given shall be given in an effective way so that there may be an assurance that the seed which shall be supplied in necessary cases shall be proper seed which the farmers can receive with a full assurance that it will be suitable for producing a crop next year.

I am glad to hear from the minister the assurance that there is not in the minds of the government any desire or intention whatever to make the occasion of any distribution of seed or assistance subserve party purposes. I would only like to say in conclusion that it had occurred to me before the Minister of the Interior spoke that possibly the aid which has been given by the government to certain banks, under circumstances the details of which we have not had up to the present time, but which we are to have later on, might have been made available for that class of farmers who have been mentioned in this debate, to whom that aid would be useful; I mean those who are in a position to buy the seed where the seed is available or can be made available. The Minister of the Interior did not allude to that aid in any way so that we are still somewhat in ignorance as to whether or not it is of a character which can be made useful for that purpose. We all recognize that the conditions must create two classes of farmers, a class who, owing to good crops in the past, are able notwithstanding the partial failure of this year's crops to provide themselves with seed for next year if it can be purchased, and secondly a class who have gone into the country in recent years and who have not yet obtained that status which would enable them to buy it, particularly in view of the money stringency which would prevent them from obtaining money although they might have obtained it in other years and under other circumstances.

So far as we on this side of the House are concerned, we would desire to cooperate with the government in furnishing, under any reasonable conditions, such aid as under a fair review of the circumstances may be found necessary to provide seed for next year's sowing.

Motion (Mr. Sifton) to adjourn, negatived.

PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS IN COMMITTEES.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom in the Public Accounts Committee for original papers to be produced and left with the clerk of the committee. Yesterday certain papers were produced by the Department of Public Works and the gentleman who brought them over told me that he had instructions from the minister to take them back immediately after the committee rose. I appeal to the government and ask them if this is to be the practice in that committee? Surely it cannot be said that where one is to examine witnesses as to the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars, the papers will be placed in his hands at the moment the meeting commences and he must then proceed to conduct the investigation. Such a condition will not permit any examination of either witnesses or papers. The practice has been, so far as I can remember, and certainly of late years, to leave all the documents there in the hands of the clerk. Members can then examine them, if necessary under his eye. Saturday is a day of which we like to take advantage to look over the papers, and if this practice is to be insisted on, it would result in any member who wishes to examine a witness being obliged to ask for a postponement in order to review the papers and then to recall the witnesses on a future day. In this case a gentleman is to be examined on Wednesday in connection with some hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of dredging. The motion is one of my own, and if on Wednesday next I am handed the papers, I will have to say I shall consume my hour in looking over the papers and ask the witness to come back another day. I ask the government what is to be the policy in that regard?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My attention has not been called to this matter; the Minister of Public Works is not in his seat, but I shall confer with him and let the hon. gentleman have his answer tomorrow.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding for the first reading of Bill No. 57 respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French republic.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, I know that it is not customary on the motion of the first reading of a Bill to discuss the merits of the Bill, but in view of an understanding that was arrived at the other day between members of the opposition and members

on this side of the House, the discussion may take place in this case on the first reading of the Bill, and especially in view of a resolution which was presented the other day and which was passed on the understanding that the discussion should take place on the first or second reading of the Bill. In the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I notice that there is one point upon which there is no difference of opinion between both sides of the House, namely, that it was absolutely necessary for us to negotiate a treaty with France, or at all events, it was advisable that such a treaty should be made. The production of Canada has been increasing so largely within the last few years that it becomes absolutely necessary that we should provide for the extension of our trade by creating new markets. It becomes then a matter of necessity for us not only to look to the markets which exist to-day, but to provide for the opening of new markets and the creation of new avenues of trade in order that our surplus production may be exported to different countries.

I may say in regard to that, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of creating new markets has been adopted by all the countries of the world. Take, for example, Germany ; at one time Germany looked only to her own market for the consumption of her products, but now the policy, well established, of the great German empire is to find, in different parts of the world, new markets for the consumption of her products. We know very well that Great Britain, by her energy and by her shipping especially, has established business connections throughout the whole world and that France, which was at one time a very pronounced protectionist country, is now looking for new markets and I may say that the masters of thought on economical questions are advising France strongly not only to look to her own markets but to make extensions elsewhere. The United States, also, is doing the same thing, is not only looking to her own market, but is creating new markets by extending her territory in different parts of the world. The policy of endeavouring to create new avenues of trade was certainly a policy which Canada could very well pursue and that is one of the reasons which induced this government last year to bring in a tariff in which an intermediate column was mentioned, the object being to to enable us to open negotiations with different countries. We could, at the beginning, have extended this intermediate tariff to some low tariff countries, like Belgium or Holland, but we found it would be absolutely impossible to do so on account of the treaty of 1893 with France. There is a clause in the treaty of 1893—clause 2—which provides that any commercial advantage granted by Canada to any third power, especially in tariff matters, should be enjoyed by France, Algeria and the French colonies. A condition was put in the treaty of 1893 providing that any advantage that we should give to any foreign country should also be given to France. I may say, although I will discuss this question later on, that no reciprocity was provided in the case of negotiations by France with other foreign powers. On the one side we had a provision that Canada was obliged to give to France all the advantages that could be given to any foreign country, but it was not provided at the same time in this treaty that France would be obliged to give Canada the same treatment that would be given to foreign countries. There was this inequality of treatment in so far as the most favoured nation clause was concerned. It was a situation most unfair to Canada because it prevented Canada entering into negotiations with any foreign country and it put us under the necessity of negotiating a new treaty with France or of cancelling or denouncing the treaty of 1893. Was it possible, under the circumstances, to denounce that treaty ? Would it have been advisable to do it? Every hon. member of this House knows that the denunciation of a treaty always creates friction, and that it would certainly have brought about friction not only between Canada and France but it would probably have brought about friction also between Great Britain and France. In view of the good relations which exist to-day between France and Great Britain, in view of the entente cordiale which was established some years ago between the president of France and our King, I say it would have been a most serious thing for Canada to have taken the step of denouncing that treaty because it would probably have contributed to a certain extent to preventing the good relations which to-day exist between Great Britain and Canada. Then, for the general reasons which I have just given and for the special reason of the treaty which existed between France and Canada, it became absolutely necessary for this government, if we wanted to do something with the intermediate tariff, to enter into negotiations with France for the arrangement of a treaty. That is the policy which was decided upon by the government and I am glad to see, by the remarks which have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for North Toronto in the speech which he made on this question, that the negotiations which have been carried on must be considered as being acceptable since, although the treaty has been in his hands for nearly two months, he has not felt justified in saying that the treaty should not be approved by the members of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the first questions that I would like to discuss before this House is the question which was rais-

ed by the hon. member for North Toronto concerning the part which Canada played in the negotiations of the treaty which was made in 1907. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has stated that the negotiations with respect to this treaty were carried on in the same way as the negotiations in relation to former treaties, but I am obliged to dissent from that view and I am pleased to be able to assert here that contrary to the precedent established in former negotiations, the representatives of the Canadian government were empowered to negotiate the present treaty without the interference of any one. It is the first time that such a thing has happened, and I am glad to say that the government of Great Britain on this occasion assented to that policy. There are some old treaties affecting Canada which are extant to-day and in which the most favoured nation treatment clause is embodied. I call them old treaties, indeed I find there was a treaty negotiated between Denmark and Great Britain in A.D. 1670 under which Great Britain agreed that the most favoured nation clause should apply not only to Great Britain but to all her possessions. There are altogether thirteen of these treaties and the last to be negotiated containing that clause was the treaty with Austria of 1876, which was a renewal of a treaty originally made many years before. There were other treaties made before 1876 providing that the most favoured nation treatment should apply not only with regard to foreign powers but also to Great Britain. These treaties are well known, they have been several times discussed in this parliament. In 1892 and 1893 we petitioned the British government to denounce the Belgian and German treaties which were in this category. These treaties were denounced, and the only treaties outstanding to-day in which the most favoured nation treatment is incorporated are the treaties entered into between the year 1670 and 1876. We are therefore pretty safe in describing these as old treaties. Since 1876 what has been the history of the negotiation of commercial treaties affecting the Dominion of Canada? Some have been negotiated by British ambassadors and some by British plenipotentiaries and representatives of Canada conjointly. In this latter class I might mention the Washington treaty of 1871, the negotiations with France in 1880 and 1882, the negotiations with the United States in 1887 and 1892, and the negotiations again with France in 1893. Now, let us inquire into the question, whether it is of importance that our commercial treaties should be negotiated exclusively by representatives of Canada. On a question of such moment I would be timorous to express my own personal view, and had I not the lessons of history before me I would hesitate to express as strong views in that regard as have been expressed by Canadian statesmen who in former years, have been engaged in these negotiations. In the light of the negotiations in respect of the Washington treaty of 1871, and of the Behring Sea treaty, and of the negotiations with regard to the Alaskan boundary, we have, I think, very good ground for claiming that the negotiation of Canadian commercial treaties should be conducted exclusively by Canadians. Canada enjoys to-day complete fiscal autonomy; we have the right to legislate to impose any tariff we like; we have the right to place whatever duties it may please us, on goods imported into Canada. Is it not advisable then that our commercial treaties should be entirely under the control, so far as negotiations are concerned, of the representatives of Canada? I have said that had I only my own opinion in support of that assertion it might perhaps not carry much weight, but I have before me the words of a man whose opinion will certainly carry great weight with gentlemen on the other side of the House. I refer to Sir John A. Macdonald who was one of the plenipotentiaries in the negotiation of the Washington treaty in 1871. Sir John Macdonald had associated with him on that occasion certain representatives of Great Britain and if we are to judge by the letters of Sir John Macdonald which are published in Pope's life of that statesman, then we may safely conclude that it is of the utmost importance that such negotiations should be carried on by Canadian representatives alone. At page 44, volume 2 (Pope's life of Sir John A. Macdonald) there is a letter written by Sir John Macdonald to Doctor Tupper, now Sir Charles Tupper, on the 29th of March, 1871, from which I quote:

> You may imagine that my position was exceedingly embarrassing. In our separate caucuses my colleagues were continually pressing me to yield; in fact I had no backers, and I was obliged to stand out and I am afraid, to make myself extremely disagreeable to them.

Writing to Sir Charles Tupper a few days later, Sir John Macdonald said (Pope's life of Sir John Macdonald, page 96):

> The British commissioners had a meeting after the adjournment and I find they were in favour of conceding the fisheries for ten years with two years notice, that is to say for twelve years certainly, in exchange for coal, salt, fish and lumber.

Another opinion expressed by Sir John Macdonald is I think very much more serious, and it is to be found at page 105 of the work to which I refer. Sir John Macdonald says:

> I must say that I am greatly disappointed at the course taken by the British commissioners, they seem to have only one thing in their minds, that is to go home to England with a treaty in their pockets settling everything, no matter at what cost to Canada.

I think there could be no stronger language than that used by Sir John Macdonald in which he stated in this letter to Sir Charles Tupper that any negotiations concerning the commercial relations of Canada alone should be carried on exclusively by Canadian representatives. Now, Mr. Speaker, we find that in 1878 the British government was asked by the Canadian government through Sir Leonard Tilley to have Sir A. T. Galt look into negotiations with France, as the policy of the Canadian government of that day seemed to be that the negotiations should be carried on exclusively by the Canadian representative. Sir Leonard Tilley's letter to the Colonial Secretary concluded as follows:—

I have therefore the honour to request that you will move the Foreign Office to put Sir Alexander Galt through Her Majesty's ambassador in Paris in such communication with the French government as will best attain the objects of the Canadian government.

Could it be expected, Mr. Speaker, that the British government would refuse to grant this request so formally made by Sir Leonard Tilley? But we find that Lord Salisbury gave instructions to Lord Lyons, who was then British ambassador in Paris, that the negotiations between the government of this country and France should be conducted by the British Ambassador, Lord Lyons. In 1874 negotiations were carried on with the United States government by Mr. Geo. Brown associated with Sir Edward Thornton, the British ambassador at Washington, with no result. I may say that in the negotiations with France which were carried on by Lord Lyons, Sir A. T. Galt assisted the British ambassador, but unfortunately those negotiations reached no result; and if you read carefully the correspondence which was laid before parliament, you will find that the reason why they were not successful was mainly that Lord Lyons asked the French authorities to grant a reduction of duties on razors and cutlery. Was it because the French authorities expected that these articles would at some time be exported from Canada to France? Certainly not; but their fear was that such a reduction of duties would give to the Sheffield cutlers a considerable advantage, and refused to negotiate any further, and the negotiations fell through. Which shows, Mr. Speaker, that it is of the utmost importance that negotiations of this kind should always as far as possible be conducted by Canadian representatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other night asserted that the negotiations with regard to the treaty of 1893 were carried on exclusively by Sir Charles Tupper. It is true that Sir Charles Tupper so stated in a letter which he sent to the Canadian government, and which is to be found at page 47 of the documents which were laid before this House in 1893. Sir Charles Tupper, in his report to Sir John Thompson, stated:—

I cannot conclude this communication without saying that while the negotiations have been carried on entirely by myself on the part of Canada, &c.

We are obliged, of course, to a certain extent to accept that statement; but I am sorry to find that the statement of Sir Charles Tupper is not substantiated by the report made by Lord Dufferin to Sir Edward Grey, then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, nor by the Marquis of Ripon, then Secretary of State for the Colonies. These gentlemen state in the most distinct way that the negotiations were carried on not by Sir Charles Tupper alone, but by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe, who was the Commercial Attaché of the British embassy at Paris at that time. Here is what Lord Dufferin wrote to Lord Rosebery on the 6th of February, 1893:

I think it is incumbent upon me to call your Lordship's attention to the skill displayed by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe in the long and difficult negotiations which they have carried on with the delegates of the French government.

The same statement is to be found in letters written by Sir Edward Grey on the 10th of February, 1893, to the Marquis of Ripon, and by the Marquis of Ripon on the 16th of February, 1893, to the Governor General of Canada. The letter is as follows:—

Downing Street, February 16, 1893.

My Lord,—I have the honour to transmit to you, for the information of Your Lordship's government, a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office inclosing a despatch from the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, reporting the successful termination of the negotiations with France in regard to Canadian trade and expressing his sense of the able manner in which these negotiations were conducted by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe.

Here is the statement of Sir Charles Tupper that the negotiations were carried on exclusively by himself, and on the next page the statement of three eminent gentlemen connected with the British government, that the negotiations were carried on by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe. It may be said: while these statements are evidently contradictory, where is the evidence that Sir Charles Tupper did not state what was absolutely correct? I have only to read the various letters which were sent by Sir Charles Tupper to members of the Canadian government to see that the statement which he made in his last letter is not supported by the letters which he had written previously.

Let us see what was done. Take this letter of Sir Charles Tupper of October 28, 1892.

In this letter to Sir John Abbott he says that he had an interview with Lord Dufferin and with him went fully into the question of Canada's trade relations with France. That was the result of the first day that Sir Charles Tupper passed in Paris. He called at the British embassy and met Lord Dufferin and Sir Joseph Crowe called upon Sir Charles Tupper at the Grand Union Hotel and went over the whole question with him. In his letter of 7th November, Sir Charles Tupper states that Sir Joseph Crowe called upon him that morning and they discussed fully the line to be taken in opening the negotiations, and a little before 4 o'clock they proceeded together to the Foreign Office where they were shortly afterwards joined by the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, who presented him to His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Let me quote Sir Charles Tupper's words:

Sir Joseph Crowe and I were then placed in communication with Mr. Hanotaux and some others, and we discussed with them the question at issue.

Here is a formal statement by Sir Charles Tupper himself, admitting that the negotiations were carried on by Sir Joseph Crowe and himself. On the 21st January we find Sir Charles Tupper saying again:

Sir Joseph Crowe and I met the French negotiators.

On the 25th of January we find him saying:

I sent our draft of the treaty, after consulting Sir Joseph Crowe, to Mr. Hanotaux.

On the 26th of January he says:

In continuation of my letter of yesterday, I may say that Sir Joseph Crowe and I met the French negotiators at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think in view of this evidence nobody can claim that the negotiations for the treaty of 1893 were conducted exclusively by Sir Charles Tupper. We have not only this affirmation in one of his letters, but we have his affirmation in several letters, and finally we have the statement of the Marquis of Dufferin who says that the negotiations were carried on not only by Sir Charles Tupper, but also by Sir Joseph Crowe. Now, Mr. Speaker, what has become of that question since? In 1895 the Marquis of Ripon sent a despatch to the governors of the British colonies in which he stated that the commercial negotiations of this nature between His Majesty and a sovereign of a foreign state should be conducted by His Majesty's representative at the court of the foreign power. This despatch was signed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, directing that in the future as in the past the negotiations for commercial treaties should be conducted by the British ambassador.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the date?

Mr. BRODEUR. June 28, 1895. Let me add that in the negotiation of the treaty of 1907 it was not thought necessary to adhere to the letter of these regulations which were laid down in the despatch of 1895, and in this case, the negotiations were left entirely to the Canadian ministers, with the understanding that if it were brought to a conclusion the British ambassador should sign the agreement jointly with the Canadian representatives. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that in view of all this evidence we find, first, that some treaties were negotiated formerly in which Canada had absolutely nothing to do; later on some treaties were negotiated by representatives of Canada with the British ambassador, and this last year for the first time in the history of Canada negotiations for a commercial treaty were carried on exclusively by Canadian representatives of this government. Canada has reached in its autonomous development a stage where the British government is generous enough to recognize that she should be entrusted entirely with negotiations for commercial treaties. It is well for me now to quote the imperial order in council which was passed on the 8th of August, 1907:

Whereas for the better treating of and arranging certain matters which are now in discussion or which may come into discussion between Us and our good friend the President of the French Republic respecting commercial relations between France and Canada, We have judged it expedient to invest fit persons with full power to conduct the said discussion on our part: Know ye therefore that we, reposing especial trust and confidence in the wisdom, loyalty, diligence and circumspection of our trusty and well beloved the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, member of the parliament of Canada, member of our Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Finance and Receiver General of the Dominion of Canada, and our trusty and well beloved the Honourable Louis Philippe Brodeur, member of our Privy Council for Canada, one of our counsel learned in the law, Minister of Marine and Fisheries of the Dominion of Canada, have named, made, constituted and appointed, as we do by these presents name, make, constitute and appoint them our undoubted commissioners, procurators and plenipotentiaries: giving to them all manner of power and authority to treat, adjust, and conclude, with such minister or ministers as may be vested with similar power and authority on the part of our good friend the President of the French Republic, any treaty, convention, or agreement that may tend to the attainment of the abovementioned end, and to sign for us, and in our name everything so agreed upon and concluded, and to do and transact all such other matters as may appertain thereto, in as ample manner and form and with equal force and efficiency as we ourselves could do if personally present: engaging and promising upon our royal word that whatever things shall be so transacted and concluded by our said commissioners, procurators and plenipotentiaries shall, subject if necessary to our ratification,

be agreed to, acknowledged and accepted by us in the fullest manner, and that we will never suffer, either in the whole or in part, any person whatsoever to infringe the same, or act contrary thereto, as far as it lies in our power. In witness thereof we have caused the great seal of our United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland to be affixed to these presents, which we have signed with our royal hand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the date of that?

Mr. BRODEUR. 8th of August.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When did the negotiations begin?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the month of July.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. About two weeks before?

Mr. BRODEUR. Two weeks before, and it was understood when we began the negotions that such an order in council would be passed, and I may say that instructions to that effect had been given to the British ambassador to allow the negotiations to be carried on entirely by the Canadian representatives.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The distinction between this case and Sir Charles Tupper's case, as I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) is that Sir Joseph Crowe went with Sir Charles Tupper. Was he a plenipotentiary ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was attaché d'ambassade, and had the same powers, in the absence of the Marquis of Dufferin, as the British ambassador.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what does the hon. gentleman depend for that statement ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It appears in the correspondence that he was attaché d'ambassade, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows that, in the absence of the ambassador, the attaché d'ambassade replaces him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But he never had power to sign the treaty ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The treaty was signed by Sir Charles Tupper and the Marquis of Dufferin, but the negotiations were carried on by the British ambassador and Sir Charles Tupper, the representative of the Canadian government. But, in the present instance, all the negotiations were carried on exclusively by the Canadian representatives, and the treaty was signed by the Canadian representatives and the British ambassador. I think this disposes of the question whether the negotiations for this treaty were or were not carried on exclusively by the Canadian representatives. I think that, as I have just said, we should be glad to acknowledge what the British government did in this instance in giving to Canada more extensive freedom in the negotiation of her own treaties.

Now, I shall refer briefly to the treaty of 1893, examining the scope of the treaty and the nature of the negotiations which led up to it. This treaty of 1893 covered only seven French articles and twenty-two Canadian articles. And I think it is not too much to say that the treaty was exclusively to the advantage of France. I have already stated that it was provided in this treaty that all the advantages we should give to any foreign power, not only in relation to the articles covered by the treaty, but in relation to anything else—we should be obliged to extend to France also ; and on the other hand, it was stipulated that most favoured nation treatment should be extended by France to Canada only in relation to the articles mentioned in the treaty. I may quote the articles of the treaty in order to make myself perfectly clear to the House. Article 1 gives the list of articles which are to enjoy the reduced Canadian duty. Article 2 then goes on as follows :

> Any commercial advantage granted by Canada to any third power, especially in tariff matters, shall be enjoyed fully in France, Algeria and the French colonies.

Article 3 gives the list of Canadian goods that were to enjoy the benefit of the French minimum tariff and then goes on to say :

> It is understood that the advantage of any reduction of duty granted to any other power on any of the articles enumerated above shall be extended fully to Canada.

So we have most favoured nation treatment general on one side and closely limited on the other—a clear inequality of treatment. But that is not the only point of inequality. It was provided in this treaty that all Canadian goods, to receive the benefit of the French minimum tariff should be shipped to some port in France But the same clause was not provided with regard to goods imported from France into Canada. France wanted to encourage her own ports and her own shipping. But we were then spending large sums in the creation of our own ports ; why, then, did not we provide for the same direct shipment that France provided for the benefit of her own ports ? Here was another clear case of inequality of treatment. There was still another point of the same kind. It was provided that Canada should never raise the duties beyond the rates fixed in the treaty. But, on the other hand, France could raise the tariff on the goods, which, under the treaty, were given the benefits of her minimum tariff. Here, then, are three points which show conclusively that this treaty of 1893 was far from being favourable to Canada.

Now, let me call attention to the articles

mentioned in the treaty. Among the Canadian articles to be given the benefit of the French minimum tariff was fresh water fish ? Eels, also, were in this list. But was it possible for us to export eels ? Have we ever had a trade in exporting eels ? Other articles were extract of chestnut, common furniture and wooden sea-going ships—all of them articles which have never been exported from Canada to France. On the other hand, among the articles excluded were salmon, cod and all our important fishes, also agricultural implements, agricultural products and minerals. But, in this treaty of 1907, which we are now discussing, we find all these articles included. We have provided for all our agricultural products, our products of the mines and of the fisheries and several manufactured products which we export or may reasonably hope to export in the future.

During the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other night, I asked him why the French government had not been ready to give us a reduction of duty on our cheese. As everybody knows, cheese is one of our greatest articles of production and export and, consequently, is one on which we should try to secure from European countries all possible concessions. It was not included under the treaty of 1893. The French government was ready to grant the concession of the French minimum tariff on Canadian cheese, but they asked what the hon. member for North Toronto called a quid pro quo. What was that quid pro quo? If the Canadian government would give a small reduction of duty on French books they were ready to give us a reduction on cheese. Was that a thing which should have been refused by Canada ? The reduction on French books, I think, instead of being a detriment would have been a benefit to our country. A large section of the people of this country are constantly using French books ; in order to complete their education they have to resort to French books, and it is advisable that education should be given as freely as possible. However, that reduction was refused by the Canadian government of that day, and I see by the correspondence which I have before me, that it was refused by Sir Charles Tupper. I may say that Sir Charles himself was anxious to give that concession; he was ready to give a reduction on French books, and obtain in return the reduction on cheese. But the matter was referred to the Canadian government, to the then Minister of Finance and the answer came that the concession would not be given, that it was impossible to grant a reduction of duty on French books, and consequently Canada had to abandon the prospect of a reduction of the French treaty on cheese. I was surprised that my hon. friend the other night was not ready to make the admission that he had practically refused an offer of the admission of cheese to the French market.

Coming to the treaty which is now before this House, I think my first duty is to express to the British authorities my appreciation of the freedom they have granted to us for the conducting of these negotiations. We were also received by the French government in the most courteous way. We arrived in France in the month of July, near the end of a very arduous session, and I was under the impression that the members of the French administration would not be very anxious to negotiate a treaty with us after a long session like that; but they were kind enough to stay there for three months in order to carry out the negotiations which have resulted in the treaty which is now submitted to the consideration of this House. I may say also that they have been kind enough to recognize not only during the negotiations but also in the exposé des motifs which has been placed before the French chamber, the sympathy which exists between Canada and France. They have been kind enough to mention in different places the bonds of sympathy which exist between Canada and France, and it is probably due to that fact that we were successful in making a treaty which is, I think, very advantageous to Canada. We have also been greatly assisted by the Chambre de Commerce of Paris, and especially by a report which has been made by Mr. Le Grand, one of the officers of the Chambre de Commerce, who has prepared and submitted to his chambre a very elaborate report on our commercial relations with France. I must mention also as persons to whom we are greatly indebted for the successful issue of our negotiations, the British Chamber of Commerce, and especially the Canadian section, who made special studies of our relations with France and made reports which helped us to a great extent to conduct the negotiations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the effect of this treaty, what is the result of the negotiations which were carried on? Our first object was certainly to provide that all the goods that we manufacture and produce in Canada should receive the most favoured-nation treatment in France. It is not surprising that our commercial relations with France have not been very extensive in the past. There is a great difference between the maximum and minimum French tariff. For most of the goods that we could export to that country we were obliged to pay the high rate of duty imposed by the maximum tariff. On the other hand, there were thirty-five countries producing about the same articles as we ourselves produced or could produce, which were enjoying on the French mar-

ket the minimum tariff which is, as I shall show in a few minutes, very much lower than the general tariff. It was no wonder then that we could not be successful in our exports to France. But we have provided in this treaty that, practically speaking, all goods which we export from this country to-day will enjoy in the future the benefit of the French minimum tariff. During 1906 we exported $235,000,000 worth of goods. We have obtained the benefit of the French minimum tariff for $212,000,000 of these goods, practically covering the whole amount of our exports. Agricultural products are certainly the articles which most interest Canada. They were not included in the treaty of 1893, but in this case, if you take a list of the articles for which we have obtained the French minimum tariff, you will find that almost all our agricultural products are henceforth to enjoy the benefit of the French minimum tariff, and will be consequently on a par with the agricultural products of the other countries of Europe, and some of America. This is of some importance as France imports a large quantity of agricultural products, for instance, she imported in 1905, the following quantities of agri cultural products:—

	Francs.
Horses	11,000,000
Cattle	9,000,000
Poultry	3,000,000
Meat	2,000,000
Meats (salted)	9,000,000
Eggs	1,000,000
Tallow	4,000,000
Lard	4,000,000
Condensed milk	8,000,000
Wheat	186,000,000
Cheese	48,000,000

Cheese is an article of some importance which was refused in 1893 because the Canadian government of that day was not ready to give a reduction on French books. Then take wheat, 186,000,000 francs. It might be stated that France has no minimum tariff on wheat. But, I have been led to believe that within a very short time there will be a minimum tariff put upon wheat, and then, if there is a minimum tariff, we will have occasion to enjoy the benefit of this minimum tariff as a result of section 1 of the treaty providing that all articles which are mentioned in schedule A shall enjoy the most reduced rates imposed upon these articles.

Mr. MONK. Did my hon. friend read what Mr. Pichon said about when he presented the treaty to the French chamber ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Does he think it probable the tariff is going to be lowered in France on wheat when they are exporting wheat ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that the duty can be lowered, but the duty cannot be increased because in virtue of the treaty which exists with Russia, there is a consolidation, as they call it, and the French government have agreed never to increase the duty on wheat.

Mr. MONK. But the hon. gentleman said it was going to be lowered.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, so much the better then. If it is going to be lowered then it will be for the advantage of Canada.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Pichon said the other day in the French chamber that it would not be. Does the hon. gentleman know Mr. Pichon ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He said that it was not going to be lowered ? At all events we will enjoy the benefit of the most reduced rate in regard to wheat.

Mr. MONK. What does my hon. friend mean by the most reduced rate ? We are on the high tariff.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, there is only one duty. There may be to-morrow two duties imposed that of the general tariff and that of the minimum tariff. As I have already explained the minimum tariff can never be greater than the duty which exists to-day. Now, my hon. friend will say, perhaps, that that is of no advantage. I will quote him a case in which we succeeded in creating a large trade in the exportation of hams. This trade was killed by a change in the French tariff. How did it occur ? In 1903 the French government decided to retain the high rate of duty under the general tariff and to also make provision for a minimum tariff. On the day when this provision of the French tariff came into force in what position were the Canadian exporters put ? They were put in this position that they had to go on the French market and compete there with the exports of meats and hams from countries enjoying the French minimum tariff, and as there was a great deal of difference between the general and minimum tariff the result was that the trade which had been established for that class of goods was simply killed. I had the pleasure of meeting several times, a gentleman who was carrying on that business and he said that the interference with it was due to the creation of the maximum and minimum rate. Now, we have thought of guarding ourselves against that and we have provided that if, at any time, the French government decide to put some of these articles referred to not only on the general tariff but to put them on the minimum tariff they shall give us the most reduced rate and will not expose our trade to be killed as it was in the case of the ham trade.

Mr. MONK. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there was every expectation that the tariff on wheat would be lowered in France.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I asked my hon. friend if he had read the speech made the other day by Mr. Pichon in which Mr. Pichon said, in the French chamber, that he had carefully guarded the agricultural interest in France and that in so far as wheat was concerned it remained on the general tariff from whence he intimated it would not be taken.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was mentioned several times, not during the negotiations, but it was mentioned in the papers, and my hon. friend must have seen it himself also, that 'La Commission du Budget' is now examining the question of the tariff and is preparing a new tariff. My hon. friend knows that there is every probability that in the drafting of this tariff there will be provision for a general and a minimum tariff.

Mr. MONK. On wheat ?

Mr. BRODEUR. On articles which are to-day simply on the general tariff. I will not say that it will be done. I do not give that information from the members of the government but it was current rumour. If my hon. friend will consult the different changes that have been made in the tariff since 1892 he will find that the list of articles on which there was only one tariff was very extensive, but that gradually—almost every year—changes have been made in the list of goods to which formerly only the general tariff applied and which now enjoy the minimum tariff. It is to be expected that the same thing will be done with respect to these agricultural products which still remain on the general list. Then, I say, it would be of the utmost importance for Canada, for a country which is exporting such a large quantity of wheat, that we should provide that if at any time France decided to have a general tariff and a minimum tariff we should enjoy the minimum tariff. Will my hon. friend say that we were not wise in acting the way we did ? Will he take the responsibility of stating before this House that we should not have made that provision ? If we had not made that provision we would have killed our trade in wheat the same as our trade in ham has been killed. I think it was a wise provision to put in the treaty, as I see in article 1, that

> The natural and manufactured products of Canadian origin . . . shall enjoy on their importation into France . . . the benefits of the minimum tariff and of the lowest rates of customs duty applicable to like products of other foreign origin.

We have done it to meet a case like that in regard to ham and we have done it to meet the case of the creation of a maximum and a minimum tariff on agricultural products.

Now, we are largely interested in minerals. Canada has become a mineral country. Is it not advisable that we should obtain from the French government the French minimum tariff on minerals ? What about the fisheries ? Of course some products of our fisheries are provided for in the treaty of 1893. I have already mentioned the nature of the fish products which enjoy the most favoured nation treatment under that treaty. They are eels, and fresh water fish—articles that we were not exporting at all—and which there was no probability of our exporting. Now, let my hon. friend consult schedule A and he will find that all the fish products of this country—the $13,000,000 worth of fish that we produced last year—may enter the French market at the most reduced rates. The treaty is applicable to any fish which may be exported to that country. Then, take our forests. My hon. friend knows that we could do with France a large business in lumber. France is not a lumber country. France has to import her lumber. She has to import her pulpwood. Why should not this provision be made in regard to the enjoyment of the French minimum tariff on the products of the forest ? In regard to manufactured products, I may say that we do not export to-day a very large quantity. Our industries were just started a few years ago and they can hardly suffice for the Canadian market. But, extensions are being made every day ; every day in the year new factories are being started.

Canada is becoming more and more an industrial country, and that fact impelled us to endeavour to provide for our manufactured products a more favourable entrance into a large consuming market like that of France. For example we export to France at the present time some agricultural implements of which France is a large consumer. France herself manufactures a certain quantity of these implements, not a large quantity, not sufficient for her needs. Canada and the United States are countries which manufacture agricultural implements extensively and there is to-day a large exportation from the United States to France. In France there is a difference of forty per cent between the general and the minimum tariff on agricultural implements, and if this treaty is ratified, then when it comes into force next spring Canadian agricultural implements will have an advantage of forty per cent in the duty over the United States agricultural implements in the French market. Should there be no treaty made between France and the United States then the United States manufacturers will have to pay forty per cent more duty than do the Canadians. I may say that I am informed on reliable authority that the American manufacturers of agricultural implements are contemplating establishing factories in Canada in order to enjoy the benefit of the minimum tariff

with France which this treaty gives us. If that were the sole result of the treaty it would be worth our while to negotiate it, because it is needless to point out that the establishment of those industries in Canada will afford more employment for our people. It has been said that the duties in France are very high and it has been asserted in certain newspapers that the general tariff imposed by France was much higher than the Canadian tariff. I may state for the information of the House that the total imports into France in 1906 amounted to 5,627,000,000 francs and the duty on these goods was 448,000,000 francs which gives an average duty of 8 per cent.

Mr. AMES. What amount of this total importation into France was free of duty ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are a less number of articles on the free list in France than there are on the free list in Canada. I am endeavouring to show that the statement that the duties in France are higher than the duties in Canada is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. AMES. Are you not including in your statement all the articles imported into France which are on the free list ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly. I say that the average duty levied upon importations into France is 8 per cent while the average duty on foreign goods entering Canada is 16 per cent.

Mr. AMES. On the goods upon which duty is paid ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, on all goods.

Mr. MONK. Does the minister say that the average duty on goods admitted into France is 8 per cent?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I would like to know where he gets authority for that statement ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just given the figures and the hon. gentleman can make his own calculation if he thinks I have made a mistake. The total importations into France last year amounted to 5,627,000,000 francs and the duty levied was 448,000,000 francs.

Mr. MONK. That includes all free goods.

Mr. BRODEUR. That includes all the goods. I am simply stating that the duties imposed in France are not as high as the duties imposed in Canada.

Mr. MONK. Well that is a mistake.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not a mistake.

Mr. MONK. You are including the free goods.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am including the free goods in Canada also ; I am comparing the free and dutiable goods in France with the free and dutiable goods in Canada. If my hon. friend refers to the Trade and Navigation Returns he will find that so far as Canada is concerned the average duty is 16·03 per cent and in France it is 8 per cent, so that the duties levied in France on dutiable and free goods is less than the duty levied in Canada on dutiable and free goods.

Mr. AMES. Can you state the value of the goods imported free of duty into France ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will complete my argument on that point. My hon. friend may say : Oh, the quantity of free goods in France is much larger than in Canada. But if my hon. friend looks at the French tariff he will find that there are 221 items on the free list whereas on the Canadian free list there are 238 items or 17 more.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Will the minister give the value of these ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am simply giving the number of articles.

Mr. AMES. That is of no value in a comparison.

Mr. BRODEUR. The figures show that the duty imposed by France is less than the duty imposed by Canada on the total importations.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I submit that the argument is no good unless you give the value of the free goods.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the argument is very fair because there is nothing like taking the tariff as a whole. There is nothing which will give us a better idea of the rate of duty than the percentage of duties levied. I do not want to insist more on that point but I think it is shown conclusively that the percentage of duty on imported goods in France is less than it is in Canada. I might now perhaps state to the House the advantage that we get in the reductions which have been made. In making a comparison of the difference between the French general and minimum tariffs in respect to the articles which are mentioned in the treaty, and the difference between the Canadian intermediate and the general tariff reference to the goods mentioned in the treaty, my hon. friend will be perhaps surprised to know that there is a great deal of difference. We have obtained the minimum tariff on 152 articles. My hon. friend may perhaps say that that does not tell for much unless we know the value of the importations of these articles, but if he goes further he will see that the difference in duty between the French maximum and the minimum tariff on the articles mentioned in the treaty is 25 per cent, and the difference between the Canadian intermediate and general tariff, including the articles subsequently mentioned in clause C, is

7 per cent. That shows that we get from France the benefit of reduced rates to the extent of 25 per cent on 152 articles and give reduced rates to the extent of 7 per cent on 110 articles. I think this shows conclusively that this treaty is for the great benefit of Canada. Of course, there is a reduction of taxation, and my hon. friends might perhaps dwell on that; but is it not advisable to have a reduction of taxation? My hon. friends have been going through the country complaining that our taxation is very large. Therefore, when we have secured a reduction of taxation to the extent of $400,000, they surely ought to approve of the negotiation of this treaty.

I have stated that there are many manufactured and other articles which we are not exporting to-day to France but which we might export later on. For example, we are producing many articles of the same kind as the American people are producing, and they have been able to export these articles in large quantities to France. Why should not we be able to do the same? The French people having become accustomed to take these American goods, why should they not take Canadian goods of the same classes? My hon. friends may ask what are the exports of the United States to France? I might mention some of these articles. Here is a list of the principal articles exported from the United States to France in 1905:

Agricultural implements	$ 2,750,000
Wheat	1,874,000
Corn	1,400,000
Carriages	39,000
Copper	11,000,000
Bicycles	72,000
Fruits	384,000
Furs	189,000
Sewing machines	100,000
Typewriters	445,000
Leather	935,000
Tallow	817,000
Phosphate	655,000
Ham	3,000,000
Lard	444,000
Clover seed	200,000
Lumber	1,200,000
Electrical machinery	400,000
Total	$25,904,000

We could export many of the same classes of goods to France with great advantage to this country. We could export, for instance, apples in very large quantities. Practically speaking, there are no apples grown in France.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the duty on apples?

Mr. BRODEUR. Apples and pears, for table use, the minimum is two francs, the maximum five francs; apples, for cider and perry, minimum, 1f. 50; general 2f. per 100 kilograms, that is 220 pounds.

Mr. MONK. Did my hon. friend say that there were no apples grown in France?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. I said that practically speaking there were no apples raised in France, and they are one of the articles which we might export with the greatest advantage.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What is to be the duty under the new treaty on apples going into France and what is the duty under the old treaty?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are the same.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Can the hon. minister tell us the quantity of apples we export to France now?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year it was not very large, but I understand that a large quantity has been exported this fall. There were exported in 1905 286,000 francs worth.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) Is there much reduction of duty on pork and hams?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there is a considerable reduction. The duty on fresh beef is 35 francs in the minimum tariff and 50 francs in the general tariff; pork, minimum, 25 francs; maximum, 40 francs. The reduction is very large and should be of great advantage to us, especially against our American competitors.

Mr. MONK. Is it not a fact that the Americans enjoy the French minimum tariff for salt meat and hams?

Mr. FIELDING. They do, and there is the more reason why we should get the same.

Mr. MONK. But they are on the same basis?

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely, but the United States, having that advantage killed the trade that was growing up between Canada and France, so that it was very desirable to make this treaty. Now, one of the great advantages we get by this treaty is an equality of treatment with regard to shipments. I have already explained that in the treaty of 1893 direct shipment was required for Canadian goods exported to France, but similar treatment was not required for goods imported into Canada. Now I have heard that in some parts of the country there may be some objection to that clause. I believe that an hon. member of this House has been interviewing the importers of Montreal to see whether they were opposed to this direct shipment. I do not know whether he got much consolation from the importers generally, I do not think he did in Montreal, because if there is any place in Canada which will benefit to a large extent by the direct shipment of French goods it is certainly Montreal. I was sorry to find that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were trying to obtain opinion in Montreal against this policy, one which was calculated to benefit Montreal especially, and all our river and ocean ports.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman alluding to some one on this side of the House?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I say that some hon. gentleman has been inquiring of the importers whether they were opposed to this clause providing for direct shipment.

Mr. AMES. I am quite willing to plead guilty to the soft impeachment, and if the hon. minister will read the correspondence, I think he will be greatly surprised to find that at least five-sixths of those importers in Montreal are opposed to this clause.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then I take it that my hon. friend has been trying to discover objections, and I am surprised that a representative of Montreal should endeavour to make a case against a provision which was designed to benefit Montreal especially.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman think that an inquiry from business men as to their opinion of the effect of this clause, is anything improper?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly I do not think it is in the interest of Canada, much less of Montreal, to try to discover opinions hostile to this provision.

Mr. AMES. The hon. gentleman—if he will allow me—seems to be under the impression that I was endeavouring to get the people of Montreal to express themselves in a manner hostile to the treaty. I asked the importers of Montreal to write me their views with absolute impartiality upon this matter, and I was surprised to find that at least 75 or 80 per cent of those who did write condemned it, as I will show when I have an opportunity to deal with this matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I am interested to learn that my hon. friend has been trying to get the people in Montreal to pronounce themselves against this treaty, or that clause of it which is designed to be so beneficial to Montreal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But they seem to think not.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, we will see later on what their opinion is. I know that some of those gentlemen who have been approached by my hon. friend have stated that they did not exactly understand the question that was put to them, and that is the reason why they gave at first an unfavourable answer. They did not know that there was going to be established between Canada and France a service more complete and extensive than the one we have to-day. There will soon be a service every fortnight, and it was feared by some that it was going to injure their present facilities with regard to importations. But now they have found—because I have seen some of them—that there is a disposition on the part of the Allan line to establish a more regular service, one more prompt and efficient. So there is no reason why they should not have direct shipment provided for in the treaty. Now, why should we not get these importations direct? Last year the parliament of Canada decided that whenever the Governor in Council saw fit to put such a regulation in force, British goods should enjoy the benefit of the preferential tariff only when they are imported directly into Canada. It is true, this clause of the Customs Act has not yet been put into force, but we expect that it will be put into force before long. I think a statement to that effect was made in the House last year when that question was discussed. Now take this supposed case for an illustration. Suppose that four years from now goods imported from Great Britain were made subject to direct shipment before they could enjoy the benefit of the preferential rate, what would be the result? The result would be that if these goods were imported through New York, they would have to pay not only the intermediate tariff, but they would not enjoy the benefit of the preferential rates, they would have to pay the general tariff; while at the same time goods which were imported from France, if we had not inserted that provision in the treaty, would be enjoying the benefit of the minimum tariff. Now, would that have been fair to British goods? We had to take one position or the other. This treaty was going to be made, not for one year only but for several years, and if we had not provided for the direct shipment of French goods, then they would have enjoyed the benefit of the minimum tariff while British goods would not have enjoyed the same privilege. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the provisions of this treaty upon which this government ought to be commended, because without that provision not only would we have injured British trade, but we would have largely injured our own Canadian ports. Why should we work for the benefit of American ports? We have been spending millions for the improvement of our St. Lawrence route and of our ocean and river ports in order that we might get some advantages from increased trade in those ports by bringing imports directly through our own ports. I say it would have been a very great mistake if the Canadian government had not provided for the protection of our own ports. That is the object we had in view, and I am sure when these circumstances are understood by the people, when they understand that we are going to have a better service, that we are going to build up our ports and bring Canadian trade through Canadian channels, they will applaud this provision in the French treaty.

Reference has been made to the fact that

the countries to enjoy favoured nation treatment are very numerous. I have already explained that some of these treaties were made many years ago, some even as long ago as the sixties. Would it have been advisable to refuse to negotiate this treaty because these most favoured nation clauses affecting these different nations were in our way? But we must not forget that, if we are to give most favoured nation treatment to these countries, we ourselves enjoy the benefit of the most favoured nation clause. Take, for instance, Austria-Hungary. Our goods which now come under the maximum tariff of that country will come under the minimum tariff. Surely it was better to extend most favoured nation treatment to these countries as Canada was to enjoy most favoured nation treatment from them. It must be remembered also that our imports from these countries are not large and no important interest can suffer much by the operation of this part of the treaty.

This treaty will be a great benefit to Canada—I have no doubt about that. I have already given figures to show that there is every reason to believe that, under the treaty, there will be a considerable expansion of our trade. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is anxious to know whether an extension of trade is likely to take place. I think the fact that our goods exported to France had to pay 25 per cent more than the goods of thirty-five other countries was certainly enough to prevent any extensive business from being carried on by Canada with France. This treaty will relieve us from the clause of the treaty of 1893 under which we extended in all things most favoured nation treatment to France while France confined most favoured nation treatment in our case to a small list of articles. I have already shown that this treaty will benefit our Canadian ports. I have proven also that the negotiations were carried on by Canadian representatives, a thing of which we should be proud, and for which we should show our gratitude to Great Britain as recognizing our right to negotiate our own treaties. Another great point in favour of the treaty is that it will help to cement the entente cordiale between Great Britain and France. It is advisable that the best commercial relations should exist between Great Britain and France. But it is also important that these relations should exist between all parts of the British Empire and France. This treaty will also contribute to make our country known throughout the world. There was a time when Canada was practically unknown in the countries of Europe. This was the case even fifteen or twenty years ago. And why? Because we had not taken means, by advertising and otherwise, to make Canada known in these countries. Since 1896 efforts have been made in the direction of extending the knowledge of Canada in these countries of Europe. The negotiation of this treaty will help to make Canada better known not only in France, and not only in the countries of Europe, but also in the countries of Asia and Africa. For these reasons, I hope that this House will vote unanimously in favour of the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House yield not a whit to the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur), who has just sat down, or to those who are associated with him, in admitting the desirability of maintaining the friendliest commercial relations possible with that country of the old world with which so many Canadians have ties of blood and affection. Whether success has or has not attended the efforts of the minister in seeking that object, we all agree that the object is one which should be sought. And we would all be willing, I think, to congratulate the minister and the government in so far as success may have attended their efforts. There was no need of the minister, it seems to me, attempting to excuse—almost apoligize for—the government in having turned first to France in an attempt to bring into effect this intermediate tariff, which was adopted last session, we understand, for purposes of negotiation. It was natural and right that France should be the first country selected with which to endeavour to make a treaty. The sentimental considerations which bind a large part of the people of this country to old France are, I think, respected by all Canadians, even those who may not have the same reasons for sharing them.

But this treaty now comes before us, the completed work of our representatives, for examination and criticism. The treaty requires the ratification of this parliament, and parliament should not give that sanction without minute examination or without satisfying itself that the treaty is in the public interest and that unforeseen complications are not likely to arise therefrom. So, I take it, it is the duty of a member of His Majesty's loyal opposition to examine this treaty from the opposite point of view to that which has been taken by the minister and to endeavour to show wherein it lacks or might have been better. In that respect we shall come to a conclusion as to whether, in the whole it had better be accepted and ratified and we may perhaps in future avoid some mistakes that may be found in this convention.

I do not see that this treaty marks any great or special epoch in Caandian history or diplomacy. It differs from the treaty of 1893, not in character but rather in degree. It is an ampler and fuller treaty, it covers a wider scope of articles on both sides. It is quite natural that after fifteen years the treaty of 1893 should have been found to have outworn its usefulness to some extent

and that the time has arrived when it should be amplified, enlarged and made to fit the changed conditions of this country, and of the other country with which it was made. There is one feature, however, of this treaty making in which we have made very rapid progress, and that is the éclat and the expense with which our negotiations are now conducted. In the good old days when Sir Charles Tupper went to Paris and undertook to negotiate a treaty for Canada it was not such an expensive undertaking as it to-day. We find that the commercial treaty with France which we have been discussing as a precursor of this treaty, cost Sir Charles Tupper for travel $73 ; for typewriting for Sir Charles, $17.19 ; for documents and other papers, $100 ; a total of $190.19. Compare that with the many thousands of dollars which will probably be found in the Auditor General's Report when those of us who appear here at the next session of parliament have the privilege of seeing that interesting publication, and I think there will be a general belief that at least in our methods of expenditure Canada has made great progress and expansion in the last fifteen years.

We must consider in discussing this treaty what we give and what we receive. We give on certain specified articles the Canadian intermediate tariff and we give a special tariff on a few more ; we receive on certain specified articles the French minimum tariff. I do not think that Canada, in being given by France a treaty of this character, has been selected from the nations of the world for remarkably favoured treatment. If we glance through the list of nations enjoying what we enjoy and more, we find that there are thirty-five nations which have the full minimum French tariff and about thirty which have the minimum French tariff in part ; and while our pride is flattered that we have succeeded in securing this treaty, after all it is no very great matter of congratulation that what Montenegro and Turkey, Nicaragua and Honduras and the black republic of Hayti can secure from France, we, through our plenipotentiaries, at great expense have been able to secure for Canada. Many a fourth-rate country has secured the benefit of the French minimum tariff, and that we should be included is a subject of course for congratulation, but it seems to me that to be omitted from that list would be of the nature of a surtax, while to be included is simply to be placed on a par with nearly every other commercial country in the world, so it gives us but little advantage over our competitors. I must take exception to the argument which the minister who has just preceded me (Mr. Brodeur) used when he was endeavouring to show how much more we had obtained from France than we had given. I think it was rather poor judgment to claim that the treaty was at all one sided. It is supposed to be a mutually advantageous arrangement in which both countries profit to about the same degree, and I will leave it to you Mr. Speaker whether it is an eminently fair comparison to say that we receive favoured treatment on 153 articles while we give favoured treatment on 110 articles, and therefore we are 43 articles to the good. It is not the number of items that gives the concession value. The imports into Canada from France of three items alone on which we give France favoured treatment, woollen goods, silk goods and gloves, aggregate as much as the entire exports from Canada to France of every article we produce, and the leaving out of one of these three would cut down the importations to a very considerable extent. It is not the number of articles, it is the rate of duty that is of importance. So again when the minister says : Look at the difference between the reductions ; here we have a reduction of 25 per cent on an average on the whole line of goods which we are permitted to send into France while on the intermediate tariff which we have given to France there is an average reduction of only 7 per cent. The minister must admit that that argument is fallacious. It makes little difference to the prisoner whether the wall is 60 or 40 feet high if he has no ladder and it is too steep and smooth for him to climb over. For example, what difference does it make that the duty on salt cod is reduced from 60 francs to 48 francs, though 20 per cent is a great reduction. A duty of 48 francs on salt cod means $4.25 per hundred, which is equal to the value of the fish, so there is no doubt that even a 20 per cent reduction still leaves an absolutely prohibitive tariff against us. On the other hand, take our intermediate tariff for example on window glass, you reduce the rate from 15 per cent to 12½ per cent. That is a reduction of only 2½ per cent, but when you have an industry protected by only 15 per cent and take off even 2½ per cent you have pared pretty close to the quick, and a percentage of 2½ per cent reduction in that case means far more towards stimulating import trade than 20 per cent reduction in the case of the salt fish. So it seems to me that to claim that the difference between the French general and minimum tariff, in so far as Canada is concerned, is 25 per cent while the difference between the general and the intermediate tariff on French goods entering Canada is only 7 per cent, and that therefore the bargain we have made is very decidedly in favour of Canada, is a line of argument hardly worthy to be seriously laid before the members of this House.

I wish now to discuss schedule 'A'

which contains the articles in which we expect to build up a larger export trade to France. If you analyse that schedule of 153 articles, you will find that they are divided into three classes. First of all there are those which were in the treaty of 1893. Twenty-three articles are supulated in the treaty of 1893 and that may be expanded to cover about twenty-six of the items that are contained in the treaty of 1907. As they were in the treaty of 1893 and are in the treaty of 1907 at an unchanged rate, the probabilities are that there will be no effect in the matter of an expansion of trade upon these items. Next, take those articles where the French maximum and the French minimum tariffs are the same; it stands to reason that we have obtained, for the present at least, no advantage there. So, we can expect no immediate stimulation of trade among such items, and that enables us to take another sixteen or seventeen additional items from the list. Of the remaining items, about 100 in number, which are to be found in schedule 'A,' which are not in the treaty of 1893, and upon which there is a substantial reduction, I have searched in vain to find many which will be of any service to us at the present time in the expansion of trade. I am willing to admit that on agricultural implements it seems probable that an advantage has been gained, that also possibly upon asbestos and the manufactures of asbestos there seems to be a hope that our trade will increase, but the great bulk of the items which are newly inserted in the treaty of 1907 and which do not appear in the treaty of 1893 are still quoted at such a high rate as to be, I think, prohibitive except under very exceptional circumstances in the trade from Canada going into France. Horses and cattle; you will see that a tax of $30 apiece upon horses over five years of age is not likely to be a barrier which we can surmount. At least, that is the opinion of the export dealers of my city. The same may be said of cattle. Where the rate of $1.75 per hundredweight places the duty required upon the average steer going into France at $25, it is hardly to be expected that there will be a great exportation from Canada at that figure; in fact, Canada probably will not export either horses or cattle to France under the present arrangement. Salted and mild cured meats have been referred to. Every one knows that the success of that trade depends upon quick transportation, that at the present time the facilities afforded for quick transportation going from Canada are by no means satisfactory, and that our merchants who are engaged in that trade having already suffered on several occasions are not likely to venture a further loss unless a better service is established than that at present existing. Cheese and butter have been referred to. The minister's experience in France must teach him that that is not a country into which Canadian cheese is likely to enter and be consumed in any considerable quantity. The English market consumes a food cheese; the French market as a rule consumes a cheese which serves as a relish. It is the Gruyeres, the Gorgonzolas and cheeses of that character that are manufactured and imported into France and we can, I think, not expect that the ordinary Canadian cheese will find a market there; at least that is the opinion of the cheese exporters of this part of the country. The same may be said of butter for France is an exporting and not an importing country as far as butter is concerned, and is one of our chief competitors in London with the butter which goes from Canada to that market. Fresh fish of the salmon family; there have been one or two experimental shipments from Montreal of fresh fish of the salmon family, but we really have no very considerable quantity of that class of fish to export as there are markets nearer which will take all we have to offer. As for dried fish, would that we could put our salted cod on the French market at a reasonable rate, but we cannot expect to build up any trade with France in salted fish at 48 francs per 100 kilos or $4.25 per hundredweight. The duty is prohibitive. The duty on cod fish and herrings is about equal to the cost of the fish in Canada, so that it is practically 100 per cent. It is not necessary that I should refer to lobsters because they were in the tariff of 1893 as they are at present. Nor is it necessary that I should refer to grains because the French minimum and general tariffs are the same. As to fruits, we know that apples already enjoy the minimum tariff, and although peaches, pears and plums are now placed upon the privileged list, we know full well that these fruits are so delicate that they can hardly be exported to advantage, and, further, France itself is a country which raises large quantities of fruit and supplies the markets of England. Clover seed is an item of Canadian export, but we can never expect to build up a trade in clover seed at 2½ cents per pound duty. It would only be when the French crop was a failure or when the Canadian crop showed a superabundance that we might send a few hundred pounds of clover seed. As for pine and spruce lumber we have a rate, which, figured out, comes to about $6.70 per thousand feet B.M. which lumber dealers will tell you is prohibitive. It is only the rough kinds of lumber that were in the treaty of 1893 in which we may continue to do some business. Hay is one of the items of Canadian export, but if we have to pay a duty of $1 per ton with the freight across the ocean and compete with

the French haymaker we are likely to have a sorry time of it in building up a business with France, herself an exporting country of hay, and only in case of famine would she look outside and would the consumers be willing to pay the $1 a ton which is mentioned here.

Wood pulp, an item in both the treaty of 1893 and the treaty of 1907, is an article which we, in Canada, export to a very considerable extent. We should like to build up a trade with France in this article. We already ship to France a considerable quantity, but wood pulp exporters will tell you that it is very desirable that they should have a regular weekly service in sending out their goods and the inability of Canadian pulp to secure the benefit of the French minimum tariff when shipped on through bills of lading through American ports, and particularly Portland and Boston, will be a very considerable disadvantage to pulp exporters. Cement; we know that Canada cannot produce enough cement for her own demand much less overtake the requirements of an export trade. There are a number of items that are placed in this schedule 'A' of iron and steel and manufactures thereof. One only has to analyse these items, difficult though it is, to see that what appears to be a benefit to Canada is really a prohibition in so far as our exporting to France is concerned. Take, for example, cast iron; you cannot expect to export cast iron and to have it received into France with a duty of $2.64 per ton. Ferro-Manganese and spiegel iron, we are importers, not exporters of these articles and we cannot expect to do a large trade in them. Wrought iron crude, in blooms, prisms or bars; the French minimum tariff equals nearly $8 per ton, as against a Canadian rate of $2.25 per ton. If the minister who is so fond of making comparisons between the schedules of his treaty would make a comparison between the actual French duty against us and the actual duty that we have against France he would find that our tariff wall is very considerably lower than the tariff wall which France presents towards us.

On iron bars and 'T' iron the French minimum tariff is $8.80 a ton at which rate it is impossible to do any business with France. On sheet and plate iron the duty on the thicker sheets is $12.28 per ton and on the thiner sheets $17.54 per ton, so that the French minimum tariffs would be prohibitive here. On iron and steel wire, tin, copper, zinc, galvanized or not, the duty is $35 per ton, again a prohibitive duty. On iron and steel rails the French duty is $10.46 per ton. We cannot expect to send any steel rails to France at that rate. Our intermediate tariff on steel rails is only $6 a ton and our British preference is only $4.50, but France expects $10.46 to be paid on Canadian rails if they enter her market. On steel in bars the duty is $8.80 per ton, on axles and tires of steel in rough $14, on steel in sheets or bands the duty is from $19.20 to $21 so that in these instances you will see it is absolutely prohibitive. We therefore cannot expect to do any trade with France even under this treaty, in iron or in the manufactures thereof except as I have said in the case of agricultural implements. We manufacture cardboard and cardboard boxes in Canada, but these we manufacture are quite unfit for the French market; France uses a finer wood board than we can get here and they would not receive our board as a gift. We cannot expect to have any trade with France on these items. Fine papers; we are importers from rather than exporters to France in these. In hides and furs and other skins Canada is an importer from France. Boots and shoes have been in the treaty of 1893 as we know, and no trade has been developed in them. Gloves and mitts we import from France, not export to France. In leather belting there might possibly be some trade built up under the duty of 5¼ cents per pound but the belting manufacturers in Canada are already as busy as they can be keeping pace with the home demand and are not looking for any export trade. The minister was rather pleased with himself when he referred to the item of eels in the tariff of 1893 and he intimated that the Canadian trade with France in eels during the interval of 15 years had not grown, and he said that this did not reflect credit on the sagacity of those who drew the treaty of 15 years ago. I might ask the minister what trade he expects to build up under item 493 of his treaty; does he expect we will export to France the pelts of sea lions and sea otters, and seals and blue backs, not one of which is to be found in Canada either on sea or land. Does he expect we are to export to France, 'furs of grey squirrels and pouches of grey squirrels, astrakans and toulopes, white hares and pouches of white hares,' all of which are Russian. Does he intend we should import into Canada the live Russian animals and undertake to build up an export trade in their furs by the propagation of these animals in our unpopulated areas. We certainly should be delighted when we find that 'goats and sheep and mouflons of the Caucasus' are to be exported from Canada and are placed on the privileged list. It is more ridiculous to include furs, none of which are raised in Canada, in this list than it is to have eels included; at least we do have eels in Canada even if a taste has not yet been cultivated for them in France. But all these go to make up the 153 items upon which the minister prides himself. Sewing machines have been referred to but it is not probable that we will develop much trade with France in sewing machines on account of the nickle plated parts, because they come under a different ruling and a complication

arises with the French customs in that respect. Dynamos and electrical apparatus; there is no chance of our developing trade with France in these lines. In fact we could not compete with France in a neutral market in these goods because France is a far larger and more skilful manufacturer of electrical apparatus than Canada and would beat us in our own market were it not for our protective duty. On railway chairs or castings the duty is $4.38 per ton and that is prohibitive; iron castings for machinery or ornament, those are largely made by pattern and our patterns would not suit the French trade, and then a duty of $10.50 per ton is prohibitive. Wire nails, the duty runs from $14 to $42 a ton and that is again prohibitive. On iron and steel tubing the French tariff runs from $15.80 to $31.60 per ton, which is prohibitive. Then as to carriages, it is hardly to be expected that a large trade will be developed in them. And so I have gone through one half of the hundred articles which are new in the list, and with the exception of agricultural implements and asbestos I fail to find any in which there is liable to be new trade with France.

Now, what have we conceded to France in return? We have secured the privilege of sending to France probably one hundred articles that we will be unable to send, and what have we given in exchange? Schedule 'B' contains a well chosen list evidently selected by people who understood well the export trade of France. There is no padding in it; they expect to do trade in all these items with us. The volume of business on these 110 items will greatly exceed the volume of the 153 items in the Canadian side of the treaty which the minister has referred to. In 1906 our imports from France amounted to $7,698,000 and in the same year our exports to France amounted to $2,150,000. Our imports are nearly four times as great as our exports, and the balance of trade is likely now to go still greater against us under this treaty. But in granting this intermediate tariff as contained in schedule 'B' the government has run the danger of seriously interfering with some Canadian industries and of reducing the protection on Canadian manufactures to an extent that may injure Canadian business. I have not time to go through the whole list. From 2½ per cent to 5 per cent does not seem a great reduction, but when an industry is only protected by from 15 to 25 per cent, if you reduce that protection by 5 per cent it may mean a serious thing for the life of that industry. Let me take one example. Item 604 in schedule 'B' refers to Dongola and Cordovan and other glazed leathers. I happen to be somewhat familar with that class of goods. It has been a difficult matter for the manufacturers of glazed leather for shoes in Montreal and elsewhere to compete with the Americans. The present Canadian protection is 17½ per cent but now the Canadian leather manufacturers are to have French competition with only 15 per cent protection on French kids. That will place the Dongola manufacturer in Canada in a very difficult position for he will have competition from both the Americans and the French, competition which will cut very seriously into his business. A 15 per cent tariff only against France would be a very serious menace to that particular industry and might cripple it entirely. One of these gentlemen writes to me and I quite believe he is right:

> We cannot perhaps tell the full effects for some time of granting the intermediate tariff on a large number of articles which are accustomed to be manufactured in Canada, articles in respect of which a great deal of capital is invested and many men are employed. But it appears to me that we shall shortly have reason to feel that the intermediate tariff is not sufficient protection for some of these articles.

I understand, however—and perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance will set me right in this matter—that we retain the right to alter our intermediate tariff when we see fit.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. AMES. With regard to schedule 'C,' where the rate is distinctly specified, have we that same privilege?

Mr. FIELDING. No. In that respect this treaty is the same as the old treaty, in which the duties on goods going into France were fixed and these special duties will remain fixed.

Mr. AMES. There is then no hope?

Mr. FIELDING. Except by way of a reduction of taxation.

Mr. AMES. It may have been inevitable, but it is to be regretted that we were not able to make an arrangement with France whereby their minimum tariff could have been given in exchange for our intermediate tariff, because it became necessary to create arbitrarily a third list, and in some cases the rates on that list are very low. In making this bargain we have the French minimum as against the Canadian intermediate, and it was evidently necessary for the ministers, or they conceived it to be so, to add at least a dozen items at lower rates than the intermediate tariff in order to make the bargain and complete the balance Now, schedule 'C' removes the protection which has hitherto been enjoyed in one important industry at least, and the serious part of it is that this cannot be altered, because the rate of duty now fixed is specific. It cannot be changed to a more protective rate on any future date without alteration of the whole treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. It can be reduced, but not increased.

Mr. AMES. The rate of protection cannot be increased. Let us take one item, ribbons of all kinds. There is a very considerable ribbon industry in Canada. It represents a large amount of money and the employment of a great many people. It has hitherto been protected by 35 per cent. Now it is to be protected, not by the intermediate rate of 32½ per cent as might have been expected, but only to the extent of 25 per cent, and with that reduced protection, French competition will be a very serious thing for the ribbon industry of Canada. And that is not the worst of it, because although France exports ribbons to a very large extent, she is not the worst competitor we can have. Our ribbon industry has been in fear and trembling to know what were the most favoured nations, and when they find that Austria-Hungary, Switzerland and Japan are also on the list, they will realize that the silk ribbon industry of Canada has to face a very serious crisis. We cannot make these ribbons in this country as cheaply as they can in France and Switzerland. The European workmen perform the different operations in different places; the yarn is made in one building, it is coloured in another, it is spun in another, and so on. Here we endeavour to perform all these operations in one factory with high-priced help. Now that our ribbon industry is to be exposed to the competition of France, Austria, Switzerland and Japan, a serious situation will certainly have to be met. That is only one instance of what happens through this most favoured nation clause. The negotiators, when dealing with France, probably did not have Switzerland in mind, and yet Switzerland is a worse competitor to our silk trade than France and the people engaged in that trade have to meet their competition with a protection of only 25 per cent.

I do not intend to speak at length on this question as the hour is late, but there is one feature of this treaty which I must refer to before taking my seat. It is that clause with reference to direct importations through a Canadian port. If I understand it, the French have hitherto understood that when Canadian goods enter France they must go through a French port, while we have been able to import into Canada through American ports. Our importers are to be henceforth deprived of that privilege. While I agree that it is a natural and laudable desire to build up our ports, still I cannot help feeling that as far as importers at interior points are concerned, you are placing upon them a rather serious handicap. I approve of the establishment of the direct line between Canada and France; I believe I have voted each successive year for the continuation of the bonus of $120,000. The bulk of our imports will, I trust, come by the direct line which we have subsidized. All things being equal, our importers will probably give that direct line every preference, but to compel every dollar's worth of goods imported not only from France, but from the trirteen countries included under the most favoured nation arrangement, to come in by a Canadian port and to allow not one ounce to come any other way without forfeiting the benefit of the reduced rates of duty, will, it appears to me, interfere with the liberty of trade, obstruct the channels of communication and nullify to a large degree the benefit which we are supposed to be giving to France and our own consumers in respect to schedules 'B' and 'C' of this treaty. The only party that I can see who will really benefit from it is the steamship company which has already established the line. It appears to me that it will defeat to a very large degree the very object of this treaty, and our French friends might naturally wonder whether we are absolutely sincere when we place such a handicap on their exports to Canada. For example, take one item to illustrate the thought I have in mind, that is, dried fruits and nuts. At the present time the Canadian trade is trembling in the balance as to whether it will be given to Europe or to California. It seems as if this treaty might turn the balance in favour of France, but to make it absolutely necessary at all seasons of the year that these goods should come through a Canadian port will to a very great extent, as I am informed by an importer of these articles, cause the trade to turn to California and purchase there instead of in France. This clause, as I understand it, was not inserted in the treaty at the request of France. It could be omitted even now, when we are called on to ratify the treaty, without any disapproval from the French Chamber. As I understand it, we have voluntarily fettered ourselves so far as these importations are concerned.

The hon. minister a few moments ago spoke of some one having been in communication with Montreal importers in an endeavour to pledge them to opposition to this clause in the treaty. I had not intended to read the letter which I sent to some thirty or forty Montreal importers, but inasmuch as the minister seems to be of the opinion that I endeavoured to snatch an adverse verdict from them, I would like to read the letter that he may see how impartial I was, and that he may realize that the replies were sent in food faith:

Dear Sir,—In the draft copy of the so-called French treaty respecting the commercial relations between Canada and France, now before the Canadian parliament, there is a provision to the effect that goods, coming from France or vice versa, in order to have the benefit of the reduced rate of duty, must arrive by way of a Canadian seaport, otherwise

the higher rate of duty will be charged. As the principle involved is a new one, to which the government may later be inclined to give wider scope, I would be obliged if you would, as an importer, give me your views in this matter. Would it benefit or would it injure your importing business were this principle to be generally applied? As representing the largest importing community in the Dominion, I naturally wish to understand the situation and will be greatly obliged if, at your convenience, I may be permitted to hear from you.

I remain yours truly,

Now I entered into this discussion with an absolutely open mind, and I think the minister will see that in that letter there is nothing that indicates which way my sympathies run. I received, I think, about thirty replies, and fully three-quarters of those replies were opposed to this provision which is to be found in the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. I see that in his letter the hon. gentleman only mentions seaports, whereas the treaty refers to rivers and seaports. It may be that the expression in the hon. gentleman's letter gave the Montreal people the impression that their city was not included.

Mr. AMES. Well, our Montreal people I think would consider themselves included in the expression 'Canadian seaports.' I do not think they would put a different interpretation upon it. I certainly consider Montreal and Quebec were included as Canadian seaports.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the treaty we have used the two expressions.

Mr. AMES. Yes, for greater exactness I presume. Permit me to say in this connection that the general verdict of those with whom I have been in communication is made up of the following objections, which I will enumerate.

The proposal in the first place is at least premature. The United States might do something of this kind. They have a large volume of trade, and they have several competing steamship lines. We should not yet do so, although I hope we may some day be in a position to do it without any objection being raised. But that time has not yet come, it will not come until we have reasonable competition, and a sufficient volume of trade to attract competing lines.

We will create by this clause, at least in winter, a trade monopoly. Our importers oftentimes contract twice a year with the European shipping agencies. They arrange to get a summer rate and a winter rate. They can get better terms in that way; they can always get better terms when the shipping agency on the other side has the option of a number of lines. When there is a number of routes there is competition, and competition means a reduced rate on freight. To be tied up to one steamship line, to be handed over, bound body and soul, to a monopoly, at least six months in the year, will have this result unless the men who operate that steamship line are more than human, that they will charge in freight rates all that the traffic will bear. They will take up by the additional rate which they will charge, practically all the benefit that would be given by the reduction of duty. It may be so arranged that there will be a slight reduction in their favour. But you can trust the steamship company, and the railway company operating with them, to see to it that the advantage is pared down to the very minimum; and so the benefit which we expected to give to our importers and to our consumers will be given to the steamship and railway lines. I am glad to learn that the hon. minister assures us that there is to be a better service than that which we enjoy to-day. That to some extent lessens the force of my argument as respecting the present service. But we have no service at the present time to be very proud of. I think there are two boats in seven weeks.

Now a great deal of the export trade from France is in articles of high value. They are bought in comparatively small quantities, they are shipped promptly, they are oftentimes shipped by express. It is possible for example for a kid glove merchant in Montreal to wire an order over to Grenoble, France, that the kid gloves should come by express, and they can be brought over in fourteen days if it is permitted to ship from Havre to New York and from New York to Montreal. But supposing you were bound to take one of these three and a half week service boats, there would be nothing else going from Havre direct to a Canadian port for over three weeks.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but there will be a line from Liverpool.

Mr. AMES. Then you have to pay the extra freight to Liverpool. So that for the express business it is going to be a very considerable handicap to be deprived of the accustomed way of shipment via New York. In the case of delicate dress goods, they are required at once, and transshipment to a considerable extent causes deterioration. They have been accustomed to come frequently by express, they can do so no more via the port of New York.

Then allow me to point out to the minister another very serious objection which I suppose has occurred to him but which did not occur to me until I came into communication with the importers themselves. The only line that comes from France to Canada is from the Northwest of France. That may well serve the contiguous country, which naturally finds an outlet from the

port of Havre. But a very large share of the exports from France to Canada are grown in the southern and eastern parts of France. We know that the silks, and ribbons, and millinery come from St. Etienne and from Lyons; we know that the olive oil, castile soap, dried fruits and groceries are generally sent from Marseilles. Now we have hitherto had the privilege of importing via Marseilles to New York and thence to Montreal for the southern portion and southeastern portions of France, and the freight rate consequently is cheaper from the port of Marseilles to New York, and then to Montreal, than it is if you have to send the goods from the south country all the way across France to Havre, and then send them from that port. Let me give you an instance. Take the case of mineral water. It costs as much to send a case of Perrier mineral water from Marseilles to Havre as from Marseilles to New York; it has to go all the way across France by rail, and you will readily see that the extra freight is going to take up the greater portion of your supposed reduction in duty.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) allow me a suggestion? He is making a fair criticism, I admit. But is he not now answering his argument of a few minutes ago when he said that the condition was altogether too much to the benefit of France in allowing her goods to enter freely? Now he is proving that they cannot enter freely. I think that the proprietors of Radnor water, for instance, will be content with the difficulties of sending in Perrier. And, from the hon. gentleman's own point of view, ought he not to regard this as an advantage?

Mr. AMES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) will admit that the clause was placed in the treaty as a clog on trade, we would be willing to allow——

Mr. FIELDING. It is not a question of the object sought, but of what will happen. If the hon. gentleman thinks that this will be a drag on imports, which operates as increased protection, from his point of view, that is to be regarded with favour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But it is a question of the object, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever the object, it speaks for itself.

Mr. AMES. I thought the whole treaty was based upon the object of improving commercial relations.

Mr. FIELDING. Take the clauses as they are.

Mr. AMES. Some time ago there was an agitation among the importers of Montreal against the holding of goods in transit in New York and from that point flooding the Canadian market. It was customary for the merchant to buy, for example, 5,000 bags of nuts to be held in bond in New York, sell 4,500 bags in the United States, and dump the remaining 500 bags in Canada. It was because of this sort of thing that the Montreal importers, and Canadian importers generally, began an agitation. Then the idea was broached that if these imports came by a Canadian port the difficulty would be overcome. Many importers were induced to give their adhesion to this idea in order to remedy the unfair competition of goods from New York. But that could be remedied in a much easier way. It is only necessary that the goods should come on a through bill of lading, shipped by a person in France to a person in Canada, and come through without breaking bulk. If that were the arrangement, if it were possible to import on a through bill of lading, all our importers would be favourable to it. But, instead, no goods can come by Portland, Boston or New York, no matter what the urgency, but must come by Halifax and St. John in winter, and by Quebec and Montreal in summer. This puts a real burden upon the import trade.

There is another feature that, I am sure, has not escaped the ministers. We in this House were, at one time, counselled to build a great national transcontinental railroad and to build an extension from Quebec to Moncton, largely by raising the bugaboo that we might lose the bonding privilege with the United States—and at that time we were willing to make great expenditures in order to make such a course absolutely impossible. Have the right hon. leader of the government and the ministers for a moment thought that it might be possible that offence would be given to the American government by the insertion of a clause such as I have spoken of? Suppose, for example, the people who have been accustomed to do some business in Canadian goods, shipping by Portland, Boston or New York, should say: Canadians have deprived us of the privilege of handling their goods, and we will place a surtax on all goods that come to the United States except by direct ports. And where should we be if the United States —very reasonably—should follow our example and take this course? What would it mean to the silk and tea trade that comes across the Pacific—the long lines of trains that travel from Vancouver to Boston and New York? It would mean that business would go to an American Pacific port and that we should have to abandon the Canadian Pacific Railway service on the Pacific ocean. This is not altogether an idle supposition; it is not impossible that the United States, seeing themselves discriminated against, as they are in this case, may

say that this is a game that two can play, and may make provision to take from Canada what Canada has taken from them. So, it seems to me, that this clause has a tendency to close the natural channels of trade, and that it is unwise to attempt to artificially force traffic along unnatural lines; that it cannot but hamper trade and defeat the very object which the government has in view. I regret that the government has inserted that provision, and hope that, even now, the government may see that it would be wise to abandon it. I do not think that the French would object in the slightest degree, and I do think that the importers of Canada and the consumers of Canada will both have good reason to object to that provision. So far as the city of Montreal is concerned, I do not think that it will make much difference one way or the other. For six months in the year, we shall have plenty of competitive lines, and for the other six months we shall not. It will force traffic our way for half the year, but it will take traffic away from us for the other half of the year, and, on the whole, our position will be about the same. But, through the western portions of the country, this will be a handicap on trade, and the consumer will, by that much, fail to receive the benefit of the French treaty.

So, summarizing what I have endeavoured to say, permit me to repeat: To my mind, and to the mind of members of His Majesty's loyal opposition, it is desirable that there should be a treaty. But, on examination of this treaty, we do not find cause for that effusive congratulation with which the ministers were welcomed on their return home. The treaty has its good points; it also has its bad points. But, long before either its good points or its bad points were known, we had the paean of triumph raised in all parts of Canada because, it was said, a great advance had been gained for Canada. The flotilla of boats up the St. Lawrence, the yacht that carried the Minister of Marine and Fisheries up the Richelieu in triumph to his summer home were not altogether necessary, nor, when we come to look the treaty in the face, were they altogether in keeping with the results attained.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business does the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) propose to take up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Public Works estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Mr. AMES.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 17, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—Mr. A. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'The Standard Fire Insurance Company'—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

Bill (No. 72) respecting patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—Mr. Clarke.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Gustave Turcotte, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Nicolet; introduced by right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

FRENCH TREATY—CORRECTION—SIR CHARLES TUPPER'S EXPENSES.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to offer a word of explanation and correction of a statement which I made last night and which I find to be not absolutely correct. In speaking of the expenses of Sir Charles Tupper in connection with the negotiation of the French treaty of 1893, I referred to the Auditor General's Report of 1894, page S—3, and there found the amount charged, $190.19. I find in the previous year also a charge under the same head $1,640.21, making a total of $1,830.40, and as I desire, that my statement should be absolutely correct, I take this opportunity of making the explanation.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I would like to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not he desires to make any communication to the House as to the day on which a statement will be made respecting the mission of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to Japan. The Prime Minister promised that an announcement should be made some time this week.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is the intention of the Postmaster General to make his statement on Tuesday.

THROWING OFF MAIL AT PAKENHAM, ONT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I desire to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) whether or not his attention has been called to any complaints as to the manner in which the mail is thrown off at Pakenham, in the county of Lanark. The mail bags are occasionally thrown off in such a way that they roll under the wheels of the cars and the mail matter they contain is torn and ground to pieces. This occurred last Christmas time when the mail bag was filled with Christmas letters and gifts. The people are very much annoyed that this should occur, and they ask that either the train should stop—which it does not at present—or that there should be the usual equipment which, especially in the country, is made use of for this purpose, so that the mail can be taken off and placed on the cars without any danger of this destruction. If the attention of the Postmaster General has not been called to this matter, may I ask him kindly to make a note of it and to have inquiry made, and the necessary instructions given.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). To the best of my recollection, this is the first time that this matter has been brought to my notice. I am glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has called my attention to the state of affairs, and I will see to it that it is remedied at once.

ALIENATION OF MAJOR'S HILL PARK.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). May I ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether any portion of what is known as Major's Hill Park has been alienated. We have seen rumours of it in the newspapers, but no official statement has been made to parliament as to the intention of the government on the subject. If the land has been alienated, or if it is proposed to alienate it, will any statement be made on the subject ? I have just had my attention called to the fact that a notice on this subject has been placed on the Order Paper. I suppose that the motion will be moved at an early day and that we shall have some statement from the government on the subject.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The land referred to has been alienated, so far as the government can do it ; but the action is not complete until we have the sanction of parliament. The whole matter will be brought before the House by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) at an early day.

PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS IN COMMITTEE.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The Prime Minister said that an announcement would be made to-day as to the policy of the government with reference to the production of original papers before the Public Accounts Committee.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I think that the interest of all parties, and the views of all parties, will best be served if these papers are brought to the Committee on Public Accounts by a clerk of the department from which they are called, with the intention, of course, that they should be put at the disposal of the committee, and kept as long as needed, but returned to the custody of the clerk as soon as done with.

Mr. BENNETT. We evidently misunderstand the position—the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) and myself, and, perhaps the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). What I called the attention of the House to the other day, was that, upon the production of original documents, it has been the custom to leave them in the custody of the clerk of the committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not intended to depart from that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps it would be well for me to make a statement as to the instructions which I gave to the official of my department. I instructed him to take the original papers which were called for to the committee room and remain there in attendance until the committee was through with the papers, and at the close of the session of the committee to return the papers to my department. I also told him that if there was an intimation from the chairman that they were required again for the consideration of the committee, he was to take them back to the committee and so on from day to day, to keep them there just as long as the committee desired them. It seemed to me that was the better course, and I will tell my hon. friend why. I find that in my department there are several important papers which are missing from the files. The only explanation that the deputy minister can give me is that some of those papers were taken to the committee room and left there, and have never been returned. My hon. friend will remember that at the first meeting of the committee the clerk made a statement that there were papers which had been lying in the closet attached to the committee room, which had never been returned to the department, which had been kept there apparently in the charge, or custody, of nobody. It does seem to me that in taking this course I have done every thing that the committee could properly desire. Of course, if the committee say that they want the papers left there all through the session, whether the committee is dealing with the subject matter of the papers or not, I will consider the request. But I did think that in making this other order I was facilitating the work of the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, we may as well understand where we are on this question.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question is not a proper subject of discussion; it can only be discussed on a motion to go into supply.

SUPPLY — ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS IN THE COMMITTEES.

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

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). As I understand the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), the proposition he has outlined is that when the Committee of Public Accounts are to meet and any question is to be investigated, a clerk from that department will produce the papers before the committee. Now let us understand where that will lead us. Next Wednesday there is to be an inquiry relative to the expenditure of some hundreds of thousands of dollars in dredging, in the province of Ontario. As I understand the Minister of Public Works, I, or any other gentleman who may be concerned in that examination, will, when the clock strikes eleven and the committee meets, be handed a whole sheaf of papers a foot in height, and I will be told: You may go on with your examination. Then as soon as the examination is concluded those papers are to be handed back to the clerk, and we are not to see them again until next day. I think such a proposition is preposterous. Apart from the question of precedent, it is an outrage on the rights of hon. gentleman on this side of the House. Why should the government seek to override a precedent that has existed in the committee, I will be bound to say, from the beginning of confederation? Take the celebrated Connolly and McGreevy case. Whoever heard of the Department of Public Works going over there with some papers in their hands and saying to Mr. Lister, or any other gentleman who conducted the examination, There are the papers, you may look at them now and go on with your questioning; but the moment you are through with them, we will take them away again. That was never done as hon. gentlemen here know who were then members of the House. An officer of the department produced the papers, they were laid on the table of the committee, and week in and week out, hon. gentlemen of that committee on either side had access to them, and with the closing of each day's inquiry the committee knew exactly what was done. This was done last year, and in the preceding session. Then the clerk of the committee gathered them up and carefully placed them, either in a trunk or in one of the closets there, provided with keys, and kept them there. The Minister of Public Works says there are papers missing. Well, of course, he does not mean any insinuation that they were taken away by the parties interested.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. BENNETT. One thing is certain, no member of the opposition will take away any papers that are the subject of an inquiry, because if there is any thing of an incriminating nature in them the opposition will want the papers to remain on file. Now who is going to take away the papers from the committee? There is not an original paper in that committee room to-day that either of the departments cannot have back any moment they ask for them. All the department has to do is to ask for that particular paper, or those particular papers, and they can have them back. May I ask the minister now what files are absent from the Public Works Department that are causing so much inconvenience? If I am concerned in them personally, I will tell the minister whether or not they can be returned. Does the minister recollect the name of the particular file?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works.) I think my hon. friend has misunderstood the statement I made. What I intended to say was that an official of my department should be in charge of the papers instead of the clerk of the committee. That official can stay there during the whole session of the committee, he can remain for any length of time after the session, if any part of the papers is needed for examination. All I mean to say is that when the committee, or any member of it got through with the papers, then the official of my department would return them to the department, and bring them back again whenever they were desired. It is only a question of who shall have custody of the papers after the committee is through with them, from day to day. But I will say this to my hon. friend. I am quite willing the matter should be considered by the committee, and I have no desire to depart from the practice of the past. All I want is that some official of my department shall keep a record of the papers. He can make a list of the papers, and if the clerk prefers to keep them in his custody, well and good. But if at the close of the session, when every body is through with them, the clerk would prefer to hand them back to my official, all right, and they will be available for the committee whenever desired.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have only to add to what has been said by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, that the practice has been lax. But we have no intention at all to depart from the practice as regards the rights of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House to examine the papers, and make the fullest scrutiny of them. I would insist upon a little more care being taken of the documents, but

they will remain in the committee room for inspection.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I make the request of the Minister of Public Works, Will he be good enough to have left this afternoon, with either one of the two clerks who are in the Public Accounts Committee room, all the papers that were produced the other day relative to the dredging contracts referred to, so that I may have access to them to-morrow ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman desire them to be left this afternoon or to-morrow morning ?

Mr. BENNETT. To-morrow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have them left to-morrow morning.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We understand from the First Minister that these papers are to be left in charge of the clerk of the House of Commons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, not of the House of Commons but of the Committee on Public Accounts.

RAILWAY CONNECTIONS AT BROCKVILLE.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). Before you leave the chair, I wish again to refer to the matter of railway connection at Brockville, both for passengers and mail. I am sorry the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals is not in his place. I went to his department this morning to inform him that I purposed bringing this matter up to-day, and his deputy told me that he was absent from the city. But the First Minister is here, and the Postmaster General is here, who is as much interested in the question as the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to go away also. Will the hon. gentleman address his remarks to the Postmaster General ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will do so, and the right hon. gentleman can read in the 'Hansard' to-morrow the charges I make against the Railway Commission. I want to charge the Railway Commission, first, with inaction, and secondly with action. I first brought this matter to the attention of the Railway Commission, and made a complaint shortly after the close of last session. Shortly after the close of last session the connection at Brockville, both for passengers and mail, was broken up. The numbers of the trains on the Grand Trunk are 4 and 6. No. 4 is the fast train and No. 6 is the passenger or mail train. During last session this No. 6 was due to arrive at Brockville at 2.05 p.m. The Canadian Pacific Railway train left Brockville at 2.30 p.m. During last session the time of the arrival of No. 4 train at Brockville was 2.30, the same time as the departure of the Canadian Pacific Railway train from Ottawa, and passengers from the west arriving by No. 4 generally caught the Canadian Pacific Railway train. I made a complaint to the Railway Commission as soon as this arrangement was broken up. I got a letter from the secretary, Mr. Cartwright, acknowledging the receipt of the complaint and saying that the matter would be dealt with shortly. But, all summer the same state of affairs existed. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) are both conversant with the matter because I talked it over with them. I do not think that either of them can hear me now although I am speaking in a pretty good tone of voice, but I met them on the platform at Brockville, and they both complained of the state of affairs and said that it should be remedied. Nothing was done by this Railway Commission until after the House met. Then, I brought the matter up in the House and a few days afterwards I got this letter from the secretary of the commission :

December 20, 1907.

File 5320 re Brockville train connection.

Dear sir,—I inclose herewith certified copy of order No. 4124 dated the 10th instant in connection with this matter.

(Sgd.) A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Per A. E. E.

Geo. Taylor, Esq., M.P.,
Care Ontario Wheel Company,
Gananoque, Ontario.

That was after I had referred to the matter in the House. That is the complaint I have to make of their inaction in not moving in the matter before, but I am going to complain before I sit down of the action which they did take. This, in so far as it went, was all right if they had carried it out.

The Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada meeting at Montreal.
Tuesday, December 10
Tuesday, December 10, A.D. 1907.

Present:—A. C. Killam, chief commissioner; Hon. M. E. Bernier, deputy chief commissioner; James Mills, commissioner.

In the matter of the transfer of passengers and mails between the trains of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Brockville, in the province of Ontario:

Upon reading the communication addressed to the board by Charles Drinkwater, Esq., assistant to the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, dated respectively the 22nd day of August, 1907, and the 29th day of November, 1907, and by W. H. Biggar, Esq., K.C., general solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, dated the 16th day of September, 1907, and the report of the chief traffic officer of the board dated the 20th day of November, 1907.

Upon the powers conferred by sections 269 and 284 of the Railway Act and such other powers as the board possesses;

The board doth order:

1. That the said railway companies so regulate the running of their trains carrying passengers and mails to and from Brockville, in the province of Ontario, and the places and times of stopping them, as to afford reasonable opportunity for the transfer of passengers and mails between the railways of the said companies at Brockville aforesaid, and furnish reasonable facilities and accommodation thereat for such purpose; and that, until some other system or arrangement satisfactory to the board shall have been adopted by the said——

That is the fast train.

—companies for the said purpose, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall daily at or before two o'clock in the afternoon notify the station agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Brockville whether train No. 4——

That is the fast train.

—of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of that day is carrying passengers desiring to transfer to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's passenger train No. 80 of that date at Brockville, and whether the Grand Trunk Railway Company's train No. 4 is expected to reach Brockville at its scheduled time; and that in the event of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's station agent at Brockville receiving, on any day, before twenty minutes past two o'clock of the afternoon of that day, notice from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada that passenger train No. 4 of the said last mentioned company is expected to reach Brockville on that day at its scheduled time and that there are passengers on that train desirous of being transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's passenger train No. 80, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's said train shall not leave Brockville until after the lapse of a reasonable time after half past two o'clock on the afternoon of that day, to enable such passengers and their baggage to be transferred from one train to the other.

Then, here is the second order :

2. That, on or before the 1st day of January next, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall so change the times of the arrival of its passenger trains No. 4 and No. 6 daily at Brockville, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall so change the time of the departure of its passenger train No. 80 daily from Brockville as to restore any agreements and train schedules which, next before the adoption of the present existing schedules for the arrival and departure of the said trains respectively, existed, under which a period of time elapsed after the arrival of said passenger trains of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada or one of them, and the departure of the said passenger train of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or that, on or before the said first day of January, each of the said companies submit to the board some other schedule or schedules for the running of said trains under which reasonable opportunity will be allowed for the transfer of passengers and mails for the said passenger train of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, respectively, or one of them, to the said passenger train of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company train at Brockville aforesaid.

(Sgd.) A. C. KILLAM,
Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

The first of January arrived and the only action taken was that the Grand Trunk, pretending to comply with this order, gave instructions that train No. 6, on arriving at Kingston, must hand over its mails to the baggageman of No. 4 and he would carry these to Brockville and transfer them to the Ottawa train. The postmaster at Gananoque had instructions to make up a mail bag containing Ottawa matter only, take it to the station and put it on No. 4. If any person in Gananoque wanted to send a letter to Smith's Falls or Carleton Place it was put in a special bag that was carried on No. 6, thrown out on the platform at Brockville and allowed to remain there until next day. Now, here is where the complaint of inaction comes in. I received the following letter dated January 3, 1908 :

File 5320, Brockville train connection.

Dear sir,—I inclose certified copy of order of the board No. 4197 dated the 28th ultimo in this matter.

The order is as follows :

In the matter of the transfer of passengers and mails between the trains of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Brockville, in the province of Ontario:

Whereas, section 2 of the order of the board, No. 4124, dated the 10th December, 1907, provides that:

Then it goes on to give the provision which I have just read, and after reciting that it proceeds :

And whereas application has been made to the board, under section 50 of the Railway Act, for an order extending the time within which the said railway companies were directed under the said order of December 10, 1907, to put in operation at Brockville the proposed schedule:

Upon reading the communications addressed to the board by Charles Drinkwater, assistant to the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, dated the 21st December, 1907, and a copy of a communication addressed to the said Charles Drinkwater by D. McNicoll, vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, dated December 20, 1907—

The board doth order:

That the time specified in section 2 of the said order, No. 4124, dated December 10, be, and the same is hereby extended until the 15th day of January, 1908.

I waited quietly until the 15th of January before I raised the point and I should have raised it last week as I intended, but I thought that I would let the time run out and see what would happen. Last night I got another document but not signed by Mr. Killam :

January 16, 1908.

Re File 5320, Brockville connection.

Dear sir,—I inclose certified copy of order No. 4233, dated the 15th instant. This extension has been given on the understanding that the board will hear the parties on or before the 1st prox.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) A. D. CARTWRIGHT,
Per A. E. E.

Geo. Taylor, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

Here is the order :

Order No. 4233.

The Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada—meeting at Ottawa.

Wednesday, January 15, A.D. 1908.

Present:—Hon. M. E. Bernier, deputy chief commissioner; James Mills, commissioner.

In the matter of the transfer of passengers and mails between the trains of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at Brockville, in the province of Ontario:

Whereas section 2 of the order of the board, No. 4124, dated the 10th December, 1907, provides that——

And he quotes the same section again and then continues :

And whereas, by order of the board, No. 4197, dated December 28, 1907, the time specified in the said order No. 4124, within which the railway companies were directed to put in operation, at Brockville, the proposed schedule, was extended until the 15th day of January, 1908;

And whereas, application has been made to the board for an order further extending the time specified in the said order No. 4124;

Upon reading what has been alleged in support of the said application, the board doth order:

That the time specified in section 2 of the said order No. 4124, dated the 10th December, 1907, and extended by the said order of the board No. 4197, dated December 28, 1907, be, and the same is hereby further extended until the 31st January, A.D. 1908.

(Sgd.) M. E. BERNIER,
Deputy Chief Commissioner,
Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada

Notwithstanding the delays experienced by the mails and passengers, that is the action that is now taken by the railway board. I left home last Monday morning, came out on the train to the Grand Trunk line expecting that No. 4 would be on time, and when I got there I was informed she was 55 minutes late, but that No. 6 carrying the passengers and mails had arrived at Kingston on time and was going to be sent out ahead of No. 4. But they held the train at Kingston for 36 minutes as they have been doing every day. This mail train leaves Toronto at 7.45 a.m., but she remains at Kingston 36 minutes to allow No. 4 to pass her and go on to Brockville. The railway board ordered that on the 1st of January the same conditions should be put in force as existed before this change was made, and under the previous conditions No. 6 arrived at Brockville at 2.05 with the mails and passengers. But on Monday last the train was held at Kingston and she arrived at Brockville only at three o'clock. On board No. 4 and the train that followed it were my hon. friend from Belleville, my hon. friend from Brantford, and my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), besides some eight or ten other passengers. When we arrived at Brockville at three o'clock we found that the Canadian Pacific Railway train had left on its schedule time, although they had been telegraphed to hold their train. The Canadian Pacific Railway arrangement is to hold the train until 2.40, but knowing that our train would not arrive at 2.40, the Canadian Pacific Railway train left, and when our train got to Brockville the mails were thrown out on the platform as usual and left there to be brought to Ottawa next morning. On our train was a friend of the member for Kingston, I refer to Mr. Sullivan, who had a return ticket to Ottawa via Brockville. When he got to Brockville he asked the station master how he could get to Ottawa and he was told they were making arrangements for No. 4 to leave Brockville and connect for Ottawa at Cornwall Junction. Mr. Sullivan bought his ticket to Cornwall Junction, but the engine of No. 4 train which we were on broke down near Prescott and we stayed on the track for an hour until No. 6 came along and shunted us into Morrisburg. I telegraphed from Morrisburg to Cornwall to know if the train would be held as there were twelve passengers on board, but I got a reply that they would not wait for us. The engine of No. 6 was put on No. 4 and we started for Cornwall and when the conductor came along the gentleman from Kingston told him he had a ticket for Cornwall Junction to go to Ottawa, but the conductor said he would have to buy another ticket from Cornwall to Coteau. This gentleman then had to pay 90 cents for another ticket, and when he got to Coteau he had to pay $2.10 for his passage to Ottawa, thus purchasing three sets of tickets to reach here. Those who were on board that train arrived in Ottawa at 10.30 p.m. that night. I say that is a gross injustice. I spoke with the ex-Minister of the Interior Mr. (Sifton) on the matter, and as that hon. gentleman also experienced this inconvenience he said he would speak to the chairman of the Railway Commission as it was an awful state of affairs. I say it is time that the government took this commission by the throat. The Postmaster General should tell them that he is not going to allow the mails to be handled in this way. There is an easy remedy for all this. The board did issue an order that the remedy should

commence on the 1st of January then they extended the order to the 15th of January, and now they say they will extend the delay again until the 1st of February when the railways can be heard. The Railway Commission seems to want to accommodate the railways and not the travelling public on the carriage of the mails. Formerly the mail train left Toronto at 7:45 a.m., it only stopped at Kingston a few minutes, and it remained at Brockville until No. 4 passed it. Then the mails from all the way stations between Toronto and Brockville were handed over to the Ottawa train and delivered at Ottawa, Smith's Falls, Carleton Place and all these other towns on the same day. The passengers were also accommodated and had direct connections under the former system. The Railway Board ordered that state of affairs to be restored, but the railways say they will do as they like, and they have been doing as they like, and these railway commissioners extend the time until they hear from them. I think it is the duty of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Railways to tell these gentlemen that they must enforce the law and make these railways accommodate the public to-morrow or to-day, and not on the 1st of February next. I brought this matter up at the opening of the session, and the Minister of Railways said that he would bring it to the attention of the Railway Board. The ex-Minister of the Interior with whom I discussed the matter at Brockville said it was a shameful state of affairs and that he also would bring it to the notice of the Railway Board and have it stopped. Surely it is high time that some one should stop it. It appears to be simply stubbornness on the part of the railways as neither one nor the other want to give way. I trust the Railway Commission will interfere even at this late date and promptly put an end to this inconvenience to the public.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has mentioned my name in connection with the matter, and I desire to say a word or two. I have experienced the inconvenience he has referred to, and I have no hesitation in saying that the existing conditions are absolutely ridiculous and inexcusable. There is no reason at all why the railroads should make such an arrangement as is asked for. It actually seems as if the railway had figured out the time table in such a way as to prevent the passengers making the train connection they desire. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) spoke to me with regard to it once or twice, and I suggested to him that he should bring the matter before the Railway Commission, he being a representative of the constituency directly interested. It appears that the matter has been brought before the Railway Commission and that the Railway Commission has made the necessary order, but has been induced to extend the time. It may be that the railway companies have through their counsel made representations of a more or less one-sided character, and I would join with my hon. friend in suggesting that the Minister of Railways and the Postmaster General should send their representative to the Railway Commission and see that the necessary order is made to put an end to this grievance at once. It is in a sense a small grievance, but it is a very annoying one, and affects a great number of people who have necessarily to travel on these lines.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I am informed that this is the second time that this matter has been brought before the House this session by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). On the first occasion I was not here. Last session also he brought the matter before the House. Then his grievance was not against my department but against the Railway Department or the Railway Commission. I understand that the necessary order has been made by the Railway Commission, but that the delay has continued, which makes the grievance of my hon. friend still greater. I would not like such a good-natured gentleman as my hon. friend to suffer from such a grievance any longer, and if he will do me the honour of calling at my office, I will call up the chief superintendent of the mail service, Mr. Armstrong, and we shall discuss the matter together, and I feel confident that we can settle it from the Post Office point of view. Then, as we are largely dependent on the Railway Commission for the connections of trains, I will accompany my hon. friend to the Railway Commission and see that the orders given formally are respected and enforced immediately. I cannot do more than that. I feel that there is a grievance and one which is very annoying. In such a settled district as that to which reference has been made, I feel that the postal service should be as perfect as it is in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). Some time ago, I brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways a matter similar to that which has been brought up by the hon. member for Leeds, in regard to the train running from Halifax to Montreal. Four miles east of Levis there is a junction called Harlaka Junction, where two trains pass within about five minutes of each other. The Halifax train, if on time, passes five minutes before the train of the Quebec Central. Therefore the Quebec Central train has to stop at Harlaka to let the Halifax train pass on to Levis, and does not leave Harlaka until the Halifax train has left Levis for Montreal. If passengers on the Quebec Central could make connection with

the Halifax train, they could leave Levis at 12.55 p.m., and reach Ottawa at 10 p.m., on the same day; but as we cannot make the connection, we are obliged to wait until nine o'clock in the evening for a train for Montreal which reaches Montreal in the morning between three and five or six; so that we do not reach Ottawa till the next day at noon. The same thing happens to the mails. I spoke to the Minister of Railways some time ago, and he told me that he would have the matter attended to, but nothing was done. I went to see the Railway Commissioners the other day about it. They said that they had never heard a word of it, and that until the minister would give them the power to settle the question they could do nothing.

Mr. TALBOT. Might I ask the hon. member for Dorchester if it is not a fact that he reaches Levis by the Quebec Central in time to cross over to Quebec and take the Canadian Pacific Railway 1.45 train leaving Quebec every day ?

Mr. MORIN. Well, we will see about that. The Quebec Central train arrives at Levis, if on time, about one o'clock. Then one has to wait to cross the river at 1.30.

Mr. TALBOT. There is a boat at one o'clock.

Mr. MORIN. Well, the boat leaves Levis at one o'clock sharp, and if the train is two minutes late, you miss the boat. Then you have to take the ferry at half-past one. It takes ten or twelve minutes to cross. Then you have to get a hack to take you to the Canadian Pacific Railway station in a hurry, and when you do that, you are likely to have the same experience as I did once. I paid $2, and when I got there the train was gone. How does that suit you ? I want a reply from you now.

Mr. TALBOT. I suggest that the hon. gentleman travel in a four-in-hand then it will cost only a quarter.

Mr. MORIN. Well, you are sharper than I am.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course the railway service for passengers does not come within the purview of my department except incidentally, in connection with the railway mail service. But if the hon. member for Dorchester and the hon. member for Leeds will do me the honour of a visit to my office after Tuesday next—until then I shall be very much occupied with the Japanese question—I will do my very best to meet their wishes.

Mr. E. G. PORTER (West Hastings). I am very glad that the hon. member for Leeds has brought this matter to the attention of the House, as it is one of considerable importance at this particular time of the year, when the House is in session. It is a notorious fact that the Grand Trunk Railway west of Brockville passes through a section of the country that is very thickly populated, while the Canadian Pacific Railway passes through a section of country which is not so densely populated. The result is that there are a great many more people living along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway who require to travel by that route than there are along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, particularly between Toronto and Ottawa. If this were a matter affecting only members of parliament, I would not perhaps feel like urging so strongly that the train service of either of these railways should be changed; but it is a matter that affects the public generally. The large number of people who have business, and business of some importance, as well as members of parliament during the session of parliament, requiring to come to Ottawa, ought to be accommodated with the very best service, apart altogether from the transmission of the mails. What has been said by the hon. member for Leeds I can verify, having had the displeasure of travelling by that train on Monday last, and I do sincerely hope that the government will see that the Railway Commission take prompt action in this matter and that a suitable remedy is afforded.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE. SPEECH BY MR. CLAUDE MACDONELL, M.P.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). As a matter of privilege, I wish to refer to an item which appears in this morning's issue of the Ottawa 'Citizen', which is the Conservative organ in Ottawa. It is a report of an address made by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) before the Borden club in this city last night. The sentences to which I object are :

> As an example of how the government does things, the speaker——
>
> That is the hon. member for South Toronto—
>
> —went on to say that the Liberals have suddenly found out that there was a great frost in the Northwest, which had destroyed the seed wheat in that portion of the Dominion. The members from the west knew nothing about it, but the Liberals wanted a chance to corrupt the electors of the west, and so had passed a resolution on this plea, providing for the settlers out there free seed wheat or money. I think it will be given in money, and will be used for no other purpose than to win the votes of the less intelligent electors of the west, he said.

Mr. Speaker, there are in this two charges to which I wish to take exception. The first charge is that the members from the west knew nothing about this matter. While speaking yesterday I did not ventilate my own connection with it, but I wish to say that while in the west, less than a fortnight ago, I had interviews regarding this matter with different members of the gov-

ernment there. I had two interviews each of two hours' duration with the Hon. W. R. Motherwell, Minister of Agriculture, during one of which his deputy was present all the time, and the Deputy Attorney General was also present to advise in respect of the jurisdiction and powers of the local and Dominion governments. I also had an interview of two hours with the Hon. James A. Calder, the acting premier, and I object to this gentleman coming with the aroma of Toronto club life about him—and he is a gentleman for whom I have a great respect—I object to his coming from the great metropolis and without giving us an opportunity to say what we from the west knew about the matter, making a public anouncement that we knew nothing about it. I think that I may say my colleagues from the west have also full knowledge of this matter.

I take exception also to the charge that the motive of this suggestion is to corrupt the electors of the west, and to the statement that money will be paid to them for no other purpose than to influence them to vote Liberal. I shall not dwell on that, I regard that as a grave, a serious, and a savage charge. I know not whether the hon. gentleman has been correctly reported and whether my quarrel is with him or with the 'Citizen,' but as a matter of privilege I wish to say that that statement as far as I know, is absolutely incorect.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did not my hon. friend read it from 'Hansard' and get a correct report instead of reading from a newspaper ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was at a public meeting and there was no 'Hansard.'

MEETINGS OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the adjourned meeting of the Public Accounts Committee which was to have been held to-day at eleven o'clock did not take place, and only a few moments ago I received a notice that a meeting would be held on Monday next. Monday is a most inconvenient time for such a meeting as many members do not arrive until the afternoon so that they cannot do some work that was intended. I inquired as to the reason for the adjournment and the only explanation I could find was from my friend Mr. Northrup, who tells me that he was asked by Sir Charles Ross if he would consent to an adjournment of this Friday meeting for some two weeks, Mr. Northrup stated to Sir Charles Ross that he had no right whatever to decide that the committee should adjourn. He was then further asked if he would raise any objection himself, and as I understood him he said that, so far as he was concerned, he would not raise any objection, that it was a matter for the committee to decide ; and I think my friend Mr. Northrup said that the chairman of the committee asked him the same question and he replied in the same way except that he insisted that if the chairman did assume the responsibility of adjourning the committee, his case must come first when it was called again. As I understand, the chairman, on these grounds, adjourned the committee until Monday. My grievance is that the meeting should have been called to-day as arranged. There was other business to be done in addition to the special matter that was to come up. Some members have motions to move, that could have been taken up and the result is that these matters are delayed. If Sir Charles Ross wished an adjournment the committee should decide whether it was necessary to make a further adjournment in so far as that matter is concerned. I do not think the chairman or any member of the committee should, without the committee being called together, assume the responsibility of adjourning the committee to a date which suits the convenience of others who are not members of the committee.

I would say further, that in that committee the other day the members of the government almost decided that there should be only two meetings per week for the balance of the session. That means about sixteen hours per month, or about forty-eight hours during the session, is all the time that will be allowed that committee to investigate an expenditure of $100,000,000. When we consider that about one-half of that time is taken up by lawyers on each side discussing whether a witness should be allowed to answer questions or not, little time is left to obtain answers from witnesses, and I figure that if the government insists on only two days per week we will have only about forty-eight hours to investigate the whole accounts of the past year. I hope this will not be insisted on, but that we will have the same number of meetings that we have had in the past. Of course the question has been raised that this interferes with other committee meetings. I quite realize that, but still this is an important matter and I hope the government will see that the decision arrived at will not be adhered to, and that we shall have as many meetings as possible during the present session.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). With regard to the meeting to-day which was not held, I thought there would have been a meeting, as the committee formally adjourned on Wednesday until Friday. I went to the committee room at 11 o'clock expecting a meeting of the committee, but found no quorum present, not even my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid).

Apparently, however, there had been some misunderstanding, because the clerk did not send out notices for a meeting to-day. I do not know whether it is customary to send out notices where there has been an adjournment to a definite time. But certainly the committee had adjourned from Wednesday until to-day and I expected a meeting and the transaction of business. But, as there was no quorum, of course, nothing was done. Regarding the Ross rifle matter, of which the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has charge, that hon. gentleman was consulted by Mr. Nesbitt, acting as counsel for the Ross rifle people and Sir Charles Ross, and was willing, in view of the inconvenience involved in going on with the matter to-day, to postpone it, but he did not wish to lose his right of way. It was found that the evidence on the Ross rifle matter could not be completed to-day, but that, with the number of witnesses called, it would require at least two days to finish. So the hon. member (Mr. Northrup) was willing to fix it for Monday, but the expectation was that it would go on Tuesday also. On Wednesday the committee takes up another matter, and Friday is fixed for still another. So for the convenience of all it was arranged to hear the witnesses on the Ross rifle matter on Monday and Tuesday. That is, so far, the committee has arranged for meetings for four days of next week. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) is justified in suggesting that the committee is not making pretty good progress. We met once this week and have arranged to meet four times next week. I would not undertake to adjourn the committee of my own motion, but I think that under the circumstances it can hardly be said that the chairman is to be blamed.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. H. Clarke) hardly puts the matter quite fairly to hon. members when he speaks of a want of a quorum. I was in the committee room before eleven o'clock, before the chairman himself got there, and was told, before the chairman arrived, that the meeting had been put off. Several other gentlemen who came were told the same thing. I met several at the door on leaving the room and told them the same. But for this belief that the meeting had been put off, there would have been a quorum.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) a question. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) told me last night that the chairman had agreed that the meeting should be postponed until Monday is that true or is it not ?

Mr. CLARKE. I did not understand so, but evidently the clerk of the committee did understand so. When I left the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) I understood that the committee would meet for other business, but not for the Ross rifle business.

Mr. BRISTOL. I understand that no notice was sent out of the meeting for to-day?

Mr. CLARKE. No.

Mr. BRISTOL. I may say that I heard in a casual way that there would be no meeting of the committee. I think that notice should have been sent out in the usual way that the committee was going to go on with business.

Mr. CLARKE. Yes, I think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was a member of the committee for a number of years, and my recollection is that, even when the meeting was adjourned to a specified day, it was the invariable practice to send out notices to remind members of the meeting. The fact that no notices were sent out in this case would lead me to believe that it must have been understood by the chairman or some one else that the meeting was postponed. Under the circumstances I think it was hardly fair to reproach my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid)——

Mr. CLARKE. I was not reproaching him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It sounded very much like it.

Mr. CLARKE. I was only chaffing him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought that such was the case, but perhaps it would be better not to have too much chaff in these serious matters. I think it would be very desirable indeed to persevere in any meetings of that committee that have been arranged. Neither Sir Charles Ross, nor counsel for Sir Charles Ross, nor any member of the committee has the slightest right to postpone the meetings of the committee by arrangement between themselves. I think that is a proposition in which every hon. member will fully concur. If that committee has decided to meet on a particuar day there is only one power that can change that decision and that power rests in the committee. And notices should be sent out in the usual way without regard to private understandings between a few members of the committee, or between members of the committee and the counsel who may have some interests to be considered. If that rule is persevered in, there will be no difficulty. But if not, we are likely to have a little friction with regard to these matters, and that, of course, is undesirable.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I meant to rise after my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) had spoken, but was forestalled by my hon. colleague from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid). I think it is only just to the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), who is not here to

speak for himself, to say that the report given of his remarks at the meeting referred to does not convey the meaning of those remarks, but that he——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) seems somewhat skeptical. He would like to make a little political capital out of this incident. I was at the meeting, and as a matter of fact I was informed by the chairman of the meeting that no 'Citizen' reporter was present. Of course, I do not know that such was the case. But I can say that the statement made by the hon. member for South Toronto was much the same as that made by hon. members who spoke on the subject yesterday afternoon, and that was, not that the money was going to be used for no other purpose than to corrupt the electorate, but he said it was a remarkable discussion inasmuch as it created the impression that there was a great necessity for seed grain and yet so many hon. members who spoke expressed ignorance of there being any such need. And he said, as was said here yesterday, that most likely the government would use this as a political lever to secure votes as well as to purchase grain. That was stated on the floor of the House, and no more was stated by the hon. member for South Toronto. I think it is only right that in the absence of the hon. gentleman I should make that explanation.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL—PURCHASE OF TIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter that has been laid before me in correspondence with respect to the operation of contractors on one division of the Grand Trunk Pacific in the northwestern part of this province. I think I can best introduce what I wish to say by reading an extract from the Beaudette 'Regime.' The town of Beaudette is on the Minnesota side of the Rainy river, directly opposite the town of Rainy River, on the Canadian Northern Railway. This newspaper says:

Tamarack against wheat.—Figures talk.

Would it not surprise you that a stretch of territory along the Rainy river and the Canadian Northern Railway in Minnesota, will sell more than $500,000 worth of timber this winter? Out of this, one firm alone will buy stuff to the extent of $250,000. Talk about your farm lands ranging in price from $50 to $100 per acre. They never yield a proportionately bountiful crop. Frost, water, drought and hail do not seem to 'phase' the hardly tamarack and cedar. Speaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific contractors, Crocket & Tharle, of Port Arthur, and Lewis Foss, their local agent, we submit the following facts:

Including the territory around Beaudette and Warroad, and all the stations of Roosevelt, Williams, Cedar Spur, Graceton and Pitt, they will have nearly 300,000 tamarack and cedar ties, and about 350,000 posts. On the American side of the Rainy they have contracts for 75,000 ties, and half a million railway fence posts. Hence in the territory previously referred to they will have about 365,000 ties, and about 825,000 posts, representing a value of a quarter million dollars turned loose among our settlers and local population. This, from the firm of Crocket & Tharle alone. The lumber industry is a great factor in producing revenue in this country, but we are not dependent on it alone. The figures just submitted, together with what is sold outside of this firm, eclipses anything the lumber interests can produce during a season.

Beaudette alone will ship timber, such as ties, posts, poles and cordwood, which will have a market value of at least $50,000. There have been threats of hard times, but with such an influx of money, and such comparatively heavy exports, it is bound to leave a heavy trade balance in favour of the border territory of Minnesota. We are not ashamed to hold these facts and figures up for public inspection. They can easily be verified. We are proud of the results obtained by the people living up on the oft despised frontier, and are pleased to compare notes with the good farmers who have secured excellent results from farming, and especially diversified farming and dairying. But our settlers should bear in mind that the timber will soon be cut away, and they must look to the soil for support. So it would be well to tuck away a handsome bunch of money to tide you over the transitory period between the times you are timber farmers, and grain and grass farmers.

That is what the Beaudette 'Region,' published in Minnesota said about the matter. My attention has also been called to an extract from the same paper which appeared in the Fort Frances 'Times' on December 26th, 1907, which I will read:

Last Tuesday the largest timber deal that has been put through in this part of the country was consummated at Roosevelt some 18 miles west of this village. As is well known, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is buying large quantities of ties and fence posts in this state on which to lay their rails and fence their way on their onward march across the Canadian plains to the far west Pacific. There must be some reason for their coming into this little neck of Minnesota to do their shipping. The contract for this material calls for 125,000 ties of standard sizes, and 150,000 fence posts 8 feet long with at least a five-inch top. This contract was assumed by Norquist Brothers & Cones, and Maloney Brothers who will furnish Messrs. Crockett & Tharle, Grand Trunk Pacific contractors, with this material. Their agent here is Lewis Foss, formerly of Wisconsin, and he has been letting several large contracts around here. The people who agree to furnish this material are good substantial business men at Williams and Roosevelt. They have sent to Roseau and Stephen for fifty teams, and will employ about 200 men. They are expected to deliver this material at Williams and Roosevelt before June 1, 1908.

It is well to remember this is no small undertaking, as it will require 700 freight cars and about 15 large freight trains to haul this material, and that the timber represents the snug value of about $65,000. These men now have 27,000 ties and 25,000 posts cut, which will be moved with the first snowfall.

It is not expected that strangers would know the shipping extent of these oft despised 'jerkwater' towns along the Canadian Northern in Minnesota, but it will make their eyes bulge with surprise when they learn authoritatively that several million dollars worth of stuff have been shipped from them into Canada and points in the states since the construction of the railroad. Few people realize there is more stuff shipped into Beaudette every year than into any other town between Winnipeg and Port Arthur, with the possible exception of Fort Frances, Ontario.

This article also is an extract from the Beaudette paper in Minnesota. Now it does seem to me that in the construction of the National Continental Railway through the Dominion of Canada, a railway every foot of which the Prime Minister declared was to be built through Canadian territory, regard should be had to the country in which those materials are purchased. All this material in Northwestern Ontario is peculiarly capable of providing for the construction of that railway. The hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) knows very well that all this material grows most bountifully in that part of the country. Cedar, tamarack and spruce timber are very abundant in Northwestern Ontario, and if there was a great demand for that class of timber for the construction of this road, surely it should have been purchased from Canadians who own timber along the shores of the Rainy River, just as accessible as the Minnesota timber, and that timber should have been used by the contractors, and their money should have been spent in Canada instead of in Minnesota. I have only the facts which are contained in the two clippings from the Minnesota paper which I have just read; and if the facts are as there stated, it seems to me that it is incumbent upon the Railway Commission to look into the matter, and see that Canadian resources and Canadian men are being employed in the construction of this road. I think also that the contractors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway are not permitted by the terms of their contract to purchase in the United States material which can be got in Canada upon the same terms. I think in future some restrictions should be placed upon the making of contracts for the supply of materials, as well as for the engagement of men, so that Canadians may get the benefit in both respects.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I regret I have not a personal knowledge of the matter which would enable me to add much to what my hon. friend has said. It is clearly a case in which further information is required before we can make up our minds. I learned from what the hon. gentleman said that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, in their efforts to obtain ties, are purchasing them in the country along the line of the Canadian Northern. A portion of the Canadian Northern runs through the State of Minnesota. I suppose what has happened is that they are buying ties on both sides of the line. Now, if there is an abundant supply of ties on the Canadian side, and they can be obtained at reasonable prices, unquestionably they should be bought in Canada. I know in a general way that the price of ties has advanced very much during the last two or three years, and great difficulty has been experienced by railway companies in obtaining the ties. Though I have no knowledge of this matter, I almost venture to surmise that the fact probably is that the contractors have bought all the Canadian ties they could get and now have to look elsewhere. Now, it is desirable that the ties should be purchased in Canada, but what is more important and more desirable is that the ties should be obtained, and that quickly, and if they cannot be obtained in sufficient quantity in Canada, nobody can object if the contractors purchase ties along the line of the Canadian Northern where that line runs in the United States. I hope the facts will show that ties which are available in Canada are being purchased in Canada, and that only those which are not available in Canada have been bought from the United States. That ought to be the condition. But if that is not the fact, if there is an abundant supply on the Canadian side and contractors are importing from the United States, there certainly would be good cause for complaint.

Mr. J. CONMEE (Thunder Bay). If my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) would use his influence with the Ontario government, with whom he is very friendly, I think he would probably do more good than by appealing to this government. Let him use his influence to persuade the Ontario government to change their policy and to give better facilities to the Canadian settler on the Canadian side of the line to furnish those materials, instead of putting them beyond their reach. If he will do this, he will have accomplished something for the settlers in the Rainy River district. The conditions are most favourable to the Canadian settler, he is closer to the point where these supplies are needed. The natural interest of the contractor will be to buy his ties in the cheapest market and buy them in Canada if he can.

Mr. BOYCE. The contractors themselves are Americans.

Mr. CONMEE. Some of them are. I suppose that Americans may be engaged

sometimes in this line of contracts, but they are sub-contractors and not original contractors and my information is that there are some ties—I regret it very much—being purchased on the American side. The Rainy river is the boundary between the state of Minnesota and the province of Ontario in that section. The railway skirts the river on the Canadian side and crosses it at a certain point in the state of Minnesota, and crosses back again into the province of Manitoba before it reaches Winnipeg so that they have considerable mileage in that state. No doubt a good many ties are being purchased there but Canadians are placed at no disadvantage in regard to the supply of timber and of lumber or in regard to facilities for shipment. The only difference is that on the American side of the boundary ties can be obtained cheaper because the stumpage is less there than it is on this side.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the difference in the stumpage between Ontario and the state of Minnesota ?

Mr. CONMEE. As I understand it it is about ten cents a tie. In the province of Ontario the government charge from 10 to 15 cents a tie, if I am not mistaken. I am not certain as to the price but I know it is ten cents per tie. When the change of government took place they refused to grant permits at all, and therefore a lot of the Canadian contractors were thrown out because they could not obtain ties at all. That sort of thing continued for over a year. Later, I believe, the government issued some permits but they have still kept the price up. I am not quarrelling with them; I am not criticising them; that is their business. If they choose to put up the price I am not particularly criticising the action, but I am pointing out that this is the cause of what has taken place.

Mr. BOYCE. Does my hon. friend know that that is the case ?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, I quite understand the whole question. I know all about handling ties and know something of the conditions on the American side. The American government do not charge stumpage. The settler may take off the ties. Under the Ontario regulations he is not allowed to take off except where he is clearing until he gets his patent. I am not quarrelling with that at all but I am pointing out the difference between the Canadian and American regulations as the reason for the condition to which my hon. friend refers. We have had manufactured every year fifty or seventy-five million feet of lumber from logs got from American territory. That was not done because the lumbermen, who are all Canadians, desired to operate on the American side but because they could get these logs cheaper.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether this timber has been purchased from the American government or from individuals ?

Mr. CONMEE. I think it is nearly all purchased from individuals.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. CONMEE. But their law gives the settler the right to the timber. When he settles upon the land he becomes the owner of the timber and everything belonging to the land. In the case of the Ontario settler he has not that right; merchantable pine is reserved even after he gets his patent.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the hon. gentleman tell me whether there is not as much timber to be acquired on the Canadian side, leaving aside the question of stumpage, as there is on the American side?

Mr. CONMEE. I think there is an ample supply on the Canadian side. There is this condition, however, these ties are not going to be used in the construction of a railway in Ontario, and I doubt if they are going into the construction of a railway even in Manitoba. They are going into the construction of a railway on the prairies of the west. There is ample timber in Ontario not only to supply the road through the province, but through the west as well if the same facility existed for getting it out. We have not got all the transportation facilities that will enable us to utilize that timber, but nevertheless there is no doubt that there does exist on the Canadian side sufficient timber within reach if the regulations of one government were as liberal as those of another.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the same conditions exist to-day under the Whitney government as those which existed when my hon. friend's friends were in power and which he supported then?

Mr. CONMEE. No, my hon. friend is not quite right in that assumption.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think so.

Mr. CONMEE. No. The stumpage on ties has gone up, under the present administration, to more than double. When in opposition they were opposed to the granting of permits and when they came into power they tried earnestly to carry out that policy. I am not criticising them. This is not the place for me to quarrel with their policy, but they tried to carry it out. Their friends broke them down in that and they had to issue permits notwithstanding their supposed policy. But, they have kept the stumpage up, I am not going to argue whether they are right or wrong, but I tell my hon. friend that that is the main reason for the purchasing of these ties on the other side, and if he wants to help the settlers in Rainy River he should interview his

friends at Toronto and persuade them that their policy is wrong and that they should reduce the stumpage so that their Canadian timber can be utilized for this purpose. I hope my hon. friend will do that.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman says that he is familiar with the facts. Does he know that these contractors have applied to the Ontario government for permits to cut ties and that they have been met with these adverse conditions of which he complains ?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, I have quite a knowledge of that. I have had a considerable correspondence with some of the settlers in Rainy River and in other places; in fact, I have had a good deal to do with advising these men because they used to correspond with me when I happened to represent that district in the legislature and for some reason they write to me still. They are not doing so much of it now as they did last year, but I have a number of letters in regard to these matters now. These letters, amongst other things, have reference to the regulations of the Ontario government in regard to the cutting of the timber and which I have stated correctly. There is no doubt but that is the reason coupled with the further reason of the better facilities which are afforded for the transportation of these ties.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to correct a statement that my hon. friend has made with regard to the rate of stumpage on railway ties. Did he not say that the rate was from ten to twelve cents ?

Mr. CONMEE. I said it was ten cents and over. I think on tamarack and some other classes it is as high as fifteen cents.

Mr. BOYCE. That is cut on Crown lands?

Mr. CONMEE. Cut on Crown lands.

Mr. BOYCE. In order to correct the hon. gentleman I will read the following notification issued by the Department of Lands, Forests and Mines :

Department of Lands, Forests and Mines,
Woods and Forests Branch,
Toronto, May 7, 1906.

Notice is hereby given that by authority of order in council of this date, the dues on railway ties cut upon licensed lands of the Crown have been increased from two to five cents per tie, said increase to take effect from the first day of May, 1906.

F. COCHRANE,
Minister.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend is referring to a regulation which is not in force in Thunder bay and Rainy River. That applies to some eastern point.

Mr. BOYCE. It is applicable to the whole of Ontario.

Mr. CONMEE. No, a line is drawn at the boundary between the districts of Nipissing and Algoma. That was always the case. That was the case with the previous government. They charged about double in the west because the ties were going not into the construction of railways in the province of Ontario; they were going into the construction of railways in Manitoba and other western districts. You will not get them at as low a rate in the west as you will in the east.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not understand it in that way.

Mr. CONMEE. Well, that is correct.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Astronomical Observatory, $15,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The appropriation last year was $13,000 and I am asking for a revote of $12,000, the additional amount being only $3,000. The amount is required for the erection of a building for the accommodation of the cœlostat, one of the most important instruments in the observatory ; and for some other buildings. When the improvements are completed they will embrace a residence for Dr. King, director of the observatory. However, that will not be proceeded with at present, or if it is an amount will have to be taken in the supplementary estimates. The present vote is probably all that will be expended in the coming year.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. O'Leary and Mr. Whalen, of Ottawa. It was let by contract after public advertisement ; the total of the contract was $13,900.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does that include the whole work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was for the cœlostat house and standardizing building and amounted to $13,900. Then there was heating apparatus $1,000, and electric wiring $500.

Mr. J. D. REID. What was paid to date ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the exact amount paid to date but it has not been very large.

Mr. J. D. REID. The item had better stand then.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect will be here shortly and he will have that information.

Mr. TAYLOR. When this item is again taken up I would like the minister to be able to give me some information. Yesterday I asked if Mr. J. M. Menzies was employed in connection with the Dominion observatory, and if so, had he made a report of the work done for 1907, and the reply was that

he had made reports. I would like to have these reports.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The administration of the observatory does not come under my department.

Mr. FIELDING. You are a builder.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All my department has to do is to erect and furnish the buildings, and then the management is under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR. At page 1405 of the unrevised 'Hansard' the minister will find the statement that four towers had been erected in connection with Mr. Menzie's reconnaissance, and I want to get his report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will repeat the question when the chief architect is here I will endeavour to get the information.

Ottawa Royal Mint, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who were the contractors for this building and what was the original estimate of the government as to the total cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original estimate was made two or three years ago and my hon. friend would hardly expect that I should have it here now.

Mr. J. D. REID. Oh, yes; that information is always given; there is no question but that we should have it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend does not understand that I have refused to give the information.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get it from the chief architect. I can give my hon. friend some information in regard to the matter while we are waiting for the chief architect. The total expenditure to the 30th November, 1907, is $403,052.76.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the building completed, or is there any more work to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will take about $30,000 to finish the work.

Mr. DANIEL. What will be the total cost when all the bills are in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including the fence, guard-houses, furniture, machinery, site and everything, the total cost will be $509,701.76.

Mr. DANIEL. Does that include all machinery that is used in connection with coining?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is my information.

Mr. TAYLOR. Might I ask the hon. minister where he gets the information, and who is now acting as his deputy or assistant deputy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information I am now giving has been furnished to me by the officer of the department whose duty it is to make up the statements. This would be obtained from the Chief Architect, Mr. Ewart.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is acting as Deputy Minister in the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. James B. Hunter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then there is a change of Minister and Deputy Minister at the same time. What has become of Mr. Gobeil?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is still Deputy, but has leave of absence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has he been or is he going to be superannuated at an early date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has applied for superannuation and the request has been acceded to.

Mr. TAYLOR. A man in the prime of life.

Mr. BARR. What is his age?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not quite sure, but I think something under sixty.

Mr. BOYCE. Is the application made on the ground of failing health?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the ground of ill health, accompanied by a medical certificate which made out a strong case for superannuation.

Mr. BARR. Has Mr. Hunter been permanently appointed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is appointed Acting Deputy Minister.

Mr. BARR. How long has he occupied that position?

Mr. PUGSLEY. His appointment dates from the 1st January, 1908.

Mr. BARR. How long has he been in the service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since the fall of 1899.

Mr. BARR. Has he passed the Civil Service examination?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As he is a graduate of the University of Toronto, the law does not require him to pass the Civil Service examination. But he has passed the usual promotion examinations.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has not made it clear whether the $30,000 required to finish the work is in addition to this vote of $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that it will take an additional grant of $30,000 to complete the building, and in that $30,000 is included the $25,000 we are now asking for.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you not take the other $5,000 ?

Mr. BOYCE. I cannot make out how $403,000 and $30,000 added together will make $509,000, which the hon. gentleman says is to be the total cost. The hon. gentleman had better look at his arithmetic again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will take all the figures, he will see that my arithmetic is quite correct. The total expenditure up to the 30th of November, 1907, was $403,052.76 ; the assumed expenditure for the current year to the 31st March, 1908, will be $51,649. Add to that the revote applied for in the main estimates, $25,000, making $479,701.76. In addition to that there will be $30,000 required. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was right in the suggestion that we should add the $30,000 to the $25,000 we are now asking for.

Mr.. HAGGART. Why have you not a vote for that $30,000 in the main estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not thought it necessary to ask for it for the present, but no doubt we will have to ask for it a little later on in accordance with the usual practice.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why could not the correct amount have been asked for in the first place ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the main estimates are made up, going through a great many hundreds of items, care is used to ask for what it is supposed will be required. After the main estimates are made up it may appear that a further amount is necessary, and in this case it is supposed that it will require $30,000 more than is provided for in the main estimates.

Mr. PERLEY. Are the estimates so inaccurate that a few weeks after they are made up the officers of the department find that $25,000 more will be required ?

Mr. FIELDING. These estimates, although recently brought down, have been prepared more than a few weeks ago. The preparation of estimates begins in the departments a considerable time before parliament meets. The department is only too anxious to ask for the full amount required and it is the business of the Finance Minister, if he can, to carve it down. Very often the minister in charge of the department would be glad to have the whole amount but sometimes the Minister of Finance puts on the brakes and it has to be voted later.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Finance has put the brakes on pretty early on the Minister of Public Works who is a new minister.

Mr. FIELDING. This applies to all the ministers.

Mr. J. D. REID. My claim is that the main estimates should state the whole amount that will be required, instead of having this later estimate of $30,000. These estimates are deceiving both to the House and to the public generally.

Mr. FIELDING. Then every estimate submitted to parliament is open to the same criticism.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Finance Minister knows that $55,000 has to be spent. Did the Minister of Public Works say to the Minister of Finance that $55,000 had to be spent ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember, I know that they all said they would be glad to have more.

Mr. J. D. REID. Would the minister let us know the estimate of the officers of his department when the contract was let ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not it with me, but I shall furnish it the next day we go into Committee of Supply. My hon. friend I think, is a little unfair to me when he says I was deceiving the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the contrary I took the utmost precaution that neither the committee nor the country would be deceived, because I stated we would probably require $30,000 more to entirely complete the building. This iron fence is entirely new, something never contemplated at all and it is only comparatively recently that it was found that the imperial authorities required it should be constructed.

Mr. HAGGART. If the minister has not the original estimate, the item should stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have brought the usual information that has been given year after year. It has not been customary to have in the memorandum furnished to the minister a statement of the originally estimated cost. That information has been given and will be found in the 'Hansard.'

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister may be speaking on information furnished to him, but he is entirely incorrect. On every occasion, the estimate of cost is furnished to the House. It may be furnished again and again in consecutive years, and he ought to have it in his memoranda.

Mr. BRISTOL. As far as I am concerned, I should like more light on this item than the minister appears able to afford us. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us that he had to put the brakes on the Minister of Public Works and other ministers——

Mr. FIELDING. On the whole of them.

Mr. BRISTOL. Considering that the Minister of Public Works is a new minister

and that his estimates are $1,700,000 more than similar estimates of last year the Finance Minister appears to have been justified in the action in this instance.

Mr. FIELDING. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) who sits next to my hon. friend (Mr. Bristol) says that I put the brakes on too severely.

Mr. BRISTOL. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) beside me has said nothing of the kind.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, he said that I was unkind.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not say that. I said that the minister should not deceive the public by not publishing the full amount.

Mr. BRISTOL. All I can say is that if this statement that $55,000 is really needed, is correct, we can only wonder what would have been the expenditure had not the Minister of Finance put on the brakes. And what would have been the general result had not the Finance Minister put on the brakes when $1,700,000 more is asked for by the new Minister of Public Works than we asked for last year on the same estimates? At all events, the hon. minister is able to say that he leads the whole administration, in that he asks more money proportionately than any other member of the government. I suppose it is a desirable thing in itself that Canada should coin its own money. But, if I am correctly informed—and I would like to know the facts—it cost Canada about $30,000 a year to get her money coined in England. But we have spent about $500,000 or more on this building, and we are told that it will cost $100,000 a year to run the establishment. So it will cost us about $130,000 a year to enjoy the luxury of coining our money in Canada. A thing may be desirable in itself, but it may be a question whether it is well to go ahead under existing conditions and complete and outfit a building the result of which will be a loss of $100,000 a year, in order that the Finance Minister and the government may say that we are coining our own money. It looks as if they might better hand the building over to be used as a public museum for the benefit of the public, instead of saddling upon the people this method of coining money at a cost of $100,000 over what it costs us to get our money coined to-day.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bristol) wants to raise the question of the desirability of having our coins minted in Canada, he must go back a few years. We have many measures of a controversial nature, but I am glad to say that the legislation for the establishment of this branch of the Royal Mint was passed unanimously in this House; and the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bristol) leader approved it from time to time, and hon. members on both sides have joined the government in taking credit for this important step in our national life. Now, the hon. member (Mr. Bristol) seems to be seized with a desire for cheapness. I must say I am surprised at that, for we are accustomed to hear hon. gentleman on the other side accuse us of mistaken efforts at cheapness. We could get our currency notes made for less in England than we have to pay to have them printed here in Ottawa. But years ago, the predecessors of the present government, for good reasons, and with the full assent of this House, determined that the notes should be printed in Ottawa. I hope that, even from the point of view of economy, it will be shown that the establishing here of a branch of the Royal Mint is a satisfactory transaction. In any case, it is too late to raise that point, for parliament unanimously decided that this should be done. I am glad to say that we have the best equipped mint, I believe, in the world. It is not the largest, of course. But I rejoice to be able to say that, by arrangement with the imperial authorities, and by co-operation with men of experience and knowledge and skill in this branch of work, we have as perfect a machine for our coinage as can be found in the wide world to-day. And, even though we may not save money as by sending orders to have our coinage made in England, the government is ready to take the responsibility and to say that this is one of the things of which this government and this parliament may speak with pride.

Mr. BRISTOL. I do not think I had the honour to be a member of the House when this matter was discussed. Of course, we are talking about a business matter in a business way. I raised the question mainly that we might have the pleasure of hearing the Minister of Finance explain, as he has done, why we should spend $100,000 more than we formerly spent, for the luxury of coining our own money. I think it is fair to say that if the estimates brought in for the mint were only about half of the actual cost, and the leader of the opposition and other hon. members of this House thought it worth while to agree with the government on this particular question, I assume that it was on the basis of the statement of the government that it would not cost more than a certain amount named. But we find that it has cost twice as much.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember the estimate——

Mr. BRISTOL. We will get it.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Of course, it is a perfectly proper subject of discussion. But, even if the cost were greater than the estimate, I cannot see that that would make any difference. Every body knows that all public works, in recent years, have cost

a great deal more than before. And it is so in the affairs of private life as well. The cost of material, the cost of labour, the cost of every thing that entered into the construction of a building has greatly increased within the last five years. And, if an estimate were brought here of the cost, brought here in good faith, an estimate made by skilled officers, approved by the veteran chief architect of the Public Works Department, whose competence and integrity no man on either side of the House will question, and if afterwards we find that the increased cost of labour and material causes the expenditure to be increased, the only thing that we can do is frankly acknowledge the fact and give the reason.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the hon. minister knows that a contract was given for that building, and yet he will find that the amount spent is far in excess of the original contract. Surely there are officers of the government who are qualified to make an estimate of what any building will cost, and surely they follow the usual custom in these matters of adding a percentage to cover unforeseen charges. In my experience in listening to the explanation of estimates and expenditures in this committee, it is quite the common thing to find that the expenditure has been double the amount of the original contract. And it is in the Public Works Department, apparently that this occurrs more often than in any other. There is no question that, if the estimate given by the Minister of Finance, the hon. gentleman who first mentioned this matter of a mint, had been the amount which we are now told will be necessary, no question could have been raised about it. But when he comes here two or three years after the original estimate was communicated to us, and says that double the amount has been spent on this item, I think we have good reason to complain, and so have the public good reason to complain.

Mr. BRISTOL. The criticism of the Minister of Finance would be reasonable if the work had been done by day labour during the last five or six years. But I understand that it was done by contract, and therefore it is immaterial to this House how much the prices paid by the contractor may have gone up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a matter of fact the cost has not been more than was estimated by the chief architect, in fact not as much. He informs me that the estimate for the building and fence around it was $350,000. As a matter of fact, the contract price was, for the building $263,194, and for the fence $43,529, or a total of $306,723. The additional cost has been made up of other items of which, the chief architect says, he did not make an estimate. The amount paid for the site was $21,250.

Other amounts were paid out as follows:—To contractors, $259,520. Then for wiring, electric motors, transformers, switchboards, &c., $49,461; for machinery, tools, oil, furnaces, tanks, $28,802; elevators, $4,143; bolt doors, $3,050; materials and labour, $10,537; steam heating, $9,139; valuation of site, printing, contract for fencing and guard house, $43,529; concrete foundation and gates, $6,471; advertising, travelling expenses, $17,148. The total amount expended is $403,052. There are some balances due on various accounts, which bring the total up to $509,701.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the area of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is nearly 300 feet square.

Mr. BENNETT. And the fence is to cost $40,000 to inclose it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes the guard houses.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the respective cost of the fence and the guard house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is all one contract. The chief architect tells me that as near as may be, he estimates the guard houses at about $14,000, and the rest for the fence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has a stone foundation, with an iron superstructure.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I noticed in a paper some time ago that the mint could not be opened at the time it was first suggested owing to the fact that the imperial authorities demanded that a fence be put around it. Is that the case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that is the case.

Mr. BENNETT. How high is the fence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a twelve-foot fence, and is permanent in character, and one which the imperial authorities required should be constructed before the mint could be opened.

Mr. BENNETT. As the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) comes from a part of the country where there is considerable stone, he can tell his constituents when he goes back that this economical government has constructed a fence which costs in round figures $250 a running foot.

Mr. FIELDING. As it was constructed according to public tender and contract, I do not see how the hon. gentleman can complain, unless he may say that it was not necessary to have so substantial a fence. It has been constructed under arrangements made with the imperial authorities, who desired that it should conform in some respects to their practice with regard to their mint. They regard the mint as an institution that can hardly be considered as an ordinary factory. I

suppose they would have been content if we had put a high stone wall around it, with a row of broken glass bottles on top of it, as we sometimes see in England. But we have some sense of beauty over here, and we thought that if we could give a substantial fence and at the same time make it an ornament to the city, it was a legitimate thing to do. The whole thing was managed by the Public Works Department, and I have no reason to doubt that the work was well done, and at a reasonable price. If it is of a substantial character, it is to be remembered that mints everywhere are of a substantial character.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who were the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sullivan and Langdon, of Kingston. They are the contractors for the fence as well. With regard to the site, I may say that the land was bought from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We asked them to name the price and they wanted something more than what was finally paid, I think $23,000. But after examining the matter carefully we thought it better to make them an offer of $21,500, instead of going to the trouble of expropriating the land.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who prepared the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Ewart, the chief architect.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to get the details of the item for printing, advertising, and clerk of construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not mind getting the details.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister should have something to say with regard to the retirement of Mr. Gobeil, the past deputy head of the Public Works Department. Now, Mr. Gobeil is only 54 years of age, and I am sure that any gentleman who sees Mr. Gobeil walking around the city with such a sprightly step, will wonder why he was retired. They will wonder to think that a young man—because, at 54 years of age Mr. Gobeil is still a young man—will be walking around the city of Ottawa and elsewhere and will be costing this country, I hope, for a good many years to come, $2,800 a year for superannuation. I think the hon. Minister of Finance will agree that after 35 years in the service he will receive 70 per cent of his present salary which will amount to $2,800 a year. How is the government going to justify the fact that a man in the prime of life is discarded and cast to one side in order to meet, what?—political exigencies. The trouble has been that the government had three vacancies from the province of Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As we are discussing a gentleman who is not here to speak for himself I would like to ask, does the hon. gentleman claim to speak with any authority when he says that Mr. Gobeil was discarded or retired against his will and in the prime of life ?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I will use the word 'retired' instead of 'discarded' if that will suit the minister better. I sympathize with the minister. He is the victim of circumstances. There were three vacancies from the province of Ontario. Of the senatorships, the vacancy left by the death of Dr. Casgrain was given to Mr. Belcourt on the ground of nationality. Then there were two other places to be dealt with. Mr. Daniel Derbyshire had a seat to sell in Brockville and he made an arrangement——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Order, order.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the point of order ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think that language should be used ; it is wanting in respect to the other House.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, you will have to take some other hon. gentlemen to task in this House who wish to obliterate the Senate altogether as do my two hon. friends, the member from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) and the member from South Grey (Mr. Miller).

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. That is not quite correct in my case.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, they want to make great improvements on them at all events. I do not think that will be considered very hard to do in regard to the Senate. I do not say that they are a useless body. It is true that there are some gentlemen who go in there at the prime of life, like Mr. Carmichael, who entered the Senate at about 90 years of age, and like Mr. Ross, the former member for Cape Breton, who was appointed after he had seen some eighty odd summers. This was the dilemma that the government found themselves in; they wanted a minister. The present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) had to get a seat and it was a case of, presto Mr. Derbyshire who was formerly the member for Brockville in this House, went into the Senate and the Hon. Mr. Graham came into this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend if he is making this speech deliberately, but I fail to see what it has to do with the item before the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. There was another vacancy to deal with. Our old friend from Centre York, Mr. Archibald Campbell had sat on the threshold rapping and tapping for many years, and he was promised in season and out of season that he was to be made a minister. He had to have a senatorship. There

were three vacancies and there were three gentlemen who stood in the front rank. Then there was a gentleman from the riding which I have the honour to represent who exhibited a letter from the Premier himself, written in 1892, pledging him that he should have a senatorship. Surely it is about time to redeem a pledge of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. I do wish my hon. friend would show us the connection between these matters and the item before the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. I am coming to that.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend says he is coming to it, but the way is so long that we may fail to see the point. I do not quite see the connection between these things and the Royal Mint.

Mr. BENNETT. Now then, there was another gentleman knocking for admission to the government—the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert), whose name had been prominently mentioned.

Mr. FIELDING. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether this is in order ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am only referring to what is stated in the public press.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend knows as well as I do the rules, and if this has any connection with the Public Works Department I do not object to it at all. I recognize that in Committee of Supply there must be a large measure of freedom, but I ask my my hon. friend not to wander too far away.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for West Middlesex could not be accommodated with a seat in the cabinet or a senatorship. He had strong claims on his party ; nobody will gainsay that.

Mr. FIELDING. Order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think this is in order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the point of order. I have every reason to believe that my hon. friend is keeping within the rules in discussing this matter. The point of order taken is that he is not discussing matters germane to the question. Here we have a gentleman appointed Deputy Minister of Public Works and we are inquiring into the reason why he is appointed to that position.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, it is the deputy minister, is it ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The deputy minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order that I have considered has reference to the remarks made in regard to the hon. member for West Middlesex.

Mr. BENNETT. If I am out of order in stating that the hon. member for West Middlesex was looked upon as a desirable applicant for the office of cabinet minister, I will withdraw the statement.

Mr. FIELDING. I understood the hon. gentleman to state that he was an applicant for a seat in the Senate.

Mr. BENNETT. I am simply stating what was in the newspapers.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend has reached the point now.

Mr. BENNETT. And Mr. Hunter, the present deputy minister, has the good fortune to be the son-in-law of Mr. Calvert, the hon. member for West Middlesex.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No wonder you took so long to get it out.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman got out one thing in this House that raised more trouble than I will ever raise in twenty years. He raised more trouble than ever was raised in this House in twenty years, so that he had better be careful. The muzzle is not off him yet on that subject. What happened then ? We had Mr. Gobeil retired at a cost to this country, for I hope and trust the next thirty or forty years to come, of $2,800 per annum, and we have Mr. Hunter placed in that position of deputy minister at a salary of $4,000 a year. I am not objecting to Mr. Hunter's fitness, and I cannot object to Mr. Hunter's courtesy, because nobody who knows Mr. Hunter will complain of his courtesy. As to his fitness for the position, it may be a question whether a gentleman who has only been seven years in the service and who has been enjoying a salary of $2,450 should be placed over the heads of many other gentlemen. This gentleman had a salary of $1,950 as first-class clerk and as private secretary he had a salary of $600 per annum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As chief clerk ?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, he is called a first-class clerk in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I should appeal to the hon. gentleman that if he wishes to discuss this question of Mr. Gobeil's withdrawal and Mr. Hunter's appointment he should do it in the regular way, because, if he discusses that question now, the item in regard to the Royal Mint will be lost sight of entirely.

Mr. BENNETT. Your good nature, Mr. Chairman, is proverbial and your indulgence is remarkable, and I do not know why you should not allow me to conclude, as I intend to conclude in five minutes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. But there will be a reply from the minister and the item will be lost sight of entirely.

Mr. BENNETT. But the minister introduced it. The minister spoke first and I am simply answering him. I see a gentleman here, Mr. R. C. Desrochers, who entered the service many years before Mr. Hunter did, who has had the advantage of being a chief clerk and who was for many years private secretary to Mr. Ouimet when he was Minister of Public Works. Why is it that Mr. Desrochers, who is well known to hon. gentlemen in this House, is passed over and Mr. Hunter is placed over and beyond him. Let us understand the question at once. Political exigencies had to be met and as a consequence Mr. Hunter had to be appointed to this very high position. Let it be understood that the rule of the Civil Service is to be, that no matter how fit a man may be, no matter how long he may be in the service, if political exigencies arise, all his aspirations and hopes and rights must be placed under foot, and a man who is fortunate enough to have a political pull must be put above him. So far as Mr. Hunter is concerned I hope and trust he will be deputy minister for a great many years to come, but I think it is unfair to these other gentlemen that he should be placed above them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must confess that I am somewhat surprised—perhaps more surprised than I ought to be—that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett), apparently without the slightest information as to the circumstances under which Mr. Gobeil is to retire, should have made the statement to this committee that Mr. Gobeil has been retired by the government and without his consent. That is the information which the hon. gentleman desires to give to the people of this country.

Mr. BENNETT. 'Hansard' will not bear out the minister's statement that I said Mr. Gobeil was being retired against his own wishes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Gobeil was being retired in the prime of life and while in perfect health, and he expressed the hope that for forty years Mr. Gobeil would live to draw his superannuation allowance.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Don't you wish that too ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that when I became Minister of Public Works, Mr. Gobeil was the first man to speak to me on the subject and he told me his health was such that he could not any longer in justice to himself continue to discharge the onerous duties which devolved upon the deputy minister of the department. He told me that for a number of years he had asked the Prime Minister to retire him, but that the Prime Minister did not wish to dispense with his services. I expressed my very deep regret that Mr. Gobeil should wish to retire and I asked him if he would continue. He persisted in his request that he be allowed to retire and not very long ago he submitted to me his own application made voluntarily accompanied by a very strong certificate from his medical adviser, who stated that if he desired that his life be preserved to him he must get relaxation from the duties of his position. I then felt it my duty to submit to my colleagues, with a good deal of reluctance, Mr. Gobeil's application and it was complied with. In view of the fact that Mr. Gobeil had been for thirty-five years in the service of the department, rising by long years of service and efficiency from the position of an inferior clerk to deputy head ; I ask this committee if in view of Mr. Gobeil's request to be allowed to retire on the ground of ill-health, I could have properly done anything else than accede to his desire and make the recommendation to my colleagues which I did. With regard to Mr. Hunter, my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has thought proper to mention that he is the son-in-law of one of the hon. members of this House. Let me say that when Mr. Hunter became attached to the Public Works deparment he was not allied by marriage to the hon. member who has been referred to.

Mr. FIELDING. That attachment came later.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Mr. Hunter was appointed private secretary to the Minister of Public Works and owing to the state of Mr. Gobeil's health more important duties were assigned to Mr. Hunter than ordinarily devolve upon a private secretary. For a number of years, under Mr. Sutherland and under Mr. Hyman, Mr. Hunter has been discharging duties which ordinarily devolve upon the deputy minister. After I became head of the department I had an opportunity of observing how well qualified Mr. Hunter was for the performance of his duties, and how faithful he was, and I desire to bear public testimony to the fact that I believe it would have been impossible for me to have recommended the appointment of any one who would give greater satisfaction to the public or who would more honestly and more efficiently discharge the duties of the office. Let me say further, that the hon. gentleman who—may I not properly say can be proud that he has Mr. Hunter as a son-in-law—let me say that he never mentioned to me the subject of Mr. Hunter's promotion ; never asked me to favourably consider his application, and neither did any one else. Except this, that my predecessor (Mr. Hyman) and those who have acted temporarily as Ministers of Public Works, have spoken to me in the highest terms of praise with regard to Mr. Hunter.

I have promoted him to the position he occupies solely upon his merits. It is not every one who is qualified for the position of deputy minister; a man may be a long time in the department without having the qualification necessary to enable him to fill satisfactorily that important position. Let me say in conclusion, that Mr. Gobeil's retirement has not been made at my suggestion or at the suggestion of any member of the government; he has applied voluntarily for retirement basing his application solely upon the ground of ill-health. So far as Mr. Hunter is concerned he will be promoted entirely upon his merits and because I believe he will honestly, faithfully, and satisfactorily discharge the duties of this position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRISTOL. When the Minister of Finance stated a moment ago that this large expenditure for the mint had been approved of by both sides of the House, I raised the point that when the Minister of Finance and those associated with him were first asking for a vote, they represented to the House that the total cost of this remarkable mint would probably be about one-half of what it has actually cost. The minister went on to tell us that the cost of labour, and lumber and other things had gone up, and I then pointed out that if the work was done by contract, as we were told, that could not affect the position. I have before me the speech of the Minister of Finance delivered in this House on May 17, 1901, and upon the faith of which he got the vote for this mint, and here is what he says, 'Hansard' 1901, page 5378?:

Taking that outline plan and placing it in the hands of the architect of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I have obtained from him an estimate that the building itself will cost about $200,000, not more. We hope that on a review he may be able to reduce these figures, but, I am giving the House his estimate. Then it will be expedient to have that surrounded by a high fence or wall, surmounted by iron railings, which will make it substantially safe, not altogether lacking in ornament. That we expect will cost $14,400.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What did it cost?

Mr. BRISTOL. Three hundred thousand dollars.

Then for fitting up vaults and strong rooms the estimate is $45,000, making a total cost of the building, with inclosure and vaults, $259,400. These are the architect's figures. As I say, I hope it will be found they are outside estimates. Then there is the cost of machinery to be considered, which we are advised will be something less than £13,000 sterling, say $64,000. In round numbers, the cost of the building, with the inclosures and wall, and machinery, the whole outfit will be, as stated by the Minister of Public Works, about $300,000.

To-day we are told that the total cost will probably be $509,000. So that when I say that no proper consideration was given to the cost of this project to the country, I think I am making a perfectly fair and reasonable criticism under the circumstances. But the hon. gentleman further said:

I estimate that the cost of maintenance will be something between $50,000 and $75,000, say $65,000 for maintenance. Then if it is to cost us $300,000 for building and equipping the mint, that represents an annual charge of roughly $9,000 a year. So if we add the interest on the plant and equipment to the cost of maintenance, I think we may say that the actual outlay of the Dominion will be about $74,000 as near as we can make it. That, of course, includes not only the cost of maintenance but the interest on construction.

If I am correctly informed, instead of costing $74,000, it will cost something like $130,000 a year, or nearly double the hon. minister's estimate for construction and maintenance.

Mr. FIELDING. Admitting that everything that my hon. friend says is absolutely correct, I do not see that there is very much ground for criticism. I need not say, like the proverbial boy, that the estimates I gave were taken out of my own head. We do not presume to estimate the cost of building or anything else except on the best advice we can obtain. My remembrance is that the building was not commenced for a long time after that estimate was made.

Mr. BRISTOL. My hon. friend repeated it in 1902.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no doubt that I repeated it in all good faith on information furnished in good faith by officers of the department. If anything improper in construction or otherwise can be pointed out, that is a proper criticism; but if the mint has been constructed according to good plans, even at a cost something more than the original estimate, I still maintain that it is a good thing.

Mr. J. D. REID. What I object to, not only in this case, but in every other case brought before this House by the Department of Public Works, is this. The government come down with the statement that they will require a certain amount to complete a certain work. $300,000 was to be the total cost of this mint, including machinery and everything else. The Minister of Public Works told us a moment ago that the cost had not exceeded the estimate of his department. If that was the estimate of his department at that time, it could not have been furnished to the Minister of Finance, otherwise he would not have made the statement to this House. There was something wrong when the public was not informed correctly what the mint was going to cost. The Minister of Public Works says that he

expects that the total cost will be $509,000; but he does not even guarantee that that will be the total cost. He may come next year for another vote of $30,000 or $40,000, and the total cost may reach $600,000. This is like many other cases under the Public Works Department. I do not hesitate to say that as we go into the estimates of that department we shall find, under every item for work under contract, that the cost has exceeded the amount of the original estimates by at least fifty per cent, and in some cases by 100 per cent. That is not fair to the members of this House or to the country, and, as far as I am concerned, unless the government give us proper estimates and fuller information, I will certainly criticise them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not think we on this side of the House should be surprised at the state of affairs revealed in this case. The government have kept very well within their limit, being only about $200,000 beyond their original estimate. I can recall a much worse case—the case of the Hillsboro bridge in Prince Edward Island, for which the original estimate was $500,000, the next estimate brought down by the late Mr. Blair was about $750,000, another was over $800,000, and finally the bridge cost nearly $1,500,000. So that in this instance the government have kept very well within the mark. The Minister of Finance tries to shield himself with the remark that the mint was unanimously approved by this House; but we must remember that when the House votes on questions of this kind, it has to rely to a certain extent on the statements of the government as to the amount it will cost and the advantages the country will gain from the outlay proposed. We find that the cost of having our money minted here is going to be twenty per cent as against a cost of three per cent when minted in the old country, which shows that is a pretty expensive luxury even in the prosperous times we are now having.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must be borne in mind that the statement made by the Minister of Finance in 1901, and repeated in 1902, was based on the outline plans, as the detailed plans under which the construction of the building was proceeded with were not made until 1904. There is no doubt that he had information from the chief architect on which he relied. But since that time wages have increased and the cost of materials has increased; and when the chief architect prepared the plans in detail, he may possibly have elaborated and enlarged the building somewhat beyond the original plan. The chief architect tells me that, even after the plans were completed in 1904, the estimated cost of the building was $350,000. The Finance Minister, in his estimate did not include the cost of the land. Of course, it would be quite impossible for the chief architect, entering upon the construction of a building so entirely different from any constructed in this country before, and to be equipped with machinery entirely different from any used in this country before, to estimate with perfect accuracy what would be the cost of this mint. It would be impossible for him to estimate with accuracy what would be the cost of the equipment of this mint, and the question really seems to me to be, as the Finance Minister puts it, has there been, is it pretended there has been, any extravagance in the construction of this building? Has it been built upon a more costly design than might reasonably be expected in a building of this character? I submit not, and I am quite sure that it will be found that the department has acted with prudence. The building was constructed under public tender, tenders were called for and all the machinery has been bought at as low a price as it was possible to purchase it at. I may say too that tenders were called for for all the large items of machinery contained in the building and my information is that the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NORTHWESTERN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company. He said: Although this Bill appears in my name, I desire to state that my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney), who is not present at the moment, has charge of it. I may explain that at the request of the solicitor who had the Bill in hand, I introduced the petition on the last day before the House rose for the Christmas recess, forgetting, for the moment, that it would be dealt with by the examiner and that the Bill would be automatically brought into the House and get its first and second reading with my name connected with it. I state this in order that I may not be in an undesirable position in the event of my wishing to oppose the Bill in committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Copp.

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 52) respecting a Patent of Eugène François Giraud.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—Mr. Sloan.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—Mr. Ross (Yale-Cariboo).

Bill (No. 60) respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 61) respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 63) respecting Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonald.

BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SLOAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the chartered Bank of British Columbia.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not take exception to the Bill, which I presume is in the usual form, but I suggest that there may be objection to the title of the Bill. In the first place, the name 'Chartered Bank of British Columbia' would convey the impression that the other banks are not chartered. Perhaps that is a far-fetched criticism. The second point is that the former Bank of British Columbia is the property, I think, of the Bank of Commerce, which amalgamated with the old Bank of British Columbia, and I fancy that the name and good will of the old bank have some value. I have not had any representation made by the Bank of Commerce, but I would suggest to the promoters of the Bill that they consider whether they cannot find some title less objectionable. Meanwhile the Bill may go to the committee.

Mr. BARKER. I suggest further that there has in recent years been an objection to any bank taking a name implying a Dominion or provincial status. I suppose a bank like the Dominion Bank would not receive that name to-day, and any bank that has the name of a province might be objectionable for the same reason.

Mr. FIELDING. Not to the same extent. We have the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BARKER. The present Dominion Bank is an old bank. But I doubt whether either of them would receive the approval of the Minister of Finance to-day.

Mr. FIELDING. We have not taken that general line heretofore as respects the names of provinces. However I think the other objection is quite strong.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Royal Mint, $25,000.

Mr. BRISTOL. In discussing this item this afternoon, I called attention to the fact that in 1901, when the first appropriation was asked for, the Minister of Finance gave as the outside estimate the sum of $300,000, which he thought would be the total cost, and a sum of $65,000 as the total cost of running the mint. The matter was a new one, and naturally this side of the House, at all events, had to take the minister's statement and the first amount was voted. If you read the statement of the Minister of Finance at that time, you will see that he was desirous of proceeding, apparently, in a very modest way. I find in looking at the debates of the following year, that the Minister of Public Works, in discussing the item of $50,000 for the Royal Mint, is reported as saying in 'Hansard,' page 559 :

> The chief architect visited England, France and Belgium in order to obtain data for the preparation of plans. He has come back and prepared plans which have been sent to England, and have not yet been returned. We are ready to begin the work now, and are waiting the return of the plans. The site chosen is on Nepean Point. The cost will be about $300,000

When the Minister of Public Works to-day was endeavouring to explain this enormous increase from $300,000 to $509,000, he told us that before these plans had been decided upon they had gone to the expense of sending their chief architect to Europe. Therefore it is presumed that in 1902 they had all reasonable knowledge that was to be obtained on the subject of mints. However, apparently, they did not stop at that, for I find that as late as March, 1904, Dr.

Sproule, when another item came up in respect to this mint, asked :

What is the mint expected to cost when completed?

And the late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Sutherland, answered : From $250,000 to $275,000. So up to March, 1904, we find the government stating to parliament that the total cost of the mint, as to which they had been getting information for over three years, would be $275,000. Now I venture to submit to the Finance Minister that if any body of men are prepared to go into a proposition on the basis of $275,000, it does not follow that the same body of men would be prepared to go into it if they thought it was going to cost $509,000, and for the obvious reason, that on the cost of $275,000 there would be a loss of about $30,000 a year, whereas on the basis of $509,000 there is a loss of $75,000 a year, if not more. Now among other items which were particularly referred to by the Minister of Finance in 1901, was the fence, which was discussed to-day, and which was estimated to cost $14,400. If the chief architect and all the staff of the department are not able to get any nearer the cost than the difference between $14,400 and $30,000, I think it is time this matter should be more fully considered before it is submitted to parliament for action. And when the Minister of Finance asks us again to vote money in respect to this matter, it is reasonable that we should have a full statement of how this proposition has grown from $275,000 in 1904 to $509,000 at the present time. It would also be interesting to know how the cost of this particular fence has grown from $14,400 to $30,000. If there is no desire on the part of the government to conduct the affairs of the country on a business basis, it would be reasonable that we should have the fullest possible light in respect of this matter before we vote any further money. If I am correctly informed, the Minister of Finance at one time was very much opposed to this mint project, he thought it was a great waste of public money. At that time there was an election coming on in Vancouver, and the question was very popular there, and whether the Finance Minister of the government changed their views that the mint was to remain at Vancouver, a change did come over the views of the minister in contrast to his views as expressed when this matter was first discussed. They, however, concluded after the election in Vancouver that it was more advisable—and certainly it does seem more reasonable—that the mint should be established in Ottawa. So, I, for one, would like to have a complete statement of the original cost of this work and of the growth that has taken place from $300,000 to $509,000, and I would like the particulars of this item of $17,000 or $18,000 which remains. I think we should have a

Mr. BRISTOL.

full and complete statement of this whole matter, of the original contract, how the contract has grown, whether by way of extras or by the discovery that other things were needed that were not originally estimated for.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am surprised at the statement which the hon. gentleman makes in view of all the proceedings in regard to the building of the mint. He has gone away back to 1901, but there was nothing asked of this House until 1904 when $50,000 was asked towards the building of this mint.

Mr. BRISTOL. I think an item of $5,000 was passed in 1901.

Mr. FIELDING. There was an item for maintenance in 1901.

Mr. BRISTOL. Before it was built?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, under an arrangement with the imperial government and for reasons which were set forth.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The whole discussion of this item has been with reference to a statement that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made some years ago which was just a rough estimate. There was no word of objection to the building of this mint when the item was, on February 6, 1905, first placed before the House. I will quote from 'Hansard,' page 606. The item was:

Ottawa—Royal Mint, $200,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How far has that building gone?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract was signed on January 5, 1905. The date for the completion of the contract is January 5, 1907. It has been let to Messrs. Sullivan & Langdon, of Kingston. The amount of the contract is $263,194. It was let after public tenders were advertised for, they being the lowest tenderers.

Then, there is some discussion which is of very little practical moment not on the cost of the mint, but on the utility of building the mint.

Mr. BARKER. What is expected to be the total expenditure on this building? The amount of the contract is in excess of the sum here voted, therefore it is quite clear that further expenditure is contemplated.

Mr. HYMAN. There is, in the first place, the contract that has been let, amounting to $263,194; the estimate for heating is $15,000; for electric wiring and fittings, $6,000; for fittings and furnishings, $10,000; for vault doors and fittings, $15,000. The suggestion would naturally arise that a building of that character, in which would be stored large quantities of coin and gold dust, would require to be well fenced, and no doubt a very expensive fence will have to be erected for the purpose of protecting that building. It is estimated that such a fence will cost about $25,000.

We all know that the cost of buildings of all descriptions has increased at least 25 per cent in the last three years.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not take the fence around Major's Hill park, which is of no use there?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall take that into consideration. Adding contingencies, &c., $13,000, the total probable cost estimated by the department is $350,000. In addition to that there is the land which cost $21,250.

Then he speaks of the cost of the land. Some hon. gentleman took exception to the high price paid for the land, and Mr. Hyman said:

The department asked the Canadian Pacific Railway to name a price. The company wanted $43,000. That seemed beyond the ideas of the department and we made them an offer of $19,000. On their refusal we took proceedings in expropriation. Shortly afterwards they approached the department and said they would accept $21,250.

Then, there was some discussion as to why a mint should be established in Ottawa, &c., but it was not very pertinent to the question. Then hon. members on the other side of the House came to the conclusion that the government had been very remiss in not building this mint before.

Mr. BERGERON. Why is it that the government have waited four or five years to come to this decision and to build this institution, while our gold has been allowed to go over to the other side?

The hon. member for Beauharnois goes on further and says:

If the building were to be erected in Vancouver or even in Dawson City there might be some reason for it, but being located here in Ottawa it will serve no useful purpose because it will be a great deal shorter for a man coming from Dawson City to go to the United States than to come here. My hon. friend talks about patriotism being stimulated by the establishment of this institution. If there were more patriotism there would not be nine million dollars of American coin in circulation in Canada to-day.

So you see that the hon. member for Beauharnois was quite agreeable to the building of that mint and he maintained that the government were remiss in their duties in not having built it before. We have a statement here from the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) of his understanding of what the cost of the mint would be. Here is that hon. gentleman's opinion:

Here is an institution which, when built and manned, will cost at least $450,000.

Now, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) comes here and expresses great surprise that this building is going to cost about $500,000. None of these estimates included machinery in any shape or form, and it is quite evident that at the time this vote went through there was no adverse discussion on this question. It went through and all were agreed that the mint was a good thing and that the government were remiss in not building it up to that time.

Mr. J. D. REID. What the hon. gentleman has just said only confirms what I stated before six o'clock, that the cost, as estimated by the government even when the contract was given, has been exceeded by at least 40 per cent. According to what the hon. gentleman has just stated, even with the cost of the land and everything else included, it would amount to about $370,000 or $375,000, and to-day the Minister of Public Works states that so far some $470,000 have been expended, and that $30,000 more, he estimates, will be needed for next year; so that, in other words, about $509,000, so far as he estimates, will be the expenditure upon this mint. He will not pledge himself that this will be sufficient to complete the whole work even. After having had the matter in hand from 1901 to 1905, making estimates, going to the old country and getting the cost of material, plant and everything else, the government came down with estimates which any one would think would be sufficiently large to cover everything. With all these estimates they asked for a good deal less than $400,000. But the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) says that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) stated that this building would cost more than $450,000. Mr. Foster was trying to show that the government did not know what they were saying and that they did not believe it would cost so little as they estimated.

Mr. FIELDING. Did you believe it?

Mr. J. D. REID. I believed then as I believe now that in this case as in every other case, the actual cost of government works is far greater than that estimated. The contract price was $263,000, then $110,000 expenses were added, and the land cost $5,000, so that the whole cost should amount to about $375,000.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You are not including the machinery.

Mr. BOYCE. Was the contract for the construction of the building alone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOL. My argument is based on the statements made before the contract was entered into. What was said after the contract was made cannot have any bearing on that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the estimate was made in 1901, as in 1902, it was based upon an outline plan. Later on plans were prepared and sent to England for examination

by the imperial authorities. After they were returned approved, which was later than 1902, the chief architect went into the matter in the ordinary course with a view of asking for tenders. In 1905, when Mr. Hyman, as Minister of Public Works, was asking for a vote of $200,000, he is reported as having stated that the contract was let for $263,194. That was the contract for the building alone. The estimate for heating was $15,000 and for electric wiring and fitting $6,000. These figures are below the figures which I have stated here, but let me say this. I went through the mint with the master of the mint and he explained that after very careful consideration a very great change had been made which involved the more general use of electricity for the running of the machinery. That was not originally contemplated at all. In the statement which I read there is $49,461.36, the cost of wiring, electric motors, transformers, switchboards, &c., and Mr. Hyman evidently was not calculating upon that. It was originally intended that the machinery should be run by steam and Mr. Hyman's calculattion did not include electricity as a motive power. There are a great many items to be added therefore to the original estimate and the increase can be very easily explained by taking these various items. There is $104,000 for machinery and motors, which Mr. Hyman did not take into account at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. Add that to the $263,000 and you have $375,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Add the price of the land to that.

Mr. J. D. REID. That makes $395,000.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That does not take in the doors and fittings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nor the fence, nor the guard houses. I am quite sure that when Mr. Foster made the statement that the mint was going to cost $450,000 he did not take into account some $50,000 for the machinery which was added.

Mr. BRISTOL. My point is simple and plain, and it is this : that prior to January, 1905, three ministers assured this House that the outside cost of this mint, including everything, would be $300,000 or less, and the machinery and this wonderful fence were estimated in that. That was the estimate the House had before it, and I challenge my hon. friend to show any further or different estimate given before this contract was let by the government prior to January, 1905. After they let the contract they saw the thin end of the increase going in, and which has continued until the estimate of $300,000 becomes a cost of $500,000 in reality. The government placed before the House and the people the assurance that this entire mint, everything included, would only cost $300,000. Would it not have been just as simple and easy, and fairer to the people of Canada and to the House to have stated in January, 1905, before the contract was made, that it would cost $509,000.

Mr. FIELDING. What the public are most concerned in is to know that this mint has been well built and without extravagance. If we are to have a mint at all in Canada I think all will agree with me that we should have a good one.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did you not expect to have a good one when you gave your estimate of $300,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly. But we are not all as wise as my hon. friend ; we could not see into the future.

Mr. J. D. REID. You were not wise at all.

Mr. FIELDING. We certainly could not be as wise as my hon. friend seems to be when he is discussing these estimates. What I understand the hon. gentleman's position to be is this : we want a mint, we agree that it shall be had if it costs about $300,000, which was an estimate based on an outline plan, and given in good faith.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman thought that it would cost less than the estimate.

Mr. FIELDING. In these cases, while I assume the responsibility for the estimates given, I have to rely on the advice of experts. The hon. gentleman's position is that he would have a mint costing $300,000 and built on an outline plan, but after a more detailed plan is made, and it goes to the officials in London and they say, we would like to enlarge that, the hon. gentleman says, we will not have a mint unless it is built on the original plan and at a cost of $300,000.

Mr. BRISTOL. Pardon me. I say it was the duty of the government, before they entered into this larger expenditure, to call the attention of the House to the change ; but they enlarged their plan and entered into a contract with their favourite contractor without informing the House.

Mr. FIELDING. Then, at the time, the mint was first proposed, it was contemplated to place it on Nepean Point. Objection was taken to that on various grounds. The Militia Department complained that it was going to interfere with their work, and many people thought that it would destroy a very beautiful point ; and we found that instead of building there, it would be necessary to buy a site. Then, I understand the hon. gentleman's position to be : we are willing to have a mint if we can build it on our own land, perhaps on parliament grounds, but if we have to buy a site we will not build it. Then, it appears that the fence is built more substantially than at one time

was contemplated. Well, we might have put up a cheaper fence, a pole fence or a board fence, which would have cost a great deal less money; but we think that when the government of Canada undertakes a work of this character, it should do it substantially and well. I would rather come before parliament and justify a work which is done substantially and well, if it is done honestly, even if it costs a little more money, and we think that is a policy the public will approve of. The great object of the public is to have work well done and honestly done.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Did the hon. gentleman not intend to have it well done in the beginning?

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so. Did my hon. friend never start to build a house and afterwards decide to make it better than he had intended at the beginning? Then there came another stage. My hon. friend quotes estimates made in 1901; that is six years ago, and during those six years there have been great changes. In those six years there has been a very great increase in the cost of labour, and a large amount of that increase in the cost of the mint has gone into the pockets of the workingmen of this country. I understand that my hon. friend's position is this: we are willing to have the mint so long as the labour is done at a dollar a day, but if we have to pay the workingmen of Ottawa a dollar and a half a day, we won't hve it.

Mr. BRISTOL. Is the hon. minister making a stump speech?

Mr. FIELDING. What has my hon. friend been doing the whole afternoon but making stump speeches? We must have a shy at it too. Unconsciously my hon. friend is taking this position. But he must know that the estimates made in 1901 were honestly made by good and capable men, and every man who has anything to do with building or mechanical labour of any kind within the last six years knows that work has cost more than was anticipated when it was started. All sides having agreed that we should have a mint, the question for the people of Canada is, has it been built substantially, honestly and well and is the machinery the best that can be had for the purpose? if these questions can be answered properly, the public will be satisfied.

Mr. BARKER. The Finance Minister has taken this question up by stages, and I think it is well to reply to him by stages. We were first told that the whole of this work would cost from $250,000 to $275,000 or, as the minister put it, striking an average, $265,000. We will not dispute what the minister says, that when this work is done we want it well done. The first estimates and all the estimates have been for work well done, nobody thought of anything else. But what we complain of is the stage system which the hon. gentleman relies so much upon. Having got the approval of parliament for a mint on the assertion that it was going to cost about $265,000, the hon. gentleman talks as if that was based on a rough estimate. But what does the next estimate show? In January, 1905, they had let their contract. Does the hon. minister mean to tell the House that they entered into that contract on a rough estimate? In January, 1905, did they not know practically what they know to-day? And how was it that a month afterwards they met parliament and did not say a word about the increased cost of the mint?

Mr. FIELDING. They stated the amount of the contract?

Mr. BARKER. They stated that $262,194 was the amount of the contract, which was on its face a confirmation of what Mr. Sutherland had said, namely, that the mint would cost about $265,000. That was for the building alone. But that was a small portion of the obligation incurred. They knew then that they had to spend far more money to complete the work, and why did they enter into that contract within a month of the meeting of parliament?

Mr. FIELDING. Parliament was advised and did not object.

Mr. BARKER. Parliament was not advised of anything more than that they had entered into a contract for $263,000, which was practically in accordance with their first statement. Why did they not come before parliament with their revised estimates and detailed plans and inform parliament that they would have to spend a great deal more money? What is the next stage? We now know that the government jumped from $263,000 to $390,000, and they are now up to $509,000. The Minister of Public Works has been good enough to tell us how we got up to $390,000. I would like him now to tell us how he gets from $390,000 to $509,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) take down the items, which are as follow:

Amount paid for site	$21,250 00
Amount paid contractor to November 30, 1907	259,520 00
Wiring, electric motors, transformers, switchboards, &c.	49,461 36
Machinery, machine tools, oil furnace tanks, inclusive of customs duty, &c.	28,802 20
Elevators	4,143 75
Paid for vault doors on account of	3,050 00
Materials, labour, &c.	10,537 48
Paid for heating, steam and hot water	9,139 00

Now, the balances due are as follow:

Balance due on the contract and some additional work	$ 16,228 00

Balance due on contract for steam heating..	950 00
On hot water heating..	89 00
On electric wiring for the light..	840 00
On the motors and wiring of same..	3,408 00
Balance due on machiney to the General Supply Company..	6,219 00
Balance due on the oil furnace.. ..	1,475 00
Balance due on the vault doors.. ..	6,000 00
Balance due on the elevators..	1,381 00
Balance due on filling and safes.. ..	495 00
Balance on contract, fence and guard-house..	43,529 00
Amount due on concrete foundations and gates, &c..	6,471 00

Mr. BARKER. That brings the fence and guard house up to $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes the ornamental gates as well.

Fittings and furniture.. .. ..$	6,000 00
Machinery ordered in England.. ..	8,000 00
Contingencies and superintendence..	5,464 00
Valuation of site, printing, advertisements, travelling expenses, and clerk of works, salaries, &c., &c..	17,148 99

This makes a total of $509,701.76. My hon. friend has asked for an assurance that this would be all that will have to be paid in connection with this mint. I may say that the chief architect tells me there is no reason whatever to suppose there will be any additional expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. I am afraid we cannot trust too much to that, judging by our experience. I want the minister to give us the details of that $17,000 item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will undertake to get that, and when we are in further consideration of these estimates I will submit it to my hon. friend and give it to the committee.

Mr. BARKER. I would like also to have the details of that $5,400 for superintendence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to get both of these.

Mr. BRISTOL. The Minister of Finance has followed the custom of some of his distinguished colleagues, and instead of answering an argument from this side of the House, he has attributed arguments to us, and then he proceeds to knock these arguments which he himself is the author of, into all kinds of formations that please his fancy. In 1901 this great government of great men on the advice of their greatest architect gave the House an estimate of the total cost of this building. They sent their great architect to the old country in 1902 and he came back full of learning, and in March, 1904 three years after they gave their first estimate and during which interval they had time to think of it, they told the people of this country that the total cost was not going to be more than $300,000, and the then Minister of Public Works believed it would only be $275,000. All that is recorded in 'Hansard' as the result of their three years of cogitation. The Minister of Finance now talks about the workingman; it is delightful to hear him so solicitous of the interests of the working man now. He was not so careful about the interests of the working man, when in the days that he was in opposition he was trying to tear down the national policy.

Mr. FIELDING. Did the national policy make the workingman rich?

Mr. BRISTOL. You held on to enough of it to give employment to the working men of Canada. The Minister of Finance told us that between 1901 and 1907 things had changed, that labour was dearer and that the cost of material had advanced. In May, 1904, this great government with all the machinery they have at their disposal gave the total estimated cost of this building as $275,000, and it was only nine months after, that they let the contract. There were only nine months therefore for this twenty-five per cent increase in the cost of labour to take place. After having given this statement to the House in 1904, nine months later in January, 1905, they entered into this contract which I venture to submit is an extravagant contract and not a contract with regard to which reasonable and proper disclosures were made to the House. The government is face to face with this position: that they had three full years and more to find out what this building would cost, and after thinking over it during these three years they told parliament and the country that it would cost $275,000. Now we find it has cost $509,000. They can spend all the time they like in explanation, but these are the facts so far as this opposition and the people of Canada are concerned.

Mr. FIELDING. All right, let it go at that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Let us look at the record of the Minister of Finance with regard to this mint. When the mint was first spoken of he was entirely opposed to it, but a little later on when an agitation was raised in British Columbia he came to the conclusion that we should have a mint. Then he came down and told parliament that the total cost would be $300,000, and when he got the department to go fully into the matter he finally assured the House that the cost would not be more than $375,000. Now we have it that the building has cost $509,000, and it does not take a very wise man to see that there must be something wrong. From start to finish the Minister of Finance seems to have used bad judgment in the matter. I have been told, and I think there is a good deal in it, that the expenditure on the mint is like a good many other items of

expenditure by this government; I am informed that there are certain parts of that machinery that the government have paid from $75,000 to $80,000 for and that they could have bought for $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to state what items of machinery?

Mr. J. D. REID. I cannot go into the details now but I think I can get the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman should give the information.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Finance has referred to the opposition criticising the amount paid for a site for this building, but there are other occasions upon which he is not so particular about using the government property, for I would like to remind him that he gave part of this beautiful park in Ottawa to the Grand Trunk Pacific for a hotel.

Now, would it not be much better if we had a fine government building on that point instead of placing a hotel between these parliament buildings and the new proposed buildings on Sussex Street? The whole thing is merely one of the many cases in which the Department of Public Works has given estimate to this House only to have it proven afterwards that the cost exceeded the estimate from fifty to one hundred per cent. In as many of these cases as have been investigated, it has been found that the money has gone to middlemen. And the Minister of Finance and Public Accounts Committee have upheld that action.

Mr. BARR. We have heard here, for the first time, from the Minister of Finance, the extraordinary doctrine that hon. members on this side must not depend on estimates brought down by the government, but must add from fifty to one hundred per cent in counting upon what the actual cost will be. No doubt the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as an old parliamentarian, knew that this was the practice, and that was the reason why he estimated that this mint would cost from fifty to one hundred per cent more than the estimate.

Mr. FIELDING. He was thinking of his own day.

Mr. BARR. No, but of the record of this government. I venture to say that there is not a contract under this government which does not show payments far beyond the estimate. The Minister of Finance tells us that the money has gone into the pockets of the workingman. I think that no member of this House, nor anybody in this country, will accept that view. Everybody knows that the money has gone into the hands of fat contractors and middlemen; and I venture to say that a large percentage of it will find its way back into the election funds;—we certainly have every reason to suspect something of that kind. The Minister of Finance knew that, from 1901 to 1904, wages were high; and if he had taken this House into his confidence and stated that an extra amount would be necessary to complete the work on the mint, the House would have accepted his explanation. But, since 1905, wages have not gone up, and, to-day, they are lower than when the contract was made. But we are living in a different condition of affairs from that which existed in former times. For instance, at present, this government is paying seven per cent on temporary loans in England, whilst four years ago it paid two per cent. And, in this case of the mint, we are going to spend $100,000 a year more than if we had our coins minted in England. The government must call a halt or it will drive the country into bankruptcy. The only hope, however, is in a change of government.

Mr. J. D. REID. As to the cost of minting silver and copper coins up to the present time, I have here the figures since the present government came into power, showing what this service has cost us.

Paid for coining.

	Silver.	Copper.	Total.
1897-8	$ 6,510	$3,985	$ 10,495
1898-9	5,366	1,200	7,566
1899-1900	15,570	1,200	16,770
1900-1	15,300	300	18,300
1901-2	6,000	1,500	7,500
1902-3	22,884	3,000	25,884
1903-4	26,399	5,000	31,399
1904-5	3,000	2,487	7,487
1905-6	25,917	1,500	27,417
1906-7	29,520	1,625	31,145
Total for 10 years	.....	.....	$183,963
Average	.....	.....	18,396

Now, we find that the annual cost to this country will be $135,000. That is, there will be a permanent yearly addition to our expenditure of no less than $117,000. This is one of the items in which the government are adding to the expenditure and raising it to over $100,000,000 as against $40,000,000 when they came into power.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know the authority for the figures which the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) has given. But to the extent that they go to show that the minting of coins is an expense, they are misleading. As a matter of fact, we make a large profit on our coinage. If the hon. gentleman means to contend that we would have even a greater profit by having our coining done in England, I quite admit the correctness of that statement. But the fact should be known—and many people are not aware of it—that there is a very large profit on this work. I admit that, as a mere question of dollars and cents, we could get the coins more cheaply if they were made in England, but on that basis we could get

our Dominion notes printed more cheaply in England than in Ottawa. But parliament years ago deliberately decided that it was better that our paper currency should not be printed in London, but in Ottawa under the inspection of the Finance Department. We have simply taken a step further by arranging to have our coins made in Ottawa, though, as in the case of the notes, we could save money by having the work done in England. There may be a method of computation which justifies the hon. gentleman's figures. But it should be known that there is a large profit instead of a loss on our coinage. So far as the minting of coin goes, the profit made on the coinage in a year would pay for the mint twice over.

Mr. J. D. REID. But there would be a saving of $117,000 a year if the work were done in England.

Mr. FIELDING. There would be a saving, but the figures the hon. gentleman mentions may be too large.

Mr. DANIEL. I feel a little doubtful whether this $509,000 is really going to complete all that is required in connection with the mint. I read in the newspapers not very long ago that the Master of the Mint would be unable to carry on the minting of gold coins, because he would require refined gold and he had not the plant for that work, and it was intimated that a smelter and other refining plant would need to be provided. Is that included by the Minister of Public Works in this amount of $509,000 ? If not, how much more will this extra plant cost ?

Mr. FIELDING. There are two items which may possibly have to be added later to this amount. One is for a refinery. Several proposals have been made with respect to refining the metal, which, if adopted, would make the construction of a refinery unnecessary. I think the mint officials would prefer that we should have a small building constructed there for the purpose of refining. We have not determined that, but are inclined to entertain the proposal.

There is another point that has escaped the notice of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. In the estimates we have made hitherto, we have not contemplated that there should be a residence for the mint officials. The Imperial authorities prefer that the chief officer of the mint should live on the ground. I have endeavoured to persuade them that it is not necessary, that we would prefer not to construct a residence for the master, and that if he is to have a residence let it be elsewhere. But the Imperial authorities are anxious, in conformity with the practice elsewhere, that we should give the master a residence. At present he is residing in a private house in the city. I think these are the only two possible additional charges, if they should be decided on, the refinery and the residence. These are but approximate estimates, $20,000 and $25,000. There would have to be a small piece of land adjoining the mint ground purchased for the refinery and for the residence, if it be determined to build one. The chief architect says it will cost about $17,000. I allow a margin on each of these things, because experience shows that it is necessary. If we were to say 20,000 for the residence and $25,000 for the refinery, they would seem to be outside estimates. The land would have to be taken by expropriation from the piece adjoining the mint. Then we would have to put up a modest residence for the master, if the British authorities insist upon it, and construct a refinery, unless some of the various suggestions are adopted that have been offered as to independent refiners supplying the metal, if we could make a satisfactory arrangement for supplying the metal; we are not anxious to do otherwise. These are the two features of the question which are under consideration. There is a possibility of these two things being added to the cost.

Mr. BARKER. Is it only the master of the mint who expects a house for himself?

Mr. FIELDING. On the grounds, yes. I think the deputy master, who is the chief officer, is the only officer for whom they ask a residence. The master of the mint is the title of the officer at headquarters in London; all the branch mints are presided over by gentlemen who bear the title of deputy master.

Mr. BARKER. Then the deputy master may expect a house costing about $20,000, and the refinery is expected to cost about $25,000?

Mr. FIELDING. With regard to the refinery, there are suggestions that private parties will be able to supply us the metal, and perhaps we will not require a refinery. But we will have to pay for the services they render.

Mr. BARKER. That is $45,000. Then there is the land, and we may expect a stone fence and everything else.

Mr. FIELDING. There would have to be a fence.

Mr. BARKER. Then we are well on towards $600,000.

Mr. FIELDING. I would prefer to err on the right side now.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is a question I would like to ask the Finance Minister, though it may not come under this item. We had a refinery in British Columbia for silver, gold and copper, though on a small scale. Now, has the government considered whether they will pay the face value of the metal there, and provide for its trans-

portation here? Perhaps the minister may not be able to answer that question at present, but I would like him to consider it. Now, we are to have a mint in Canada, and we should endeavour to mint as much as possible of the refined article that is produced in Canada. In doing so I think the holders of the gold to be refined should receive the full face value of their product, although it has to be minted in Ottawa, they should receive as much as the same could be purchased in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a matter of detail that has not yet been worked out. I think we should certainly refine the metal in Canada, for every reason, whether we have a refinery ourselves or make use of some private refinery.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is this mint absolutely under the control of the British government?

Mr. FIELDING. The mint authorities would have the absolute right, if they wished to exercise it, of controlling it altogether, because it is a branch of the Royal Mint. One effect of that understanding has been that in the construction and equipment of the mint we have had the benefit of skilled men whom we could not obtain in any other way. But the British authorities have asked the deputy master to make his local appointments subject to the approval of the government. The chief officer and the experts are taken from the Royal Mint and sent over here from England, or from the colonies where they have had branch mints. The deputy master has been instructed to make his nominations from this country.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood the Finance Minister to say that the minting of gold, silver and copper coins here would result in an absolute profit, that the country would make a profit out of it?

Mr. FIELDING. Not as respects gold, there would be no profit in the coinage of gold. But as between the metallic value and the coin value there is a considerable profit both on silver and bronze. But there is no profit on gold, whether you have it in coin or bullion makes no difference as to its intrinsic value.

Ottawa—Astronomical Observatory—additional buildings, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am now able to give to the committee the information which was desired before recess. The revote is $12,000, and the new vote $3,000. The total ependiture is estimated at $17,000. The additional buildings consist of one eleven by nineteen to accommodate the staff and contain the instruments to make solar observations. Then two smaller buildings are required.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who were the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. O'Leary and Whelan. The contract price is $13,900, the original estimate was $14,000. The building is nearly all concrete. The difference between the contract price of $13,900 and the $17,000, is made up of $1,000 for heating apparatus, $500 for electric wiring, $1,000 for superintendence and contingencies.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then I understand that $14,000 is the estimate of the engineer for everything?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only for the building.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will this $17,000 finish the whole thing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will complete the whole matter.

Mr. J. D. REID. There will be no more asked for next year or in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Parliament buildings—additions and alterations, $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The note which I have from the officers of my department is that this vote of $150,000 is asked to make provision for continuing the works placed under contract in connection with the additions and alterations to the parliament buildings, which consist in extending the northwest wing northward and the residence of the Speaker of the House of Commons westward, the construction of a new upper story and roof on the tower which forms a portion of the residence, the cubic contents being 745,000 cubic feet; also for alterations to the parliament buildings in accordance with the sub-joined estimate submitted by the chief architect. The amount paid to the contractors is $76,970; renewal of windows, furniture, carpets, matting, lumber, paints, labour, $7,300.30; alterations and improvements to ventilation system, speed motor, switchboard, Nernst lamps, &c., $21,567.75; contingencies, printing, advertising and salary of clerk of works, $1,939.92, making a total expenditure up to the 31st March, 1907, of $107,777.97. Then I have further information. The amount due on the contract work is $160,463; heating and boilers, $5,000; electrical wiring and fixtures, $5,000; furniture, $10,000, &c. The total probable cost of the additions and alterations to the parliament buildings is $322,247.97.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who are the contractors of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. W. H. McGillivray and T. Labelle of Ottawa.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many tenders were received and were uney the lowest tenderers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were five tenders received; they ranged from $237,437

to $263,000. The lowest was that of Messrs. McGillivray and Labelle.

Mr. J. D. REID. Now it is estimated that it will cost $322,247.97.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But that includes many other things.

Mr. J. D. REID. What did the contract include?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would rather say what it did not include; it did not include heating and boilers, electrical wiring, fixtures, fittings, furniture and some work in connection with sidewalks, roads, &c., superintendence and contingencies.

Mr. DANIEL. What furniture would there be in a building that is not finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The furniture will be put in when the building is ready for it.

Mr. DANIEL. You have bought furniture before the building is finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that is the estimated cost.

Mr. DANIEL. When does the minister expect to have this building finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The date of completion is 15th March, 1909.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then it will not be ready for the next session of parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected that certain necessary rooms will be ready in time for next session.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then it is possible we may not have the use of any of that building next session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman mean that unless he uses the rooms next session he will not have an opportunity of using those rooms at all?

Mr. J. D. REID. I stand as good a chance as the hon. minister of being here after next session. I will take chances on that.

Mr. BENNETT. Remember Ross.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perheps we will both be here.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister will remember my mentioning to the House today that we were short of rooms and there is the possibility of our being in the same position next session because the contractor need not give up the building until his contract is completed unless we pay him a bonus for the use of those rooms. If we are likely to be in that position I renew my request that the Minister of Public Works make some arrangement with the housekeeper who has eight or ten rooms down here in this building by which these rooms can be obtained for the use of the members of this House. I am quite satisfied that if a reasonable amount were paid to this man for being obliged to vacate these rooms he would do so. Is it right that all the members of this House should be inconvenienced as they are simply because the housekeeper is occupying seven or eight rooms in this building. As long as he is satisfied to vacate these rooms I think there should be no hesitation in every member of this House agreeing to recompense him to the extent of a reasonable amount for doing so. If seven or eight more rooms were used for the really legitimate business of this House it would be a great convenience. I will ask the minister if it is a proper thing to see all the corridors of this House piled up with blue books that are here for the members. Nobody knows where to find them. It is impossible to know where to get your bluebooks. Up to the present session they were in the post office, and we knew where to get them. But the postmaster throws them out into the lobby and they are left there. I really think the minister should take steps to get the use of these rooms for the members of the House. I mentioned the matter several times, but the Minister of Public Works does not seem to pay any attention to it. The members of the opposition should have a couple of rooms immediately; they should certainly have at least one extra room placed at their disposal if nothing better can be done. The chances are, if the contractor does not give up the work without being paid a large bonus, that we shall be in the same position next session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From what the chief architect tells me there is no question whatever but there will be a number of rooms fitted and ready for the use of hon. gentlemen when parliament assembles again. As to the arrangement for the present session I shall be very glad to do what I can to accommodate hon. gentlemen. But to-day is the first time I have heard the hon. gentleman speak on this subject. I see him frequently, he and I are friendly, and I think he might have come to me and told me of the inconvenience he is put to. I shall be very glad to take the matter up with him or with a committee of gentlemen opposite, and if it is possible to do anything I shall be very happy to do it.

Mr. J. D. REID. To-day is the first time I knew that the Minister of Public Works was in charge of these rooms.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then why did the hon. gentleman say that the Minister of Public Works paid no attention to these complaints.

Mr. J. D. REID. I brought it up in the House two or three times.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not when I was present.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not know whether the hon. gentleman was present or not, but it certainly was discussed this session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, please see me tomorrow about it.

Mr. J. D. REID. I will see you early next week.

Ottawa—Victoria Memorial Museum, $300,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In this is included a revote of $50,000. This for the Victoria Memorial Museum which was placed under contract on the 20th of December, 1904. It is a very large building which is being erected at Appin Place at the foot of Metcalfe street, between McLeod and Argyle avenue. If hon. gentlemen have not seen this building it would be well worth their while to go and see what a magnificent structure it is. It is being built very cheaply, under contract. Tenders were called publicly and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, Mr. George Goodwin, of Ottawa. There were five tenders received ranging from $950,000 to $1,349,000 and the lowest tender was accepted. The estimate of the chief architect was $1,250,000, so that Mr. Goodwin's tender is $300,000 less than the estimate. He is doing exceedingly good work, is carrying out his contract and we will have a very fine building.

Mr. BENNETT. Is Patrick Canty clerk of works on the Victoria Memorial Museum, the same gentleman who was clerk of works on the Laurier Tower when it collapsed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is not the same.

Mr. BENNETT. Who was clerk of works when that so-called Laurier Tower collapsed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Taylor was one of the architectural staff. Will the minister ask Mr. Ewart if Mr. Canty was not engaged in some capacity on the Laurier Tower ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that Mr. Canty was not employed upon the tower in any capacity.

Mr. BENNETT. It was stated in the House at the time that he was, and the statement was not contradicted by Mr. Hyman, then Minister of Public Works. A gentleman named J. A. Ewart was paid for preparing working drawings, &c., in reference to the iron work on the Victoria Museum, the sum of $1,250. Who is Mr. Ewart and where does he reside ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Ewart is an architect in Ottawa and is a specialist in iron work.

Mr. BENNETT. I see from the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Ewart was paid $131 for professional services, and at page 319, Auditor General's Report, I see that a firm named Band, Burrit & Meredith were paid $6,000 for plans of the archives building. How many firms are employed outside of the staff of the department in the preparation of plans and work of that kind ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Outside architects are only employed when there is a good deal of work on hand, and which cannot be attended to by the staff of the department. I am informed that some four or five are employed outside of the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. What are their names ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no outside architect employed in connection with the museum ; I can give the names later when we come to another vote.

Mr. BENNETT. What did this firm of Band, Burrit & Meredith do ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were given the work of preparing all the plans of the Archives building.

Mr. BENNETT. Where do they live ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Ottawa.

Mr. BENNETT. Upon whose recommendation are these various outsiders employed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister employs them, of course after consultation with the chief architect as to their special qualifications for the particular work.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this Mr. Ewart a son of the Chief Architect of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have any outside architects made the plans for the Victoria Memorial Museum ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, those plans were prepared by the chief architect of the department, and the work is done under his direct supervision. Mr. Canty is the clerk of works under him.

Mr. REID. Then I understand that the only payment to outsiders for making plans is this amount for Mr. Ewart ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is all.

Mr. REID. I see that this firm of Band, Burritt & Meredith get five per cent for overseeing the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes the preparation of the plans.

Mr. REID. On this Victoria Memorial Museum is there any item of that kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because the plans were prepared by the chief Architect of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. On page V—20, I find this item : 'A. G. Ewart, draughtsman, services and travel, Ottawa to London, Eng-

land and return, $950.06.' Is he on the permanent staff ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Ewart is on the staff of the mint, as assistant of the superintendent of the mint.

Mr. BENNETT. He is a gentleman from England, is he ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he is a Canadian.

Mr. BENNETT. Is he related to the J. A. Ewart who is designing ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, he is a brother.

Mr. BENNETT. And a son of the Chief Architect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Are there others ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose these outside people are not employed in the department except in special cases of this kind ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they are not on the staff of the department, and are only employed in these special cases.

Mr. J. D. REID. It seems rather hard on the gentlemen who are on the permanent staff that when there is a trip from Ottawa to London, with all expenses paid, none of them are capable of going and transacting the work. What is the special nature of the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a matter that rests entirely with the superintendent of the mint. He took Mr. Ewart with him, I suppose with a view to looking over the mint in London to obtain the necessary information to enable him to give valuable service in connection with the mint here.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there not an officer in the department capable of preparing similar to those prepared by Mr. J. A. Ewart ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Chief Architect tells me that we have at the present time in the department a gentleman who would be able to do that class of work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was he not in the department at that time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D. REID Then there was not at that time in the department a man qualified to do that work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Qualified is a strong word. There was no man with the special knowledge which it was considered desirable the architect should have for that class of work. The hon. gentleman knows that there are various classes of architectural work, as there are of engineering work, and it was thought advisable to employ a man who was a specialist in this class of work.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the gentleman in the department paid who is qualified to do this class of work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,500 a year.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is he ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. John Bain. He is a graduate of the Toronto School of Science.

Mr. J. D. REID. How long did it take Mr. Ewart to do this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Chief Architect tells me that there were a large number of drawings. He designed the whole of the structural iron work of the building, which took him a good many months.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not wish to find any particular fault with Mr. Ewart because he is a son of the Chief Architect; but there are probably in the department men who are qualified, to do this work, and when they see it given outside, and to a son of the Chief Architect of the department, they are likely to be very much discontented. There is no doubt that it did not take Mr. Ewart more than two or three months to do all this work, though he is perhaps not getting too large an amount for it, not being an officer of the department; but it is going to cause discontent, and it is not fair to the other officers of the department. I am satisfied that there are men in that department qualified to do work equal to what this gentleman has done. I for one think that if any relative of any chief officer of the government is employed, it would be much better to put him on the permanent staff than to give him special work by which he is going to make two or three times as much as any regular officer of the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman must bear in mind that it is not often that special work of this kind is required. He should also remember that the staff of the architectural branch of the department is not a large one, and that the members of that staff are constantly engaged in the work of the department. There are buildings to be erected all over Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the staff has to be kept constantly at work getting out plans for buildings for which parliament provides. Occasionally there is special work to be done, and even if members of the regular staff are qualified to do it, instead of taking them from the regular work of the department, which requires all their time, it has been considered advisable to engage outside persons possessing the necessary qualifications for this special work.

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. minister ever considered that, if he follows the policy of bringing in these outsiders he will never have an experienced staff of his own? He deprives the men of his staff of opportunities to learn. And, as has been said, it

is most embarrassing for the staff to have outsiders brought in to do special work while the regular hands are merely employed as copyists on plans, never learning, never improving.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work is not merely copying, but designing buildings, such as post offices, custom houses, drill sheds, armouries and others of that kind. But there is something in the view expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker). That view has impressed itself upon the department, and now a gentleman has been employed on the staff who is qualified to do this special work.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to call attention to another case, for which I would refer to page V—328 of the Auditor General's Report. It would appear that Mr. Vautelet has been employed to prepare plans for a harbour shed at Quebec, and the country has to pay $12,250 for his work. Will the minister tell us what were the striking peculiarities of this freight shed that made it necessary for the department to go outside for this service and pay $12,250 for the preparation of the plans ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to give the information asked for. In employing Mr. Vautelet in this connection, the minister was following the practice which has prevailed, I think, ever since confederation under all governments, that of employing specialists for this special work. This gentleman, Mr. Vautelet, was employed by the Dominion government for the first time in 1889, and at times thereafter, to design bridges and supervise the construction of steel bridgs.

Mr. J. D. REID. Under salary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On a percentage basis. This was done from 1889 to 1896 when this government came into power. Mr. Vautelet has been employed under this government to design these sheds at Quebec, and also to design the structural steel work of the dam to be constructed to the north of the city of Winnipeg, as well as designs for expensive sheds which it was proposed to erect at Montreal. The information furnished me concerning this shed at Quebec shows that it was a very extensive building. It was an immigration building to be constructed in the harbour of Quebec. It was to have a total length of 1,260 feet and a width of 80 feet and was to be two stories high. The foundation was to be of piles cut off five feet below high water spring tide, and on these were to be concrete piers to support the building. The frame of the structure was to be of steel work and the walls of brick, and floors partly of concrete and partly of asphalt. The lower floor was intended to provide accommodation for first and second-class passengers, with ample space for baggage and freight. The upper story was for the accommodation of immigrants, and to be divided up into the necessary rooms. The towers were to contain large water reservoirs for sanitary purposes. The estimated cost of the building was $375,000. The work done by Mr. Vautelet in designing the plans was very special work. The plans consist of 23 sheets, approximately 3 by 4 feet, containing all details of construction. These, hon. gentlemen will see, represent a large amount of work. And the information I have received from the assistant engineer of the department is that the copying alone of the original plans, which consist of 23 sheets, would occupy a mechanical draughtsman for three months. It may be said that this is work which ought to have been done in the department. But let me tell hon. gentlemen that the ordinary work of the engineers—for this is engineering work—is not of that character. A large steel building of this character must be designed with the greatest care, and the work should be given to those who have made a study of it. Mr. Vautelet was employed because it was felt that he possessed the qualifications necessary.

With regard to the other work on which he has been employed, the work at St. Andrew's rapids, this also was work of a very special character. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) knows, Winnipeg is a city of 100,000 inhabitants. It is hoped, by the construction of these works, the lock and dam, to make Winnipeg a port of Lake Winnipeg. Owing to the peculiar conditions there, the greatest care has to be exercised. The Red river rises to the south and runs northward. It happens almost every spring that, while the river at these locks would still be icebound, further south the ice would be melted and the water would be running with a free course. It was necessary to design the dam of a most special character in order to prevent the possibility of flooding, as that would result disastrously to the city. Mr. Vautelet was employed for this work. He went to Europe for the purpose of studying a lock and dam built to meet similar conditions. I may say frankly to my hon. friend, that in the opinion of engineers of my department, no one on the staff was capable of designing a work of this character.

Mr. J. D. REID. What was paid to Mr. Vautelet for the work at Winnipeg ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Auditor General's Report would show. The contract was that Mr. Vautelet was to receive a percentage on the expenditure. I believe he was to receive five per cent on the cost of the work which he designed. That is my recollection of the arrangement, but I speak subject to correction. I may say that the work in making the designs for

this work were of a most elaborate character. They consist of 42 sheets. I have looked over them very carefully, and I can say that there is an enormous amount of work on them. I am told that it took Mr. Vautelet at least twelve months to complete the designs and plans of this work. I do not know whether that included the time occupied by his trip to Europe or not. In addition, he had to employ several additional draughtsmen at high wages, paying those draughtsmen out of the amount he received.

Mr. J. D. REID. Now, as to Quebec.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost of the building at Quebec was $375,000 and Mr. Vautelet was to receive 3½ per cent. In 1889, when Mr. Vautelet was employed on work for the department, my information is his commission ranged from 3 to 5 per cent upon the cost of the work which he designed.

Mr. BARKER. Was this gentleman employed on behalf of the government ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Did the department advise the minister that such an expert was necessary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. They would not undertake this themselves ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They would not.

Mr. BARKER. They considered that an expert in the construction of metal frames and that sort of thing was necessary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. More especially in connection with the St. Andrew's Rapids works. I may say that the works designed there are the only works of their kind on the continent of America.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Vautelet in no way acted for the contractor ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BARKER. Absolutely for the government ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. MORIN. The St. Andrew's dam is on the Red river near Winnipeg, I understand. It is a dam right across the river ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MORIN. Is it made in order to provide water-power, or to extend navigation ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To extend navigation. The hon. gentleman may not be aware that the present head of navigation is at a point about twenty miles north of Winnipeg. By the construction of this dam and lock it is expected that vessels navigating Lake Winnipeg will be able to steam right up to the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. MORIN. I heard a gentleman say, speaking of this work, that he was afraid that the ice coming down in the spring would stop at the dam and flood the country. Is the minister afraid of that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not with dam and lock of the present design. My information is that there is absolutely no danger.

Mr. MORIN. Is there a design to melt the ice ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) is really serious in his question, I may say that the design of the dam is such that a portion of the work can be removed at the close of navigation, leaving the ice a free run. He will see, as a practical man, that that can be done.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that this shed at Quebec is 1,260 feet long, 80 feet wide and 30 feet high

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two stories high.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is just a plain shed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a steel shed.

Mr. J. D. REID. Now, for making plans for this shed, the government are paying $12,500. There was not an officer in the department, it appears, who was qualified to make the plans for a plain shed in Quebec. It seems to me that this is altogether too large a sum of money to pay for such a service. It seems only another instance of the extravagance of the Public Works Department, of course, the agreement was made before the present minister took charge, therefore, perhaps, he is not responsible for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) a member of this House before 1896 ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did he ever criticise the employment of Mr. Vautelet for the designing of the steel bridges, as for instance right here in the city of Ottawa ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not remember the item. But the minister compares the design for a bridge with that of a common, ordinary shed. There is no trouble to find a draughtsman to make plans for a shed, but it is quite a different proposition to get a man who is qualified to make plans for a bridge. Does the minister wish to compare the architect or draughtsman who made the plans and specifications of the Quebec bridge with the one who made the designs for a steel shed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not speak of the Quebec bridge, but of a bridge here in Ottawa.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, take even the bridge here in Ottawa, does the minister be-

lieve that it takes a man with qualifications for the designing of a bridge to make the plans and specifications for a shed of this kind? Does he, in all seriousness, state that $12,500 is a reasonable amount to pay for making plans, for a common, ordinary, everyday shed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not a common, ordinary, everyday shed, but a very large building, two stories high, the lower part to provide accommodation for freight and baggage, and the upper part to be divided into living apartments for immigrants to enable them to be cared for comfortably. The building contains also a large dining room. The design had to be of a special character. I do not profess to know much about the construction of steel bridges or steel sheds; but I do claim that a shed of 1,260 feet long and two stories high, and with accommodation for freight and baggage, and containing living rooms and all that sort of thing, is not a common shed. I should say it was a very extraordinary shed.

Mr. DANIEL. The framework is of steel. What is the outside cover?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume, sheet iron. The chief engineer is not here at the moment, and we are now dealing with the engineering branch. In the first place, the question would be whether or not Mr. Hyman, when minister, was justified in employing Mr. Vautelet. In doing so he was acting on the advice of the engineering staff of the department and doing the very same thing that had been done as long ago as 1889, when the previous government was in power and employed Mr. Vautelet. So far as remuneration is concerned we allowed him exactly the same remuneration as was allowed him in 1889 when he was employed on special work. It must be borne in mind that the engineers of my department are not ordinarily engaged in the construction of steel buildings or steel bridges. The ordinary work they have to do is looking after the dredging of harbours, building armouries, drill halls, post offices, custom-houses, wharfs, and wooden sheds as warehouses upon these wharfs. Now, if it is admitted that it was not unreasonable for the minister, having been advised by the chief engineer, to follow the practice which had been pursued by his predecessors, and employ Mr. Vautelet, then I think it would not be regarded as unreasonable that the same remuneration should be paid him. We know there is a scale of remuneration for architects and engineers, and I am told this was the usual and ordinary commission to allow for designing plans of this character.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the minister is doing justice to himself when he argues that because a shed was particularly long it required great mechanical skill. The question of the length was much less difficult than that of the width. The point to be ascertained was what would be the retaining strength of an iron girder thrown across a space 80 feet in width. I can take the minister to dozens of towns in Ontario where there are skating rinks constructed with timber trusses seventy and eighty feet in width. I was building myself this fall one with sixty feet trusses.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Without an architect?

Mr. BENNETT. Only a practical carpenter at $3 a day. There was a rink at Simcoe with a width of some seventy feet. It is not the question of length that is important but the width. It seems strange that in a department where there are men paid $3,500 a year and upwards, there was not one gentleman who could give an estimate of what would be the sustaining strength of an iron girder carried across a width of 80 feet, and what should be the size of the iron girder to span eighty feet in width.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I think we ought to have a little more information about the Victoria Museum and what is the estimated cost of this building. I understand the contract was let at $900,000, and the architect's estimate is more than a million and a quarter to complete. It strikes me that does not reflect much credit upon the skill of the architect. But leaving that aside, what is the estimated cost of the remainder?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will understand that the contract price is for the building alone, and there has to be some additional expenditure, for instance, for heating apparatus, boilers, electric wiring and fixtures, fittings, furniture, contingencies, superintendence, &c., all of which it is estimated will increase the cost of the building, fittings and furniture when completed, to $1,300,000.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. When do you expect it will be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About two years from the present time.

Mr. DANIEL. How much will it cost to heat the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $75,000.

Mr. ALCORN. What did the land cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $75,000. It formerly belonged to the Stewart estate. I am informed the property was purchased through the court, that it was put up to public auction by the Master in Chancery.

Mr. BOYCE. We would like a little more information in regard to the actual cost of this building. The minister's statement that it will be about $1,300,000, is somewhat vague.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman's experience should teach him that in estimating the cost of fitting up a great building, the cost of the furniture, heating, electric wiring and so forth, it is impossible to come within a few dollars of the actual cost. As I have said, the contract price of the building is $950,000, which is about $300,000 less than the chief architect's estimate. I am satisfied that Mr. Goodwin the contractor will not make a dollar out of his contract, in all probability he will lose money. In giving the additional amount for fittings and furniture, heating apparatus, boilers, electrical wiring, fixtures, contingencies and superintendence, the most I can do is to take the estimate of the chief architect of my department, and he tells me he thinks that I am safely within the mark in putting all these at $350,000 which makes $1,300,000 altogether.

Mr. BOYCE. Who is in charge of this work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The overseer is, Mr. Canty. Mr. Canty is clerk of the works who is acting directly under the chief architect.

Mr. BOYCE. But he has charge of all the public buildings in Otttawa ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BOYCE. Are his services confined to this building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. Are they liable to be transferred at any time to any other building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. He is devoting all his time to this building.

Mr. BOYCE. Who has the contract for the wiring ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract is not let yet.

Mr. BOYCE. Are the tenders in ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BOYCE. How will they be let ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders will be called for.

Mr. BOYCE. And the plumbing in the same way ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, all these will be let by contract.

Mr. BOYCE. All those items which are the subject of the minister's estimate ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders will be called for and contracts will be let to the lowest tenderers.

Mr. BOYCE. Tenders will be invited by public advertisement ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may be some small contracts which will be let without tender, but under the law appertaining to my department all contracts involving an expenditure of over $5,000 must be let by tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is this Pat Canty ? What did he do before his appointment ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Canty is by trade a mason and builder, an experienced man well qualified for his work.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand, here is a building costing $1,300,000. It is a most important building, it is a building that should have a first class, reliable man to superintend the work—an architect to see that the work is done and yet the government employ a mason to see the whole work done properly. He has to look after the other work as well as the masonry. This man is not qualified to be superintendent of that work. Does the minister think that a man getting $3.50 a day is qualified to see that that work is done properly ? The government employed such a man as that to look after this tower which fell down a short time ago.

Mr. BOYCE. This is the same man.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the same man. That was Mr. Taylor.

Mr. J. D. REID. But he was a man of similar qualifications. A man who will take that position at $3.50 a day to oversee a work of that magnitude is not qualified for the work especially when the minister states that his only qualification is that of a mason.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And builder.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is not a contractor; he is a mason.

Mr. BENNETT. And a prominent politician.

Mr. J. D. REID. Put there probably by the Liberal organization of this city.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Do you expect a Tory organization to put him there ?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I do not, but if the minister would take a lesson from the Postmaster (Mr. Lemieux) and get good men like the Postmaster General does to fill vacancies he would secure better results. In the Postmaster General's Department, when they want to get a man for a post office, they advertise for the Liberals to meet together and select a good man.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that sarcastic ?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I mean it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is very difficult to satisfy the hon gentleman. I am sure if we had given Mr. Canty $10 a day the hon. gentleman would have complained of our extravagance.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I would not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because we are able to get a man of experience and of excellent judgment at $3.50 a day in the person of Mr. Canty my hon. friend complains, but I may say that Mr. Canty has done so well that we have advanced his wages to $4.50 a day. Now, let me ask my hon. friend to go down and examine that building and see what splendid work is being done. It is a credit to Canada. Mr. Goodwin the contractor, is doing a magnificent piece of work there and Mr. Canty is most zealous in discharging his duties. He is there early in the morning and late at night seeing that the work is properly done. In addition to that Mr. Ewart, who has taken a special pride in this work is giving it his special attention. I have every confidence that through the supervision which the Chief Architect gives to the work and with Mr. Canty on the spot the work is being properly supervised.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As regards the Post Office Department I hope my hon. friend is only ironical, because he has asked me for some post offices in his own county and he should not complain if I have appointed some good honest Grits as postmasters. Surely he did not expect me to appoint opponents when good Grits could be found to fill the positions. I have received his thanks since then and I suppose that to-night he is only jocular in his remarks.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did expect that Liberals would be appointed but what I was referring to was this. Here is a post office to which a postmaster was to be appointed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I ask what the appointment of postmasters has to do with my estimates ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I am just answering the hon. Postmaster General.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Cannot you do that after we get through ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I will read you this :

A meeting of the Liberals
of the
Village of Kemptville
will be held in the Town Hall on the evening
of
Monday, July 22,
at 8 o'clock.
The object of the meeting is to select a fit and proper person to recommend to the Postmaster General for
Postmaster for Kemptville.
R. D. McMASTER, E. L. B. CORNELL,
President. Secretary.

Mr. BENNETT. Before we leave that item, I have a strong recollection that Mr. Canty was a gentleman whose name was brought in at the time of the collapse of the so-called Laurier Tower. On April 6th, 1906——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the hon. gentleman reading from ?

Mr. BENNETT. 'Hansard' of April 6, 1906. All through the discussion Mr. Canty is referred to and Mr. Hyman, the then Minister of Public Works, says this :

I understand that Mr. Canty, the gentleman mentioned, is inspector of the Museum building, but Mr. Taylor is the gentleman in the department who is responsible for the inspection of the building now under consideration, and Mr. Canty is only called in at certain times.

Now, the minister must have had in his recollection that discussion which was a matter of public discussion at the time. The newspapers were filled with it. There was a long discussion in the House the afternoon the accident happened. The House was agog with excitement on that day on account of the collapse of that famous tower. They felt as if there was going to be an earthquake. It was a fortunate thing that a number of men did not happen to be in the building at the time as it was about the noon hour and their lives were saved. On further discussion it was alleged that Mr. Canty was the responsible man, and Mr. Hyman did not deny it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My statement was made on the information given me by the chief architect and he still tells me that he has no recollection of Mr. Canty having had anything to do with that building. It may be Mr. Hyman was mistaken, I do not know as to that.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Hyman was speaking from the papers brought down.

Mr. TALBOT. I do not recollect whether it was the day afterwards or the second day afterwards, but I think I recollect that Mr. Hyman's statement as to Mr. Canty was withdrawn by him.

Mr. BENNETT. No. He made a mistake about the architect in Toronto and Mr. Hyman made that correction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even if you take Mr. Hyman's statement, all he says is that Mr. Canty was called in occasionally and that Mr. Taylor was the gentleman who had charge of the work.

Mr. BOYCE. What experience has Mr. Canty had in the construction of buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that Mr. Canty has been engaged in his trade as mason and builder ever since boyhood and as he is about fifty years old I suppose he would have thirty or thirty-five years experience. He is regarded, at all events by the chief architect, as being an exceedingly good man for this work.

Mr BOYCE. And he is working now for $4.50 a day ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. The chief architect is taking great risks when he recommends this man as superintendent after the experience he has had with him on this tower. He has cost the country thousands and thousands of dollars and I do not believe there is any private citizen in this country who would employ that man for such work again after the experience we have had.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should state to the committee that in addition to Mr. Canty being there as clerk of works, Mr. Sutherland, a member of the architect's staff of the department, is there every day devoting his time to the supervision of the work.

Mr. J. D. REID. It does not make any difference if there were a dozen men with him. After what happened when Mr. Canty was in charge of the tower it is a disgrace to the government to keep him in their employ. No private individual would do it It all goes to show that this man was put there and is retained by some influence which the government cannot overcome. It is necessary you should have such an officer, but there must be plenty of good Liberals in the country who have the necessary qualification. He was responsible for the fall of the Laurier tower which cost this country a great deal of money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not so.

Mr. J. D. REID. The report says he was in charge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Hyman's statement was that Mr. Taylor was in charge but that Mr. Canty was called in occasionally.

Mr. J. D. REID. I want the country to know that this Mr. Canty is the same man who had charge of the work on the Laurier tower.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely the hon. gentleman would not want to injure a hard working man in Mr. Canty's position. Even if you give the fullest weight to the statement of Mr. Hyman, he says that Mr. Taylor and not Mr. Canty was responsible for the Laurier tower. Mr. Taylor is no longer in the department.

Mr. McCOOL. There was a full investigation after the fall of the Laurier tower and it was proven that Mr. Canty had nothing whatever to do with it in any way, shape or form. If you search the debate in connection with the fall of the tower you will find that the minister took back his statement regarding Mr. Canty and declared he had made a mistake. I know positively that Mr. Canty had nothing whatever to do with it, and as to his ability to look after a work of this kind there is no better qualified man in this city or out of it. Mr. Canty is a well known man in this city, born and bred here and one of the most reliable builders that can be found.

Mr. BENNETT. It is unfortunate that the member for Nippissing (Mr. McCool) jumped in here, because he contradicts the statement made by the senior member for Ottawa in the course of that debate. I quote :

Mr. FOWLER. I see one of the members for Ottawa present and I would like to ask him if he would give the name of the clerk of works of this building.

Mr. STEWART. If the hon. gentleman is referring to me I may say that I have been given to understand that the inspector in this case was appointed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and also the contractor is or was a friend of these hon. gentlemen.

Then, in the course of the debate, Mr. Fowler said :

I understand that this officer named Canty, if rumour speaks true, receives $5 a day and pays no attention whatever to the building.

There was no denial made by Mr. Stewart or anybody else.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Stewart does not say that Mr. Canty was in charge of the building.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Taylor was a draughtsman in the office as Mr. Ewart knows. Mr. Taylor was not supposed to stand there from early morning until dewy eve to watch the mixing of cement; it was the duty of the clerk of works to do that and there is no question but that the clerk of works was Mr. Canty.

Mr. McCOOL. It seems very hard to convince the hon. gentleman that Mr. Canty had nothing whatever to do with it. If he will take the trouble to look up the evidence that was taken at the inquiry he will find my statement to be absolutely true, namely, that Mr. Canty had nothing whatever to do with the construction of the tower in one way or the other.

Mr. BENNETT. I find from 'Hansard' that the correction made by Mr. Hyman was with reference to another officer altogether, and not Mr. Canty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) makes the positive statement that he was a witness in the investigation and that it was proved there that Mr. Canty had nothing to do with the erection of the Laurier tower.

Ottawa—addition to eastern departmental block, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is simply a revote. The work of construction has not been commenced, but it is thought desirable to give this additional accommodation, more especially for the Finance Department.

Ottawa—new departmental buildings, $250,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was proposed some time ago, as hon. gentlemen are aware, to construct new departmental buildings which would face upon Sussex street, occupying the space between Sussex street and Major Hill Park. The reason for that was that the rentals now being paid by the government amount to a very large sum. The land has all been purchased, with the exception of eight properties, upon valuations made by an experienced land valuator. Hon. gentlemen will see that I am only asking for a vote of $250,000, of which $200,000 is a revote. My own view is that perhaps it is well not to proceed too rapidly with the construction of these buildings, but to acquire all the land first, and later on to take the necessary steps for the commencement of the work. The buildings are going to cost a very large sum of money, and it has been thought well not to embark on so large an undertaking in the present financial stringency. Therefore I am only asking for an additional vote of $50,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is likely to be considerable discussion on this matter, and I would suggest to the minister that we let the item pass on condition that we can discuss it on some other vote later on, so that we may now adjourn.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite willing to do that.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 20, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

MEAT AND FOOD INSPECTION.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What are the names and number of establishments being operated under the law and regulations of the Meat and Food Inspection Act?
2. When were they individually put under the operation of the Act?
3. What are the names and number of inspectors for each establishment?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister ol Finance). I have been asked to say that it would be more convenient if the information were sought for in the form of a return.

CUSTOM HOUSE OFFICER AT AYLMER, ONTARIO.

Mr. MARSHALL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What salary does the custom house officer receive in Aylmer, Ontario?
2. Has the salary attached to this office been increased in the last two years?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The present salary of the customs officer at Aylmer, Ontario, is $750 a year.
2. The salary attached to the office has been increased within the past two years.

IMPORTATIONS FROM ENGLAND IN SAND, CEMENT OR CLAY.

Mr. DEMERS asked:

What quantity of water-closets, urinals and basins, wash-stands, baths, sinks, and wash-tubs or earthenware tubs, made of sand, cement or clay, has been imported from England into Canada during the years 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The total importation from Great Britain during the undermentioned years of 'bath-tubs and washstands of earthenware, stone, cement or clay or of other material, n.o.p.,' was as follows:

1906..	15,939
1907..	25,875

The trade and navigation returns do not show the importations in detail for all these articles in 1904 and 1905, some of the articles being included along with other goods as manufactures of clay, and not separately classified.

PRINTING AND LITHOGRAPHING.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. During the last ten years how much money has been expended by years by this government for printing and lithographing done outside Canada?
2. For what reason was such work done out of Canada?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We have not been able to find any records in the department of information such as suggested by the hon. gentleman's question. If he is able to make it more definite with reference to any particular department, we will make a further search. But so far as information is available, we cannot find any thing referring to the matter mentioned in the hon. gentleman's question.

LIVE STOCK IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What method was followed by the Department of Agriculture in obtaining figures recently published in the press regarding the

live stock, &c., kept on the farms of Canada?
2. From whom and through whom was this information obtained regarding the live stock of the province of New Brunswick?
3. Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied that the figures as published referring to New Brunswick are correct?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. Schedules were sent to all the farmers in Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritime provinces requesting them to furnish information regarding the live stock, &c., on their own farms.
2. This question is answered by No. 1.
3. Yes.

TORONTO HARBOUR—EASTERN GAP.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. (a) What was the date of the contract awarded to Murray & Cleveland to do the work at the eastern gap, Toronto harbour; (b) and was the work for a lump sum or at schedule prices?
2. (a) What was the total cost of the work, and (b) when was it completed?
3. (a) Were any changes made in the specifications? (b) If so, were they at schedule prices, or on what other scale or basis?
4. (a) Did the contractors make any claim for extras? (b) If so, was such claim allowed in whole or in part, and (c) were they at schedule prices or on what other scale or basis?
5. (a) What was the total amount paid for extras, and (b) were such extras allowed and paid for each month, or on the final completion of the work?
6. (a) Did the contractors or some one representing them put in a final claim or any claim to the government for $87,000 or thereabouts for extras, and (b) has any of this claim been paid yet? (c) If so, when and (d) how much, and (e) on whose report or recommendation?
7. Is there any claim still outstanding against the government in connection with this contract?

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

1. (a) May 21, 1889. (b) Schedule prices.
2. (a) $419,173.75. (b) August 31, 1896.
3. (a) Yes. (b) Schedule prices.
4. (a) Yes. (b) In part. (c) Schedule prices.
5. (a) $73,162.52. (b) Part monthly, part on completion of the work.
6. (a) In 1896, contractors put in a claim for $88,658.90 for extras. (b) Yes. (c) April 6, 1907. (d) $63,685.14. (e) On recommendation of departmental board of arbitration and awards.
7. No.

CATTLE EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

What is the value of cattle exported to the United States during each of the following years: 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The number and value of cattle exported to the United States from Canada during the undermentioned fiscal years have been as follows:—

	No.	Value.
1900..	86,989	$1,401,137
1901..	46,244	891,340
1902..	31,743	787,864
1903..	10,432	292,288
1904..	3,517	119,942
1905..	3,696	152,084
1906..	4,726	206,102
1907..	10,216	530,693

ENFORCEMENT OF FRUIT MARKS ACT.

Mr. LALOR asked:

1. Has the government inspectors lately made a seizure of apples in the port of Montreal?
2. If so, how many barrels were seized?
3. What was the value?
4. What were the reasons for such seizure?
5. By whom were the apples shipped?
6. Were they for export or local consumption?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture):

1. The Dominion fruit inspectors have made no seizure of apples, but during December last they examined a large shipment of fruit at the Canada cold storage warehouse, Montreal.
2. 1,400 barrels were examined, and 939 barrels were found to be wrongly marked according to the definitions of the Fruit Marks Act.
3. The government has no information as to the value of these apples.
4. The examination of the apples was made in the ordinary course of the Dominion fruit inspectors' duties.
5. The brands on the barrels show that Robert Wade, Brighton, Ont., was responsible for the marking. He was probably the shipper, but the government has no positive information on that point.
6. The government has no information as to what market the apples are intended for.

SALE OF GRIFFITH ISLAND.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. When was Griffith island, in the Georgian bay, disposed of?
2. Who was the purchaser, and what was the price paid therefor?
3. How was same sold, by auction, tender or private treaty?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Griffith island, in Georgian bay, was sold on the 15th August, 1899.

2. The purchaser was Alexander Thomson, of Owen Sound, Ont.; and the price paid therefor was $4,021.

3. The island was sold by tender.

SITE OF BELLEVILLE DRILL HALL.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. From what party or parties was the land for the site of the drill hall and parade grounds at Belleville purchased?

2. What person or persons negotiated the purchase or purchases in behalf of the department?

3. What amount was paid for each parcel of such land?

4. What commission, salary or other remuneration, if any, was paid to the person or persons negotiating such purchase?

5. Was the person or persons who negotiated these purchases employed at the same time in the government service, and drawing salary or pay? If so, in what service and what pay?

6. Who was engaged and who acted in behalf of the department as inspector of the building and under what arrangement as to pay or salary?

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

1. Mrs. E. E. Strumme, R. Arnott.

2. J. B. Charleson.

3. Mrs. Strumme, $5,000; R. Arnott, $4,000.

4 and 5. Mr. J. B. Charleson, inspector of public buildings, Department of Public Works; salary, $2,800 per year.

6. Ira Thomson, clerk of works; salary, $3.50 per working day.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—REPAIR SHOPS.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. Who is the contractor for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway freight car repair shop at Moncton, and what is the bulk sum of the contract therefor?

2. How much has been paid to the contractor to date on account of said contract, and how much in extras in connection with said building?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways):

1. E. A. Wallberg, $56,630.

2. $54,547.34. No extras have been paid.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. Who is the contractor for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway passenger car repair shop at Moncton, and what is the bulk sum of the contract therefor?

2. How much has been paid to the contractor to date on account of said contract, and how much in extras in connection with said building?

1. Who is the contractor for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway paint shop at Moncton, and what is the bulk sum of the contract therefor?

2. How much has been paid to the contractor to date on account of said contract, and how much in extras in connection with said building?

1. Who is the contractor for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway stores and office building at Moncton, and what is the bulk sum of the contract therefor?

2. How much has been paid to the contractor to date on account of said contract, and how much in extras in connection with said building?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Railways):

1-1-1. The passenger car repair shop, passenger car paint shop, the storehouse and office builing at Moncton, were all awarded under one tender to Mr. E. A. Wallberg at his tender price, $154,945, his being the lowest.

2-2-2. $147,736.08 has been paid on account of contract; no extras.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. Has the contract for the new Intercolonial Railway planing mill at Moncton, which was awarded to Rhodes, Curry & Co., been transerred?

2. If so, when was it transferred, and to whom?

3. What was the bulk sum of the contract therefor?

4. How much has been paid to date on account of said contract, and how much in extras in connection with said building?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways):

1 and 2. No, it was not transferred.

3. $23,995.

4. $23,007.96. No extras.

FIRE EXTINGUISHERS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many fire extinguishers have been purchased by the government for the different departments of the public service since June 30, 1906, to January 1, 1908?

2. From whom were they purchased, and at what price?

3. What is the total amount paid for the same?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). My hon. friend will see that this question relates to different departments and I would suggest that he leave it as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion.

IMPORTS OF ANTHRACITE.

Mr. BELAND—by Mr. Talbot—asked:

1. How much anthracite or hard coal has been imported from the United States during the past fiscal year?

2. What quantity of the same product has been imported from other countries?

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The quantity of anthracite coal inported into Canada from the United States and other countries during the fiscal year 1907 has been as follows: United States, 2,756,322 tons; other countries, 28,539 tons.

IMPORTS OF RAW COTTON.

Mr. BELAND—by Mr. Talbot—asked:

1. What quantity of raw cotton has been imported from the United States during the years 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively?
2. What value in money do such importations represent?
3. What quantity of the same product has been imported from other countries during the same three years?

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The quantity and value of raw cotton imported from the United States and other countries during the undermentioned fiscal years have been as follows:

Fiscal years.	United States		Other Countries	
	Lbs.	Value.	Lbs.	Value.
		$		$
1905.....	56,110,370	5,550,032	572,305	67,012
1906.....	67,743,738	7,596,729	257,309	29,900
1907.....	72,145,508	7,822,401	234,970	29,620

EXPORTS OF PULP WOOD.

Mr. BELAND—by Mr. Talbot—asked:

1. What quantity, in cords, of pulp wood has been exported to the United States during the fiscal years 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively?
2. What value in money do such exportations represent for each of these years?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

The quantity and value of pulp wood exported to the United States during the undermentioned fiscal years have been as follows:

Fiscal Years.	Cords.	Value.
1905..	593,624	$2,600,814
1906..	614,286	2,649,106
1907..	628,744	2,748,909

PAYMENTS TO NEWSPAPERS—GRAZING LEASES.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. What amount has been paid by the Dominion government for all purposes, from January 1, 1904, to January 1, 1908, to the Mr. BELAND.

following papers: 'Alberta Star,' Cardston; 'Lethbridge Herald,' 'McLeod Advance,' 'Nanton News,' and 'The Frank Paper'?

2. What companies or individuals who hold closed grazing leases, irrevocable for 21 years, and containing a clause allowing the purchase of 10 per cent of the leasehold at $1 an acre, have availed themselves of this privilege, and what was the quantity of land purchased in each instance, and amount paid on same?
3. Do any of the revocable leases contain a clause permitting the purchase of 10 per cent of the leasehold at $1 an acre?
4. How many applications were received by the government for irrevocable leases, and how many of those were granted?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The first part of the question requires information from several departments. I would ask the hon. member to allow that part of the question to stand as a motion for a return. The answer to the second part is as follows:

2. The Milk River Cattle Company, 5,831·90 acres at $1 per acre; paid on account $1,500. Grand Forks Cattle Company, 9,452·65 acres at $1 per acre; paid in full with interest, $9,805.75. John R. Craig, assigned to David McL. Finnie, 506 acres at $1.50 per acre; paid in full with interest, $909.08.
3. No.
4. (a) No special note was made of applications for irrevocable leases, and the only way in which this question could be answered would be by going back through all the grazing correspondence for the last four or five years, which would be a very large undertaking.
(b) 10.

Mr. SPEAKER. The first part of the question stands as a notice of motion for a return.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of all papers and correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of the province of British Columbia, relating to the application of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to acquire a portion of the Metlakatla Indian reserve, British Columbia, and to the general question of the claim of said province to the Indian reserves therein, since the date of the said application.—Mr. Ross (Yale-Cariboo).

Return showing the amount paid each year for provisions on each of the government steamers for the last three fiscal years, the average complement of officers and men provisioned on each for each year, and the cost per man per day.—Mr. Foster.

Return showing the amount paid each year for provisions for the Royal Military College, for the Halifax garrison, and the permanent military school in Quebec, the average number of men provisioned each year in each of the above institutions, and the cost per man per day.—Mr. Foster.

Return showing all advances to ministers of the Crown and their private secretaries, on account of travelling or other expenses in connection with the Imperial Conference of 1907, the date of such advances, and the appropriation against which it was charged.—Mr. Foster.

Copy of all correspondence, documents and papers, in the investigation into the case of Mr. O. S. Tinnie, chief clerk in the Gold Commissioners's office, Dawson, Yukon Territory. —Mr. Thompson.

Copy of letters, telegrams and reports, regarding complaints made by John Franklin and Stapleton Brothers, with respect to Indian Agent Yeomans.—Mr. Knowles.

Copy of all correspondence, telegrams, &c., in the possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the withdrawal of the winter steamers from Charlottetown on or about the 8th of January, instant, and their replacement some days later.—Mr. Martin (Queens).

Copy of all certificates by farmers resident in the riding of West Kent, and returned to the department by immigration agents for the said riding, and on certificates such agents were paid for placing immigrants with each farmer, giving the names of each immigrant and of each farmer such were placed with, giving the total amount received by each agent up to the present time.—Mr. Clements.

Copy of all correspondence relating to the morality of the Yukon.—Mr. Thompson.

Return showing all fines imposed for violation of the Fisheries Act in district No. 2, Nova Scotia, comprising the counties of Antigonish, Colchester, Cumberland, Guysborough, Halifax, Hants and Pictou, showing the amount of each fine, dates on which same were imposed and paid, the place of trial in each case, the offence charged, and the names of the convicting justices or fishery officers.—Mr. Sinclair.

CONSTITUTION OF THE SENATE.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). The resolution which I propose seconded by Mr. Schell, of South Oxford, is as follows:

That this House deems it expedient to invite the honourable the Senate to co-operate with it by means of conferences or joint committee, in giving consideration to the advantages to be gained by changes in the composition of the Senate, looking to:—

1. An age limit for retirement and a shortened term of service for future senators.
2. An extension to other authorities than the present one, of power to select persons for the filling of a portion of future vacancies in the Senate.
3. A rearrangement of some of the duties and work of the two Houses.
4. And in making recommendations in regard to these and other changes calculated to place the Senate in a position of increased usefulness and of increased responsibility to the people.

There are, Sir, also two other resolutions bearing upon the Senate which appear on the Order Paper, and with the consent of the House it is proposed that the principle involved in each of these three resolutions shall be discussed at the same time. The resolution proposed by Mr. Miller is :

That this Canadian Senate, as an institution has not proved to be of any decided benefit to Canada, and cannot be regarded as a necessity. That the disadvantages connected with and resulting from the maintaining of the Senate greatly outweigh the advantages and benefits derived therefrom, and that the Senate may with advantage and gain be abolished.

The resolution moved by Mr. Lewis is :

That in the opinion of this House it will be advisable at the next general election for the House of Commons for Canada to submit the following questions for the votes of the people:—

1. Shall the Senate of Canada be abolished?
2. Shall the method of appointment of the Senators of Canada be altered?

In moving a resolution of this character, Sir, I realize that I am not treading on entirely new ground. The question is one that has been discussed in many forms for a considerable number of years. It is a question of great importance, as naturally any question is that involves a change in the constitution of our country. It would be very natural that in proposing such a change, I should be called upon first to prove my case. Some two years ago I moved a resolution in this House in regard to the Senate. At that time I quoted a number of authorities and a number of instances showing dissatisfaction, disappointment and disapproval with the Senate. I quoted resolutions of the Liberal convention of 1893. I mentioned the dissatisfaction and trouble of the Mackenzie administration. I quoted statements of well-known Liberal statesmen, some of them of a former day. I quoted a resolution of the Ontario legislature passed in 1899. All of these went to show a very grave feeling of dissatisfaction with the Senate and a very strong desire that there should be some remedy. I might have mentioned some other evidences of dissatisfaction. The resolution which my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) has put on the Order Paper evidences very serious dissatisfaction indeed. I might also mention the plank in the Halifax platform of the hon. leader of the opposition, showing dissatisfaction in some respects with the Senate as at present constituted. In criticising the Senate or its acts, one realizes that a member of this body may perhaps be treading on tender ground, and may be charged with presumption in doing so. But in criticising the Senate I do not wish you by any means to infer that I consider the House of Commons to be without faults. I realize very clearly indeed the many faults and weaknesses of this body. But there is this very great difference between the two bodies, that we go back fre-

quently to the people to have our record examined and for criticism and perhaps punishment. It is not so with the Senate. My criticism of the Senate is not the criticism of the individual members of the Senate; it is a criticism of the conditions surrounding those members. Now, Sir, faultfinding and criticism are not on the whole a pleasant or gracious task; it is not one that I take kindly to. It is necessary at times, but I do not as a rule indulge in it. So that with the quotations that I have made, with the instances mentioned from time to time in our party press and by our party leaders, I will ask this House to take the dissatisfaction and disapprobation of the Senate as something proved, as a postulate. If I cannot do that, the resolution of my hon. friend from South Grey calls for proof along that line, and if he but half proves his case, he will abundantly supply all the justification I desire to have for mine. If our constitution were not a written constitution, we might perhaps make all the changes necessary without any appeal to the Imperial authorities. But we are under a written constitution which largely limits us. We may make changes in procedure, but even there we are limited to some extent.

We must, then, I believe, seek for a remedy for the present condition of things. The dissatisfaction is so widespread, and the danger of continuing in the present condition is so great, and would be so much greater in a time of crisis, that I believe we are forced to seek some remedy. The nature of your remedy will naturally depend upon your diagnosis of the disease, and upon your ideal or standard for a second chamber. So that it may be well to look at what are the usually accepted reasons for a second chamber. I will state them: first, as a legislative body. Some people would desire that it should be a fully co-ordinate body with the first chamber. That view, however, is seldom held. It is regarded as a corrective of hasty or ill-considered legislation; it is intended to reconsider cases in which there is doubt of the popular will; it is intended to represent the sober second thought of the people; it is intended to ascertain and enforce the permanent and not merely the transient ideas of the people; it is intended to insure stability, permanence, and continuity in government, rather than mere activity; it is intended to protect the rights of certain minorities; it is intended to represent the people as a whole rather than certain local majorities; it is intended frequently to protect provincial rights; it is intended to represent certain ideals of the people not easily attained by our ordinary form of general election. When we read a list of reasons of this kind for a second chamber, we realize their importance. I believe that every one of these reasons exists in Canada and did exist at the time the second chamber was made a part of our form of government. Not that they all exist in equal force, but all do exist. It will depend, then, upon the extent to which you believe any one of these reasons to be predominant what form of remedy you will desire to have applied to the Senate to make it correspond to what you think it should be.

Among the remedies proposed, the first one that should be mentioned is that referred to in the motion of my hon. friend from South Grey, that is, abolition. It is true that removal can hardly be considered a remedy. But taking it as a remedy, one must recognize that it has some advantages. It has the merit of simplicity; involves but few details; it comes quite readily to the tongue. I conceive that it is the view of numbers of thinking people, including my hon. friend from South Grey. But I think I may ask him to concede that in many cases it is the remedy rather of impatience and irritation than of sober thought.

Many of the people who now complain of the inactivity of the Senate would be just as bitter in their complaints if the Senate, as at present constituted, were suddenly to break into vigorous activity. Nevertheless the dissatisfaction with the Senate is really so great, that the question is forced upon us: Shall it be mended or ended? Before, however, considering the merits of such a suggestion as abolition, it is absolutely necessary that we should consider its practicability. Is abolition practicable? We know that before abolition can be accomplished, we must have an Act of the Imperial parliament. To obtain such an Act, it will be absolutely necessary, not only that this House should be willing but that the Senate itself should be a consenting party. It will be further necessary that the various provinces should consent to the change—certainly the provinces which were parties to confederation or which came in under any compact. When we consider that the consent of all these parties will be needed and when we consider what the expression of some of these provinces has been in the past, we cannot fail but come to the conclusion that abolition, however desirable we might consider it, is not practicable. Then we are met by this other fact. We do not always terminate immediately any institution that is not entirely satisfactory. We are too young as a country to jump so hastily at conclusions. We are only forty years of age, which is but a short time in the history of any country, and we are asked in our youth and with so little experience, to absolutely abrogate the Senate without once even trying a remedy. That is certainly not the line of action we would take in any ordinary proceeding of life. But passing from that view and taking up the general argument regarding abolition I might almost say that the general argument would not be necessary owing to the

impracticability of abolition. But when I recollect the ability and the power of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller), I realize that even the impossible may perhaps be rather endangered by his attack. So that on that account and for the advantage that may accrue from a moment's examination of what abolition might effect, I propose to enter a little on the general argument.

What would abolition mean in Canada? The abolition of the Senate would remove all the good that is in that body, and I presume there is some good in it. It would remove all the ability and experience that is in the Senate, and we must acknowledge there is some there. It would put the business of Canada in the absolute control of the House of Commons, and not only that, but in the absolute control of the majority of that House, or a caucus of that majority, or the leader of that majority. Would that be wise? That is a possibility indeed well worth considering. We have to consider the possibilities of the future. The abolition of the Senate would mean leaving the destinies of this country under the control of an absolute democracy rather than a limited one. It would mean very much increased work for this House and much greater care in all the legislation brought before it. It would mean that the minority of this country would be at the mercy of the absolute will of the majority. It would mean that the minority must submit to the most rigid enforcement of everything the majority might desire. Under such circumstances, can we not imagine how arbitrary the majority of a House of this kind would be. Free from the restriction of the Senate, might not the majority of this House become arbitrary or unjust? Examples may not be very numerous ; but if I can do so without offence, I might quote one within my own memory. A very distinguished member of this House, feeling that he had been unjustly dealt with by a newspaper correspondent, took the somewhat unusual and rather antiquated course of calling that correspondent to the bar of this House. Without discussing the merits of the case, may I not ask you to recall whether the majority at that moment, embittered at what it thought was an unfair attack on a distinguished member, was prepared to act dispassionately. It remained for one man, who has more especially the honour and dignity of the House under his care, to see that justice was done, and he showed himself strong enough and fair enough to have justice done. But who can guarantee that, under other circumstances, a man equally just and resolute would hold that position? Who can guarantee that an irritated majority might not crush out entirely the rights of the minority—not merely the rights of the individual but of the entire minority? There would be nobody to protect the minority or see that in some way justice was done. I fear that a House, left entirely to itself, would assume an arbitrary attitude. We have known, in other hon. chambers, of an arbitrary speaker and an arbitrary interpretation of the rules accomplishing injustice. When the conditions are such that any one man can make his mere will prevail, he no longer needs to appeal to reason in order to accomplish his ends; he no longer listens readily to reason in others; and we know that uncontrolled power is not apt to be scrupulous in its regard for the rights of others. So I fear that a House of Commons, supreme and unrestricted, might, through an arbitrary majority, create great injustice to the minority. And besides the majority in the House of Commons might not represent the majority of the Canadian people. I need not enter into any question of gerrymander, but we know that with the possibility of a change in the distribution of the seats now existing, the majority elected in this House might not represent the majority of the people. Yet full arbitrary power would be placed in the hands of that majority, whose election was obtained by distributing the seats in such a manner as to favour one particular party.

Mr. HAGGART. How could the Senate remedy that?

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. The Senate could not come in and do justice to the individual. The Senate could not change the rules of this House; but where the interests of the country at large are affected by the arbitrary action of this House, the Senate could act in such a way as would enable justice to be done, not to the individual, but to the country. It could restrain, and I believe, if the acts of this House were shown to be arbitrary, it would restrain. This House is elected by the people, and in that respect is established on the proper foundation, but just consider for a moment all that is involved in an election. Consider the steps taken. In the first place, there is the primary meeting for the election of delegates to the convention, and then there is the meeting of the convention to choose a candidate. Probably not more than 200 electors on either side take part in these primary meetings and conventions which decide on the two candidates, and the choice of the electorate is limited to the two men so chosen. No matter what different views a man may hold, he can only express them through one or other of these two men ; and let any man remember his own election contest. Let him recall the misrepresentations, the appeals to prejudices and sectionalism, and all the devices used to influence the people, charged by each party on the other, and he will realize that in many cases the members of this House are rather the

elected supporters of the one party or the other than representatives of the people in the true sense. It depends largely on our own sense of honour whether we are the representatives the people hope we may be, and which they endeavour to make us by this form of selection.

But if, even at the time of the election, a majority of this House absolutely represented the view of the people, it does so only on one or two questions. It does not do so on many questions that come up and later on it does not represent the people properly at all. And yet this House, by the abolition of the Senate, would have complete control of all legislation, not merely on those items that have been discussed before the people, but on anything that the leader of the majority in the House chose to bring in. And we know that a government of a party is seldom elected absolutely on its own programme, but very often is elected mainly on the mistakes of its opponents. Abolition of the Senate, then, would make this House absolute. There would be no resisting its force; and I believe that, in every polity, there should be some centre of resistance against predominant power, or that power will become absolute. Any system of government that is of value is one in which there are checks, one in which no authority is given full power. The people cannot afford to give absolute power to one set of men. And, indeed, if you wish governors to govern well, you must, as far as possible, prevent them from having the opportunity to govern ill. The tendency towards machine politics, as it is called,—towards close organization,—is very great, and it would become greater if this were the only chamber that had control of the destinies of the country. Abolition of the Senate would, I think, if we look at the matter properly, demand that there should be some referendum, so that whatever might pass in this House could, under some circumstances, be referred to the people for their judgment. That would be the proper course. But, if you are going to adopt a course of that kind, you might as well use your Senate for a referendum. And I wish to point out here that all the theories of second ballot, and initiative and referendum, which many have considered necessary, are all proofs of the necessity of a second chamber and are necessary to enable one chamber to properly fulfil the functions of government. The laws passed even by two chambers are frequently imperfect and need change. How much more would this be so if we, in the turmoil of our work, passed the laws without any possibility for examination, reflection or change. I may also point out that, while there has been, for a long time, a feeling of dissatisfaction with the Senate, and a desire to change, no province in this country has ever asked for abolition. Some provinces have asked for change. The Ontario resolution of 1899, to which I have already referred, specifically asks for certain changes, but makes no demand for abolition. In fact, I think I may fairly state that all the arguments for abolition, certainly all that I have heard, and I have not heard those of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller), are against the Senate as it is at present constituted, and not against the Senate as we would hope to make it. Has the Senate of Canada any merits? The Senate thinks it has. And I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Ask Archie.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Yes, I think we might safely ask him. His experience is not so long as that of some of the others, and so there might be others whose opinions would be of greater value. But his opinion should carry weight, and I think that opinion would be that the Senate has merits. The Senate does its work quietly—there are no fireworks. It is reported very little in the public press. It does not often enter into conflict. At the same time, I must concede that the evidence shows a considerable amount of work done by the Senate. The value of that work we must judge each for himself. If the Senate were continually at war with the Commons, it would naturally bring itself more into notice. And perhaps the Senate might say, as a reason for some of these quiet moments, that the legislation sent from this House is fairly perfect and requires very little change or amendment. I cannot, however, very well use an argument to show value in the Senate unless I believe in it myself. The Liberal party in this country has felt the pinch of an unfavourable Senate, and has been moderate in its approval of the Senate as compared with the Conservative party. If I were asking a Conservative friend to afford me an argument for the Senate, while the argument would not appeal to me as it would to him, he would probably quote to me the action of the Senate in relation to the Yukon railway and the Drummond County railway. I have heard Conservatives speak laudingly of the action of the Senate in these cases. As I say, that action does not appeal to me as it does to my Conservative friends, but it may be that the Senate will take similar action that will appeal to me and not to them. Whether I am right or wrong, I know that certain actions of the Senate have appealed very strongly to Conservative members of this House as being good and valuable actions. But does the Senate need to perform these actions every day in order to warrant its existence? It seems to me that if the Senate were, once in a session, to return to this House a Bill with imperfections and have those imperfections righted, and the sending out of an imperfect law thus prevented; if once in a parliament, it saved

a lavish expenditure; if once in a generation it stood as a bulwark against an ebullition of popular feeling that was only temporary, it would abundantly warrant its existence. We are young as a people. In some matters we have not yet struck our level. We need a few checks to steady us in times of emergency.

Further, the representation in this House is a representation of local majorities. It is not easy to get representation for many minorities in this country. I prefer to think of our people as being Canadians, and Canadians only, but we know that there is a great mixture, and that, for instance, in the province of Ontario, which I know better than I know the others, there are Roman Catholic minorities that find it difficult to get a fair representation in this House. It is not the fault of either party, but simply an exigency of party warfare. The same may be said of German minorities in Ontario. The Senate, if properly constituted, would afford an opportunity for at least a fair representation of these minorities, a better representation than at present of the various portions of our country. If we are to improve the Senate, if there is a remedy that we can find, that remedy must recognize why it is that a body of men so able in themselves have failed to satisy this country. What are the faults? Well, as I see it, I think they may be said to be the lethargy that comes from either old age or advancing years; the lack of any feeling of responsibility to the people; too great a feeling of permanence and security; no particular incentive to work—nothing pressing them. I will say nothing here of the party bias that is to some extent present, because, while that has in the past affected action, I do not claim that it has been a very serious feature. Now, while these weaknesses are there, we know also that the Senate is endowed under the constitution with enormous powers. It can do things just as it pleases without a single check; and when you realize the theoretical power, at least, under the constitution, one almost begins to be thankful for the moment that the Senate has chosen the quiet and easy course. If it once were to prove active and obstreperous, there is no saying what it might do. And, certainly, we have no chance in any way, except by the force of public opinion, to restrain them. The real remedy, if we can find it, for this dissatisfaction with the Senate, must not affect only the Senate, it must ultimately in some way give an increased feeling of responsibility to members of the Senate. It must make that feeling of responsibility a real one, it must stimulate for good, and it must limit the potentiality for mischief. I would like to see, I believe every man in this House would like to see, such changes in the constitution of the Senate as would so entrench the Senate in the esteem of the people that when it had to differ from the House of Commons, we would at least respect its decision and sit down quietly and examine it, and not, as we do at present, satisfy ourselves by reviling it.

Can a remedy be obtained that will not only improve the Senate but make it a fairly satisfactory working body? Now many people acknowledge the weakness of the Senate, the great need of change, but lament that it is not easy, not possible, some will say, to make any change that will be of value. I have not often made statements in this House that may be called very strong, but I feel a little like making one now that may be by some considered strong. I will say this, that if you will allow me to preface the statement with the remark that no system of government will be actually perfect, will more than approximate your ideal, then I would say, not only is there a real remedy for this state of affairs, but there is more than one remedy, more than two. But in seeking a remedy I would say this, it will not be like an answer to a riddle, which, as you know, is one moment unknown, and the next, when it is given to you, is universally accepted as being full, complete and satisfactory, and you wonder you had not thought of it before. There is no such answer as that to the question, what is the best means of reforming the Senate? To ask for that is to forget all the weakness that is inheritent in any system of government.

I think the difficulties have been two with regard to the manner of reforming the Senate. In the first place, we have no clearly defined idea of what we desire, or what actual standard we wish to attain to. The other is, I think, that we have felt that we must seek out, or must obtain some new, or novel or striking form of remedy, something that will be new, something that will appeal to the people as being intricate and peculiar, something no doubt that you will be able to defend as logical. No such remedy of that kind need be sought for, it will not prove satisfactory to the people. Every system that we choose must depend to some extent, not merely on being logical, but it must depend on the wisdom, upon the moderation and upon the patriotism of the members who compose it. So I say that instead of looking for something novel and striking, we must proceed along the lines that we are accustomed to, that we are using in practical government at the present time. We know indeed that the British form of government, the parliamentary system has been very much admired. It has its great weaknesses, it is not really a logical system, it is a system of checks and yet much as it has been admired, it is not the invention of any man of genius, it is not really the result of conscious design. At every great time of crisis the opportunity has been taken to strengthen one branch of the legislature at the expense of

some other, to establish some form of check against the predominant power.

Now, Sir, the present resolution, as you will see, does not dogmatize. I am only inviting the House to consider the suggestion of concurring with the Senate in order to examine into the advantages to be obtained by considering a number of propositions. The first refers to an age limit for retirement and a shortened term of service for new appointments to the Senate. This is not the first time that I have moved a resolution embodying that principle. Two years ago I moved a resolution in these words :

That in the opinion of this House, the constitution of the Senate should be brought into greater accord with the spirit of representative and popular government and the genius of the Canadian people, by amendments which in future appointments will: (1) abolish the life tenure of office by senators; (2) limit the tenure for one appointment to within the legal term of three parliaments; (3) provide a fixed age, not exceeding eighty, for compulsory retirement.

That was discussed at the time. I did not attempt to move it as a universal panacea for all the objections to the Senate. The object then was to effect the least possible amount of change that would at the same time make the Senate a fairly serviceable body. The opinion was expressed at that time that this particular resolution was inadequate to the situation, and I will not at the present time combat that opinion. But I will say this, that the principle there laid down, of the necessity of having a term limit, I still believe in. There I do dogmatize. I think that without that, no remedy you may apply to the Senate will be satisfactory to the Canadian people. With that, and with some limitation to the veto power, you may have more than one remedy that will make the Senate a fairly satisfactory working body. The life tenure is certainly not in accord with representative government, it is not in accord with the spirit and genius of the Canadian people. I need not dwell, I think, in this House, upon the somewhat pitiful effects of old age, when a man, no matter what his powers may be mental or physical, pretends to be doing duties that can certainly only be done properly by a man in middle age, not at least in advanced years. It is so painful a task that I prefer to leave this House to recognize that when a man passes eighty years of age it is only one man in a hundred that is capable of doing the work he should do in that legislative body. His judgment may be good in many ways, but he has not the vigour to apply himself as a legislator should.

The people demand a change in that respect. I think there is no doubt whatever that the people of this country feel and feel strongly that no governor should be placed over them who has a life appointment, who may be put in his position at thirty years of age, and no matter how long he may live, no matter how he may develop afterwards, he remains one of their legislators. If our Senate were not a fixed body then that would not be so great an evil, because he might be removed ; but when he becomes one of a fixed body and thereby shuts out others who are probably better fitted for the position, his presence is an anomaly and an injustice.

The second portion of my resolution refers to :

An extension to other parties than the present one of power to select persons for the filling of a portion of future vacancies in the Senate.

At the present time, Sir, as you know, the appointing power for the Senate lies entirely in the hands of the Governor-in-Council, which is the government of the day. The result of that is evident to you. I find no fault with either the Liberal government or the preceding Conservative government. Appointments have been political almost invariably. I do not see how, under our political system, it can well be otherwise if the appointing power remains entirely with them. And so, without finding fault with either the Conservative or the Liberal administration in that respect, I feel that we are not likely to obtain any real improvement as long as the appointing power remains with them. But what change could we have that would make the Senate a better body ? One change that has been strongly urged is the election of Senators instead of their appointment, an election by larger constituencies than those that elect members to the House of Commons. That would have this merit at least, that it would refer the constitution of the Senate back to the people, who are the source of power. In that respect it would be a decided advantage upon the present system. If there were no objections to that, I think we would long since have appealed to the people as the proper and correct course. We must recognize, however, that there are objections. We know that it was tried once in this country when we had the old Legislative Council of Canada.

There is a difference of opinion as to whether it was successfully tried or not. On the whole I am of the opinion that it was not considered a successful method of choosing a legislative council. The argument that we would then have too many elections is rather a strong one. We have at present our municipal elections, trustee elections, elections for the local legislature, and elections for the Commons. If, in addition to that, we had another, we would very seriously add to the work of the people and certainly very seriously add to the work of party organizations. You would have two bodies then virtually of the same substance, that would come from the same origin, chosen

virtually in the same manner, chosen through the same party organization, and in every way similar bodies. Each of these bodies would claim to represent the people and to represent the people in the same way. There would of course be friction, but the friction in itself would not be objectionable ; the objection would come when each of these bodies would claim to properly, fully and in the same way represent the people. The government of course would be responsible only to the first Chamber, but the second Chamber would claim to fully represent the people just as the first does. If under such circumstances you found that the first Chamber, elected by the people, was Liberal and the second Chamber, elected by the same people with different constituencies, was Conservative, what would become of our vaunted representation? In that way the people would be represented certainly but in an exceedingly crude form, and we might easily have a state of affairs in which, coming directly from the people at slightly different times, one House would be Liberal and the other Conservative.

In addition to that only the very rich could enter the second Chamber. We know it is expensive enough at the present time to run an election in a small constituency. If you demanded that a man should run in a constituency half a dozen times as large, it would be almost an impossibility. If two Chambers of that kind were to agree you would be very likely to say that the second Chamber was superfluous ; if they were to differ you would say it was mischievous. It seems to me that with a second Chamber we should necessarily have it of rather dissimilar origin from the first Chamber if it is properly to represent the people, to make up in its representation what this Chamber lacks.

We might here fairly take the example of some other countries, not that they should be in any way conclusive, but to see at least what value may be in them. Taking a few examples we see that in France the second Chamber is based very largely on a very highly developed municipal system throughout the whole country, not by direct election, but by election of the municipal bodies. In Germany it is a federal system of fully equipped kingdoms. In Great Britain it is very largely hereditary. In Australia, the most recent of the larger commonwealths, it is elective, elected by the people as one body, voting as a single electoral body throughout the country. In New Zealand, that land of very advanced views, socialistic I might almost say, I found to my surprise that the Senate is appointed for life, but not on elective principles. In the United States it is chosen by the various State legislatures. At the Cape the senators are elected and in Natal appointed. Thus you see there is great variety and each country makes its choice to suit its own peculiar circumstances. While the simple expedient of limiting the term of a senator, leaving the appointing power as it is, would be perhaps a weak remedy, yet is is one remedy. The election of senators by large constituencies of the people, with the term limited, would also be a remedy that would make a very valuable body indeed. I fear that these objections that I have raised would prove to be really valid objections, but it would be so large an improvement on the Senate as it at present exists that if no other remedy were satisfactory I would cheerfully and willingly accept it as a remedy that would produce a fairly satisfactory second Chamber.

There are other features on which I would like to dwell ; there are other remedies that we might strive to make use of. If we take the example of France, where the second Chamber is chosen by the municipal bodies, we realize that in this country our municipal system is not organized in the same way, that it might change through any change in the laws of the local legislatures. Then the municipal laws are not alike in each province. I recognize also that it is scarcely the class of work to put upon municipal councils or municipal bodies, and so I would hesitate to urge—and I do not think it would be acceptable—any such scheme as basing the choice of senators upon our municipal system. Again Germany is made up really of separate kingdoms united for a special purpose; I do not think that the German confederation affords us any lesson. But when you come to the United States you do find something that may be of value in judging whether or not their experience will help us. In the United States they limit the number of senators to two members for each state, irrespective of the size of the state. These senators are elected by the legislature of the state. We have similar bodies. Our provinces are not as numerous as the States but we have the principle of provincial representation in our Senate. It seems to me that to some extent at least we should recognize these provinces in the appointment of senators, but if we were to throw on the legislative bodies the entire power of appointing senators for the provinces, we would probably find some objections. We might find, for instance, that giving the local legislature the power of appointment the legislature itself or the cabinet in it would be very likely to limit their choice to men who had made themselves known and felt in the arena of provincial politics only. That would perhaps be not entirely satisfactory. We would find also this danger, that you might have a Senate entirely opposed to the House of Commons on political questions, although the House of Commons perhaps would distinctly represent the views of the people on Dominion matters. That would have been the case

under such a system during the great part of the career of Sir John Macdonald ; for while he must have represented the people of Canada very largely, very fully, yet the provinces were in the hands of the opposing party and would have supplied him with a Senate antagonistic in every respect.

These are very serious matters indeed to consider in thinking of the propriety of giving the appointing power entirely into the hands of the provinces. The fact that the provinces have provincial rights that need protection ; that the provinces bargained for certain special representation in the Senate not according to population, shows it would be fair to presume that they will not be fairly protected, if all the appointing power is in the hands of the Dominion government against whom the provinces apparently need protection. Thus I would feel that while it might not be desirable that the entire appointing power should be left in the hands of a provincial legislature, yet we might fairly leave a portion there, a portion equivalent to the actual reason why the Senate Chamber exists as a protector of the provinces. What that protection would be would be a matter of judgment, probably 25 per cent would be sufficient. We then have the local legislature as one body that will be permanent that has a right to a share in the appointment of senators. Logically it should and we might fairly leave a portion of that power with them. Of all other bodies there is none but the Dominion government that I think can fairly be appealed to. Universities might perhaps at times be given a slight representation, but with a fixed number of senators we could scarcely afford to let them have much say in the matter. The cabinet, this House of Commons and its members, represent the people of Canada. As I have said, they represent the people somewhat crudely, but they represent the people of Canada much closer than does any other body. And in that way I feel that they are more entitled to speak for the people of Canada than any other body, and that we may fairly leave the large number of appointments to the Senate with this body ; but not necessarily with the government itself. I would prefer rather that the government should be limited, limited very distinctly with regard to the number of their appointments to the Senate. If instead of appointing the whole number of senators the government of the day for fair protection, for fair chance to enforce its policy, should be limited to the appointment of say 50 per cent of the senators, that might be sufficient.

Now, if that were done you would have a certain variety of representation from the provinces directly, you would have a certain safeguard for the Dominion government of the day through its power of appointing say fifty per cent, but you have made no provision whatever for any proportionate representation from this House. It may be that the provincial governments would be all Liberal, it may be that the government at Ottawa would be Liberal. Justice demands that in such a case there should be the same principle applied that we apply in the formation of committees. I think fairness and justice demand that the opposition of the day should have some power to see that their views are presented in the Senate, some power of consenting to the appointment of a number at least proportionate to their own numbers in this House. This is only one form that I suggest; it is the form that appeals to me more than that of election, more than that of appointing senators by the local legislatures; more than that of simply changing the term for which a senator is elected. I prefer a composite form of selection, a selection not coming from any one single body. And if the local legislatures be allowed to appoint a small number corresponding to their need of protection, if the Dominion government were allowed to appoint say fifty per cent of the members of the Senate, and if the opposition of the day were allowed a proper representation in proportion to their numbers, then I think you would indeed have a Senate composite in its origin, a Senate representing more variety of views than at present. I am not introducing any novel mode of procedure, and yet I believe it would so largely improve the quality of the Senate itself as a working body, and so largely plant them in the esteem of the people that it would bring about a Senate that there would be very little objection to. We must remember that the same principle of patience and forbearance towards mistakes that the people now exercise to the Commons in as much as they know the Commoners come back for chastisement, would be exercised towards the Senate under these conditions. The people would know that this Senate though objectionable at the moment would change rapidly year after year, and that, if not directly, yet indirectly through some of their governing bodies they could reach the obstreperous senators and punish them if they so desired. This suggestion—I do not dogmatize on any special method; any of these methods that I have outlined would so largely improve the present condition of affairs that I think it would be well indeed if the House, if the Senate itself, especially if the government of the day would give them very careful consideration.

I have also suggested certain changes with regard to the work, and to the powers of the Senate. The Senate, at present, does not initiate very much in the way of legislation. Government measures are seldom introduced there. As you all know we have made this change, that we no longer introduce divorce Bills into this House; the matter of divorce is taken up and we may say handled entirely by the Senate, and we, as

a rule simply concur in their findings. It has been suggested that other work might be thrown upon them. One distinguished member of the Senate did suggest that private Bills should be largely introduced there. I am not prepared to urge that, but I think a conference between the experienced members of both Houses might devise measures by which an increased portion of the work should fairly be thrown upon the Senate—not such a portion of the work as would rob this House of its proper and full importance before the people. That I would not like. I would not like to see in this country a second chamber equivalent to the Senate of the United States, nor do I think it would likely occur if any addition were made to the powers because in this country the cabinet is responsible to and must have a majority in this House and that would always place the fight in this House. It would centre interests in this House so that I have very little fear that the Senate would aggrandize power even if it got increased work. There is also this work the Senate may do, and which it is now doing: There are from time to time new questions which come before this country, questions too new perhaps for actual legislation. We appoint committees here to examine into telephones and telegraphs at very great length, and from time to time valuable information is acquired. On all such questions it seems to me the Senate of Canada might become a standing committee, a committee to search out new lines of legislation, to thoroughly examine all projected new lines, looking into all matters of public utility and matters of public ownership—matters such as the rural free mail delivery that has been so much discussed. The Senate might become a very useful body indeed if it were a permanent committee of examination in that direction, digesting as it were information for us and handing it down to be placed in safe and proper form amongst the laws of this country.

With regard to the powers of the Senate, I feel that the veto power under present conditions should not be placed in the Senate. Irresponsible as the Senate is, it is illogical that it should have the veto power. The senators possibly will not give it up readily, but with increased powers granted them in other directions perhaps they would be willing. I think the suspensory power very valuable; I think there should be an opportunity for them to say when a measure would come up from this House: We are not prepared to accept this measure at the present time, we will hold it over until another session so that we may ascertain the views of the people. But the absolute veto power I think should be removed, and if the Senate were willing to that end, then something in the form of a joint vote would be entirely desirable. In Australia where they have an elective system the Senate naturally must consent to Bills along with the House, and where they differ then they have a peculiar method of arranging. A joint vote may be asked for, but the two Houses may still continue to differ and in the end the governor is allowed, if he so desires, to dissolve both Houses and send them back to the country; and in the face of a dissolution of both Houses it is wonderful how the animosities will soften down and how the objections will be removed.

Now, Sir, in any remarks I have made I have not dogmatized particularly as to a remedy, except in one or two particulars. I have given views as suggestions, and I hope the gentlemen of this House will give them consideration as such. The form of my resolution is by no means vital. The particular points I urge are the points I think which should be considered. I have no particular desire that my particular form of resolution should be the one which the line of remedy should follow. I realize too that this is about the best time to take up such a question. It is true that the Liberals of Canada have for many years felt that the Senate should be reformed. It is true also that when the Liberals came into power they were not in a position to reform it because they did not have a majority in the Senate, or a majority feeling in that way. It is true that time has elapsed, it is true that we now have a majority. It was absolutely necessary not only that the Liberals should have a majority in the Senate but a large majority before they could undertake such a work. And it was necessary for time to elapse sufficiently to allow our Conservative friends to realize that the present condition of affairs meant to them an antagonistic Senate were they to enter into power. So that I think under all the circumstances this is actually the best time that such a question should be brought up, especially as there is no keen burning issue now before either House to kindle a special animosity at the moment. Any feeling of dissatisfaction or disapprobation towards the Senate is not the irritation of a moment, but a calm, ripe judgment of these people. I realize also that in opening up this matter I am opening a gateway to our hon. friends of the opposition to remind us that we have not been very prompt in fulfilling our old promises. I hope, however, that after enjoying themselves for a few minutes in that way, they will address themselves to the real question and help us with the ability that many of them possess to arrive at a solution. If I have done anything to promote a reform of the Senate or added anything of value to the discussion of the subject, I shall feel that I have at least done one good day's work for Canada.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of reluctance and trepidation that I rise to speak to the resolution which, with the permission of

the House, I have the privilege of bringing forward at this stage ; that resolution is as follows :

That in the opinion of this House it will be advisable at the next general election for the House of Commons for Canada to submit the following questions for the votes of the people:—

1. Shall the Senate of Canada be abolished?
2. Shall the method of appointment of the senators of Canada be altered?

My reasons for trepidation and reluctance are twofold. In the first place, this is a grave matter, which should be dealt with, if I may use the word, by the bull dogs of war of the front benches, not by one of the bull-terriers of the back benches of the opposition. I also wish to put myself right before the House in another matter. Unfortunately for myself, but probably fortunately for Canada, as the results will show, some two or three sessions ago I felt it my duty to bring before this House, in not a speech, but a statement concerning the waning marine interests of Canada certain facts, which it took upwards of four hours to deliver, and I have no doubt that that statement of matters with which a great number of members of this House were not conversant, wearied them. But I have this consolation, that the government have seen fit only lately to bring into force certain things which I then advocated, and which I have been urging on the Boards of trade of the maritime provinces, namely, keeping foreign shipping out of our coasting trade. When I do reluctantly rise to my feet, I wish to occupy only as short a time as the circumstances will permit.

Now, Sir, while I compliment him on his delivery and manner, I do not agree with my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. McIntyre (South Perth) that we are here as Elected Rulers. We are not elected rulers, but Elected Representatives of the people ; and my reason for rising on this occasion is that I feel that as such representative I have a message for this House and the government of Canada in reference to the Senate. There is a strong feeling throughout Ontario, particularly that part of the province to which I belong on this subject. I have no desire or expectation that my 'foot-prints on the sands of time will lie' but I hope for the good of Canada, and West Huron in particular that my shoes will scrape good and hard, as I pass by.

Now, I am not going to give utterance to my own opinions on this matter further than to say that I endorse the utterances of a number of gentlemen whose words I intend to quote. I bring forward this resolution because of what Dr. Falconer said in addressing the Canadian Club some months ago that it was a wise thing to let the people vote on the great questions of the day ; it educates the people, and enables those in parliament to see what the people wish, and we, as representatives, should carry that out. I intend to refer to the utterances of one gentleman in particular in regard to the abolition of the Senate, and I do this without any political bias whatever. Some hon. gentlemen may think that I am trying to make some political capital; but I am not. I am dealing with this question entirely on business principles. Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir Richard Cartwright, in 1896, at a great mass meeting at Massey Hall, in the city of Toronto, referring to the Senate used the words: 'When shall Providence remove this millstone from around the necks of the Canadian people.' ?. Sir Richard Cartwright was at that time viewing the Senate from the outside point of view. He has now all the experience of the Senate behind him, and I give all credit to his knowledge, his acumen and his ability. He now takes an inside view of the question, and the Ottawa 'Free Press,' one of the ablest of the Liberal journals of this country, stated that Sir Richard Cartwright had made a speech on the Senate which we could carry down the sands of time as one of the ablest speeches ever made in Canada. I only wish I had more eloquence to describe that speech, but amongst other statements in it was this : 'While there may be some doubt as to the good of the Senate to Canada, there is not the slightest doubt of its great danger and capability of harm.' Now, the hon. gentlemen of the Senate need not quaver in their shoes, because senators have vested rights, and whenever this country makes a promise or a contract, it carries it out, and I for one will advocate carrying out the word of Canada once given, whatever change may take place in the future.

Now, Sir, I believe there is great capability of harm in the Senate, and where is the harm ? The harm is to the poor people of Canada. There is no question that if the Premier, for the time being, appoints enough senators from his own side of politics—it matters not which party occupies the treasury benches—and he says to the leader of the Senate, 'I want such and such a Bill to go through,' or if the pressure is so strong that it goes through the House of Commons, and he says to the leader of the Senate, 'I want that Bill annulled,' the thing is done. I do not say this with reference to any government. But here is where the injustice comes in. A company, some small corporation wants a Bill through both Houses. It is a good and an honest Bill. It passes the Commons and goes to the Senate. The leader of the government, who has control of the majority in the Senate for party purposes has no interest with this Bill. What happens ? Some great corporation gets its grip on this Bill, which affects the poor people of Canada, and that is the end of it. I understand that has oc-

cured numbers of times, and that is one of the great injustices we have to contend against. I can claim to speak on behalf of the people of West Huron particularly and of the province of Ontario. I go from house to house and from town to town. When I am on a railway, I do not travel by night but by day, and I ask the people I meet on the trains—people who do not know me—how they feel on this question. From what they say, the people of Ontario want some change. The hand writing is on the wall. The people want either the abolition of the Senate or some other material and effective change in that body. I ask you, Sir, to allow the people to vote on this matter, discussion will take place naturally and the government will then know what the people desire and that is what should be carried out.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). After listening to the speech we have just heard from my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) and the short speech made by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Lewis) I realize that I shall have in my remarks to repeat some of the things which they have said. On the 6th February, 1649, a resolution was carried in the British House of Commons for the abolition of the House of Lords. That resolution was as follows:

Resolved, that the House of Peers in parliament is useless and dangerous and ought to be abolished.

On the following day the House of Commons of Britain passed another resolution—a resolution to abolish the monarchy. It is somewhat significant that while from the time of the coronation of Charles the Second to the present no number of persons in Britain have seriously thought of the abolition of the monarchy, there has always been in Britain a considerable number of persons agitating for the ending or mending of the House of Lords. The resolution which I have introduced has in view the same object as the Cromwellian resolution to which I have referred, but is not so severe in its language or extreme in its criticism. The resolution which I propose, seconded by my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. Wright), is as follows:

That the Canadian Senate, as an institution, has not proved to be of any decided benefit to Canada, and cannot be regarded as a necessity. That the disadvantages connected with and resulting from the maintaining of the Senate greatly outweigh the advantages and benefits derived therefrom, and that the Senate may with advantage and gain be abolished.

Mr. Edward A. Freeman , in 'Subjects of the Day' for February, 1891, in discussing the question of ending or mending the British House of Lords lays down the case thus:

The question is a practical one. First, if the institution is a good one, keep it. Second, if it is moderately bad, reform it. Third, if it is absolutely bad, sweep it away.

At first glance one would naturally conclude that he had fairly stated the case, but upon closer investigation and after more careful thought I differ from Mr. Freeman and am of the opinion that he has not fairly stated the case and that he has not accurately fixed his premises. I would say: First, if the institution is a good one and is necessary keep it. Second, if it is only moderately bad and is capable of being reformed so that it will be useful and worth to the people of Canada what it costs, reform and retain it. Third, if it is absolutely bad, or if, as it is now, or as it may be mended, it will be unnecessary and not worth what it costs, sweep it away. If we accept these three propositions, as stating the case, which to me seem reasonable, I think that the Senate must go. Not so much because it is even moderately bad or mischievous, but because it is comparatively useless and unnecessary and not worth what its costs the people. When I speak of the cost to the Canadian people it will be seen, as I proceed, that I mean to include more than the actual money cost of maintaining the institution. I suppose that we in Canada have a second chamber largely because our Canadian people, at and before the time of confederation, sought to imitate as closely as possible the parliamentary institutions of the mother land. Let us remember, however, that in Britain the House of Lords is the older institution of the two, and that while we may argue that a second chamber is necessary in Canada to guard the rights of the weaker provinces and to revise and reconsider the work of the lower House, in Britain the House of Commons came into existence as a check and safeguard and as a protection of the rights of the public against the encroachments, the injustices and the wrongs endeavoured to be perpetrated by the British nobility and the British lords. I have said that dissatisfaction with the House of Lords has existed in Britain for many years. It may be said in reply that the House of Lords and the Senate of Canada are altogether different institutions and that objections to the one are not necessarily valid objections to the other, and that consequently the same criticisms do not apply to both. In reply to that I would say that, in my humble judgment, the House of Lords of Britain is less objectionable than the Senate of Canada. For the greater part, the members of the House of Lords are neither elected or appointed. The peers take their seats in the upper chamber because of hereditary right, and it is that hereditary right which is most largely objected to. Our senators do not take their seats in the Senate because of

hereditary right, but are appointed for life. In either case, death alone creates a vacancy. As a general rule, the members of the British House of Lords are men of very considerable means, great leisure and high degree of culture and education. There are some six hundred persons in Britain entitled to take their places in the House of Lords, and these people receive no indemnity and cost the country nothing. Out of the six hundred more or less entitled to seats in the House of Lords, not more than one hundred, usually less, are found occupying these seats and taking part in the work of the upper chamber. These hundred or less who are the working members of the House of Lords, are men of public spirit, who have a natural taste and inclination for political and public life. The House of Lords at work then may be said to be composed of a picked number of men from a select class. And again, in Britain there is always a check upon the House of Lords and an influence that may be brought to bear upon them ; that is, the power that lies in the Soveriegn of adding to their membership by creating new peers. That power was in evidence when in 1832 the House of Lords was induced to pass the Reform Bill to which they were really in opposition. They gave their consent to the Bill because of the promise that Earl Grey, the then Prime Minister, had obtained from the Sovereign that he would, if necessary, create an additional number of peers so as to bring the House of Lords to such a number as might be required to pass the measure. Our Senate is composed of men who are paid. Our senators are not superior to the members of the House of Commons either by reason of their position or by reason of their culture or learning. And it is impossible, I think, for any government, under any system, to choose an upper chamber for Canada that will be in some respects as well selected as is the House of Lords by the natural process of selection to which I have referred.

Again, with our Senate there is no check. There is no influence that can be brought to bear upon them to make them subservient to the will of the people, like the power of additional appointment in Great Britain. Our Senate is supreme. I object, Sir, to our Senate, not to our senators. And I do not object to our Senate, because it contains some old men. The word 'senate' itself is derived from a Latin word meaning, an old man. We have the old Latin Senatus, meaning an assembly of elders. And I am not in sympathy with those who are eager to employ and rely upon the vigour and strength of younger years rather than the more mature judgment and greater wisdom that comes with age. If you will glance at the gentlemen who compose our Canadian Senate to-day, I think you would find it exceedingly difficult to find among the younger members of the Senate three men more able or of greater usefulness to our country than Hon. R. W. Scott, the venerable leader of the government in the Senate chamber and the Secretary of State ; Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce and Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the honourable and venerable one-time Prime Minister of Canada. And let me mention one other, one who, no longer a young man is rapidly approaching the time when he will be called an old man, Hon. G. W. Ross. Each of these men, with the possible exception of Mr. Ross, is well past any age limit that will be fixed, if it be found advisable to reform the Senate by fixing an age limit. It has been suggested as my hon. friend from South Perth has said, that our Senate be composed of men elected as are the members of the House of Commons, except from larger constituencies. In every recent discussion of the Canadian Senate, reference has been made, and in future discussions is likely to be made, to the now famous resolution passed by the Reform convention that met in Ottawa in 1893, that resolution reads as follows :

> The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

Elect your Senate, and I at once admit, that, in the language of this resolution it makes the Senate dependent upon the people and brings them under control by the public opinion of the country. But, I have thought that one of the strong points, one of the virtues of the Senate, in so far, as it has strong points and virtues, is that very independence of the people, that very ability to stand uninfluenced, uncontrolled, unmoved by any sudden gust of popular passion, by any momentary impulse of the people. Elect your Senate and no one will propose, I think, to increase the total number of senators. Then, it will necessarily follow that the constituencies for the Senate must be very much larger than the present constituencies for the House of Commons, and it will inevitably follow that no man of moderate means will be able to carry on a campaign for a Senate election. For, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from South Perth, as was pointed out by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) during the debate of 1906, and as was urged by the late Sir John Macdonald at the time of Confederation, when he contended for an appointive rather than an elective Senate, no man of moderate means would be able to spend either the time or the money necessary to carry on an election in so large a constitu-

ency. Now, I have no feeling of antipathy, no feeling of ill-will, toward wealthy men as such. Though I am not one of them, I am glad that there are wealthy men in Canada. I would deem it a very bad advertisement for Canada, indeed, if no man, if no considerable number of men, had been able to acquire within our borders honestly-made fortunes. Yet, I do think it would be unwise, I think it would be an unfortunate thing to constitute a second chamber so that its members would be, for the most part and of necessity men of great means, men representing only the wealthy classes and the moneyed interests.

Again, it has been suggested that our senators should be elected by the several provincial legislatures. If we adopt that method of reform, we should be getting further away from the system of Great Britain and nearer to that of the United States. The Right. Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), speaking in 1906 upon this subject, rather agreed with the idea of the election of our senators by the legislatures of the several provinces, and said that, possibly by adopting such a system, we might find the solution of the vexed problem of Senate reform. And, at the same time, he suggested that the members of the Senate might be elected by the several legislatures three at a time, and thought that by this means it would be ensured that at least one of the three would represent the political party in the minority at the time in the legislature. The right hon. gentleman said also that he would not be adverse to go further in the idea of giving protection to the weaker provinces and giving all the provinces, regardless of their area or population, equal representation in the Senate. Now, Sir, if we adopt these changes, I suppose it will not be deemed that any province ought to have a larger representation in the Senate than it has in the House of Commons. Prince Edward Island has now four representatives in this House. If four representatives in the Senate were given to each of the nine provinces, we should have a Senate of thirty-six members.

That total number of 36 it will not be possible to increase until, by addition or subdivision, we increase the total number of our Canadian provinces. That would reduce the total number of Senators to 36, and would, insofar as the reduction of the number is concerned, be welcome to me, as it would go a considerable distance towards the goal I desire to reach. But how, if the provinces are to have a representation of so small number as 4 in the Senate, are we to elect our Senators by the several provincial legislatures, 3 at a time? And again, while we are looking for improvement in the method of constituting our Senate to the practice of the United States, I find that the United States, like most other countries, is becoming dissatisfied with its second chamber, and that they as well as we are looking about for some method of reform, some change that will make their second chamber more satisfactory to them. I have been reading a very well written article upon the United States Senate in a recent standard American Encyclopedia. That article makes this statement:

> The question of electing United States senators by direct vote of the people instead of by the legislatures of the several states, has been agitated for many years. For this purpose an amendment to the national constitution is necessary. The legislatures of fourteen states passed resolutions in 1903 asking Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the constitution. The states which passed the resolution were Oregon, California, Minnesota, Texas, Arkansas, Nevada, Washington, North Dakota, Kentucky, Missouri, Utah, Montana, Idaho and Kansas. In several states the rule has been adopted of placing the names of candidates for the United States senate on the ballots for members of the legislatures, leaving to the legislature nothing more in effect than ratification of the popular choice.

So in turning to the United States for examples in the matter of reforming our second chamber, it is to consider a system that after one and a third centuries of trial, the United States are becoming dissatisfied with and are endeavouring to change. A Senate elected by the different provincial legislatures is apt to be elected or appointed because of past political services, just as under the system now in vogue. Senators elected in that way by provincial legislatures are just as apt to be partisan as those elected or appointed under the present system. Under that suggested system of reform, there will always be in the Senate a partisan majority whether that partisan majority be larger or smaller except this, that the smaller the majority the more intense and the more in evidence will the partisan feeling be. It has been suggested by my hon. frined from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) that we reform the Senate in one respect by shortening the term of appointing Senators to a period of years—ten years has been suggested, fifteen years has been suggested—rather than the present life tenure. One result of such a reform will be that from time to time we will have to dispense with the services of men who, by long experience have added very much to their usefulness, and in their place put men of inexperience who, because of their inexperience, will not and cannot be so useful. My hon. friend from Perth said that we might appoint a man, it may be at the age of 30, to the Senate, and we know not then how he may develop, or what in after life he may turn out to be, and therefore would have us conclude that we might in that way be perpetrating an evil and

bringing upon ourselves a misfortune. Now I point out to the hon. gentleman, and I point out to this House, that every time we appoint a judge to the bench in Canada, whether to the County Court or to one of the Superior Courts, a much more important position, because that man in himself will have more power than any one senator can have in the Senate, we run the same risk, yes, a much greater risk, in appointing that judge, because we appoint him for life, and yet no evil has been found to result from that system. Turning again to the article from which I already quoted upon the United States Senate, I read this :

> Some of the states make it a rule to re-elect the same senators practically for life and this is especially the case with the New England States and in certain Southern States.

Thus again we see the United States largely departing in practice from the constitutional rules that we are now asked to imitate, to follow and to copy. It has been suggested that while our senators should be elected or appointed for a term of years, there should be a power to re-appoint. Now if we had this power of re-appointing, it seems to me we would be altogether likely, within a short time, to adopt the practice of certain states in the republic, and that re-appointment will be the practice rather than the exception, and it is possibly wise that it should be so. If not then it seems to me that another result of the power to re-appoint will be to make the senators more subservient to the reigning power. After having considered carefully all the plans I have heard suggested for a reform of the Senate, I object to them. I object to them because I have not been able to see in them anything which to my mind will mean a real reform, a real improvement. But I have been able to see in nearly all of them that which to my mind would likely lead to mischief and harm rather than good. If we are to have a Senate, then I agree with the words made use of, or the opinion expressed, by the hon. the leader of the opposition when he spoke upon this question in the debate of 1906. If we are to judge of that gentleman's present opinion by one of the planks in the Halifax platform, his mind has somewhat changed upon the matter of Senate reform since he spoke in this House in 1906, as his changed upon many questions, I quarrel not with him, because I yield to every man the privilege of changing his mind. But the words to which I refer, and which the hon. gentleman used in 1906, were these:

> There is not very much wrong with the present mode of constituting the Senate.

Of course the hon. gentleman went on to add, as we would expect him to do, that there would be nothing very wrong with the present mode of constituting the Senate if the present Prime Minister were stronger than he is, and would appoint the men that ought to be appointed. I think the leader of the opposition intimated that it would be a good thing and a proper thing if the leader of the government would appoint to the Senate, not exclusively men of his own party, but some from the opposition party. Now whether that be wise or unwise, whether it be reasonable or unreasonable, I frankly say that I do not expect to see, within any short time, the leader of any Canadian government, be he Reform or Conservative, appointing to senatorial or other high positions any large number of men from the opposite side. Yet upon that occasion the leader of the opposition was good enough, was fair enough, let me say, was generous enough to speak in this wise :

> I for one do not desire to be understood as reflecting on all the appointments that my right hon. friend the leader of the government has made to the Senate or even the majority of them. He has appointed very many able men, very many distinguished men to the Senate; Sir Oliver Mowat, the Hon. David Mills, and other men of that type, who although Liberals, were men proper to be appointed to the Senate of Canada, and their appointment justified itself not only to the Liberals but to the Conservatives throughout the country.

Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) went on to say that all of the appointments had not been so satisfactory, that some of them had not been well chosen and that some of the appointments had been a surprise not only to Conservatives, but to Reformers as well. I observe that the two gentlemen whom the leader of the opposition specially mentioned as having being good men and proper appointees are, and were at the time of his pronouncement, safely dead, as politicians in this day usually have to be in order to receive any degree of praise, any measure of commendation, from their political opponents. I am very glad, however, and I am sure the people of Canada will be glad to hear, that a large majority of the appointments recommended by the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the Canadian Senate have been satisfactory even to the leader of the opposition and that he has no fault to find with them. I again say that if we are to have a Senate I quite agree with the idea expressed by the leader of the opposition and say that no better method of constituting the Senate is likely to be discovered or acted upon than the method we now employ. I oppose every plan that I have heard suggested because, as I have said, I see nothing in it that appears to me likely to be a real improvement, but should any method be discovered by which you will put into

our Senate greater life, greater energy and greater activity or by which greater importance will be attached to it, I will the more strongly and emphatically object to it because it seems to me that it will bring the two Houses into collision and that there will be friction and mischief resulting. As it is now, our Senate is not seriously considered. The public pay it little attention—it pays little attention to itself. It is at present a comparatively unnecessary, a comparatively useless and expensive thing—that is all—but let it come to greater life, greater energy and greater activity, and you run the great danger of making it not only a comparatively useless and expensive thing, but a mischievous and hurtful thing as well.

To strengthen my position on this point, let me read these words of Lord Salisbury —and words of so eminent a man upon so important a question are well worthy of our attention and most careful thought. Lord Salisbury speaking of the British House of Lords said:

It is because most of those who sit in the House of Lords do not themselves select the profession of politics as a thing which they love but come to it by the operation of external causes, that we have a body that brings to the consideration of political matters a feeling which is described as one of languor, but which I would describe as one of good nature and easy-going tolerance, which enables them to accommodate themselves to the difficult part of playing second to the House of Commons. . . . Depend upon it, if you ever succeed in so altering the character of this House that it consists of determined politicians, who always attend all debates and attach the same weight and importance that are attached to their opinions by those who sit in the House of Commons, you will have pronounced the doom of our present system of government, you will be imposing upon the House of Lords a place in the constitution which will be fatal to the constitution as it exists.

We all agree that it would be unwise to retain and maintain our Canadian senate as it is. While we are racking our brains and puzzling our minds to discover, if it be possible, some method of reform that will make the Senate more useful and more tolerable to the people of Canada, let us ask ourselves why, after all, it is necessary for us to have a Senate ? Why is it necessary for us to have a second chamber of any kind?

The Hon. Mr. Gladstone attributed the degree of toleration of the British people to their House of Lords to the English love of aristocracy. He said:

In truth the love of freedom itself is hardly stronger in England than the love of aristocracy; as Sir William Molesworth, himself not the least of our political philosophers, once said to me of this feeling with the people 'it is a religion.' The great strength of the House of Lords in popular estimation does not, so far as I can judge, lie in its legislative performances, nor even in the vast possessions of its members, but in the admirable manner in which a large portion of them, without distinction of politics, perform public and social duties in their local yet scarcely private spheres; and it is the love not of equality but of inequality, among the people which makes the noblemen almost kings in their minor yet far from narrow circles and permits their fellow countrymen to contemplate, for the most part without the slightest admixture of envy, their favoured lot.

Sir, whatever there may be in Britain, there is not in Canada any such love of aristocracy as Mr. Gladstone here refers to. With all our diverse religions there is not among our Democratic Canadian people any such religion as that love of aristocracy referred to by Sir Wm. Molesworth, and it does not strengthen the argument for the maintaining of the second chamber of Canada that the strongest reason Mr. Gladstone could find for the existence of the House of Lords in Great Britain should be that love of aristocracy to which he refers. Two reasons mainly are advanced in support of our Canadian Senate. First, that it is necessary to have a second chamber to revise the sometimes hasty, ill-considered, ill-advised legislation of the House of Commons. I would ask, Sir, what superior knowledge, what superior wisdom is possessed by the hon. senators that enables them to or makes them capable of correcting errors of the lower House? The House of Commons devotes more time and a great deal more attention to its work than does the Senate. The House of Commons sits longer hours, it has shorter and less frequent intermissions, and knotty and intricate problems are more carefully and fully threshed out in special and select committees of the House of Commons than in the committees of the Senate. Again, the members of the House of Commons come more frequently and regularly in contact with the people and are therefore more in touch with the people and more cognizant with the popular views and sentiments than those in the upper chamber.

The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre), speaking in 1906, attached some considerable value to the Senate as an authority to revise, but the hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) attached to it little or no importance as a revising power and said :

A second chamber is supposed to be a check upon hasty legislation. But this is an idea which has never made much impression upon my judgment at all events. Considering the course of such legislatures in the Dominion which are composed of a single branch, elected by the people, the legislatures of Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia and some others, I do not believe that we need seriously apprehend any danger from the existence of one branch only of the legislature.

Sir, the great authority that must criticise, that must censure and deal with the legislation of the House of Commons is the people that are represented in and by the House of Commons, and to whom the House of Commons is responsible, and it would be an unwise thing, it is I contend an unwise thing to maintain any second institution that renders an excuse for the dividing or the shirking of that responsibility.

The second reason which is more commonly advanced in support of the Canadian Senate was well given in the other words of the right hon. the Prime Minister in the debates of 1906, when he said :

But one reason which to my mind is absolutely conclusive and paramount is, that under our system of government a second chamber is an absolutely needed safeguard for the smaller provinces because of possible invasion of their rights by the larger provinces.

Sir, with all due deference and with the fullest possible respect to the greater wisdom and the larger experience and the splendid ability of the rigiht hon. gentleman —in whom no one has greater confidence than I, and for whom no one has greater admiration than I—it would after all seem to me that in the first place this need of protection on the part of the smaller provinces is more imaginary than real, and that in the second place, such protection even if required is not given and cannot be given by the Canadian Senate. It is very clear that as our Senate is constituted to-day—Ontario having 24 members in the Senate, Quebec having 24 and each of the smaller provinces a considerably smaller number,—that the Senate does not and cannot afford any protection to the weaker provinces. But adopt if you will the change suggested by the right hon. the leader of the government and give to each of the provinces an equal representation in the Senate—it is not likely, in fact, it is scarcely possible that the rights of all the smaller provinces shall be attacked at the saem time in connection with the same question and along the same lines. But suppose that with nine provinces each having say ten senators to represent them, which would give to Prince Edward Island more than twice as many representatives in the Senate as she has in the House of Commons, and would make the total number of senators ninety, (which all will admit is a sufficiently large number) then suppose that an attempt were made to impose upon the rights of say any two of the smaller provinces at the same time and in connection with the same issue, what protection would there be, how could the twenty senators representing these two provinces protect the rights of their provinces against and in opposition to the seventy senators representing the other provinces ? I can easily understand that at the time of confederation the smaller provinces were fearful and nervous lest the larger provinces with whom they were allying themselves might at some time endeavour to intrude upon their rights, and that at that time the smaller provinces eagerly clung to any thing that might seem to afford them any possible protection in the event of such a case arising. But I do not believe there has been a single instance from confederation to the present time when any such protection has been required or when the Senate could have given that protection had it been required. My hon. friend (Mr. McIntyre) from South Perth—whom without any attempt to flatter I will say is at least one of the most thoughtful and one of the most able of the junior members of this House —quoted as the only instance, I suppose, that came to his mind, of the House of Commons acting rashly or unwisely, when it was necessary that any other power should check its impulse ; the case of one of the members of the press gallery being brought to the bar of the House. He referred to what appeared to him to have been the inclination of the majority of the members of the House at that time. Sir, I do not know what was the state of feeling of the members of the House of Commons on that occasion, I do not know how many were in favour of the procedure that did take place or how many were opposed to it, but this I do say, that if for a moment the House of Commons was disposed to do an unwise rather than a wise thing, that the Senate had nothing whatever to do with bringing the House of Commons to a realization of what it ought to do or what was its real duty on that occasion. The power that formed a check, if it was a check, was the power that was in the right hon. gentleman who leads the government. Sir, the real and the effective protection that must ever be to the weaker provinces must be, and must be based upon, that feeling that prompts a man to protect a woman ; it must be based upon that feeling that leads us always to sympathize with the weaker party in any struggle. The great protection of the smaller provinces must be that British love of fair play that is, and I trust always will be a trait in the character of the Canadian people. No political party could afford to endeavour to trample upon the right of any of the provinces, especially one of the smaller provinces. No party can afford to take that course, because even though actuated by only the most selfish motives, it would know that that smaller province, be it comparatively never so weak, may at some time hold the balance of power and decide what political party should rule or govern. And even though the members of any political party in the House of Commons should endeavour at any time and upon any occasion to impose upon the rights of one of the smaller provinces,

public opinion and Canadian love of justice would frustrate that attempt. I quite agree with the idea expressed by the hon. member for South Perth, when in speaking in 1906 in connection with this suggested necessity for the protection of the smaller provinces ; speaking by the way in reference to the election of the senators by the people, he said :

I would rather put up with the anomaly we now have and consider that after all the provincial rights which theoretically need protection are not in very much danger.

The right hon. the leader of the government on the other hand laid great stress on the necessity for a Senate as a means of protecting the rights of the smaller provinces.

I want to point out to the House how opinions differ on this subject. The member for South Perth valued the revising power of the Upper Chamber ; the right hon. the leader of the government attached little or no value to the Senate as a revising power. The member for South Perth, for reasons that he stated, opposed the election of our senators by popular vote ; the right hon. the leader of the government for the same and added reasons agreed with him and opposed the idea of an elected Senate. But, we have to-day, the hon. James Young, of Galt, Ontario, a very able man who has devoted considerable time to the consideration of Canadian political and public questions, writing to the newspaper press and expressing no degree of admiration for the Senate as we have it ; holding the Senate as we have it in very light esteem, and advocating the election of our senators by popular vote as the only method that is likely to give to us a satisfactory Senate. And so it is—no one considers the Senate as we have it to-day to be satisfactory ; no two persons appear able to agree upon any system or method of reform that is likely to be satisfactory in practice. In fact, I may go further and say that one seldom finds any one person who is willing to lay down any suggested method of reform and say that he feels sure in his own mind that that will really decide the matter and prove satisfactory. Now, it appears to me that all this is very significant, and it goes far to prove that it would be unwise for us to maintain our second chamber as we have it to-day, that we are not likely to devise any scheme or method by which our Senate may be so reformed to make it acceptable or useful to the people, and that we ought, if we do the wisest thing to do away with it altogether.

One other reason is sometimes given, if reason it may be called, for maintaining a second chamber, and that is that other countries have their second chamber. If that be a reason, shall we have four houses because Sweden until lately has had four houses, and because Finland has to-day four chambers ? Different provinces of Canada, as has been pointed out, when they first framed their constitutions, I suppose animated by a desire to do as other people had done, provided a second chamber, and for a time legislated and governed by means of two houses. Though they have dispensed with their upper chamber, we will all admit, I think, that those particular provinces have been just as well governed and legislated for since they abandoned it as they were before, and just as well governed and legislated for as the provinces which have continued to maintain a second chamber. I will admit that the fact that other countries have their second chamber ought to make us very cautious as to what we do; and yet, Sir, if after careful consideration, if after patient thought, if after looking at this question on every side, if after our experience of forty years, we come to the conclusion that our second chamber, as it is or as we may amend it, is not necessary, is not worth what it costs to the people, then the fact that other countries have their second chamber is not in itself a sufficient reason why we should not abolish our Senate. I commend, Mr. Speaker, to your attention and to the attention of every member of this House the following words of Mr. W. P. Byles, who is now or was recently a member of the British House of Commons representing the west riding of Yorkshire; and I ask your attention to his language, not because of the hon. gentleman by whom it was spoken, for I have no knowledge of his parliamentary career, but because of the language itself. Mr. Byles said :

Some one may ask what I would put in the place of the House of Lords? I answer, nothing, only the conservatism of Englishmen, their abject fear of breaking the continuity of things would suggest to them in getting rid of one obstruction to manufacture another not quite so bad.

And I ask you whether, after all, our inclination, in so far as we have the inclination to maintain our second chamber, is not due to that very conservatism, that very abject fear of breaking the continuity of things referred to by Mr. Byles ?

Sir, I have spoken of the cost to the country of the Canadian Senate and I have said that I meant more than the actual money cost of the institution. Our Senate is costing us to-day over a quarter of a million dollars a year. Some attempt has been made, not in this House, but in the newspapers, to make party capital out of the fact that our Senate is costing us considerably more to-day than it did some years ago. I do not see that any party capital can be made of this question at all. In the last few years we have added new provinces to our Dominion, and those new provinces have of course the same right to representation in the Senate as the older provinces have. We in this House as well as the members of the up-

per House, irrespective of party, have voted an increased indemnity to ourselves and to the members of the other House. As a matter of course, the cost of maintaining the Senate has very largely increased, and it will be still further increased as our western provinces continue to increase in population. They will demand and must receive, if the present system is continued, a further representation. But be that as it may, our Senate is costing us to-day more than $250,000 a year to maintain. It is a large sum of money, but that is not the only cost; in fact, I think I can correctly say that that is not the greatest cost to the people of Canada of maintaining the Senate. I believe that our Canadian public are sometimes too ready to look with suspicion upon their government, whether that government be Reform or Conservative. Reformers used frequently to say that Sir John Macdonald used the Senate with its Conservative majority to assist him to play tricks upon the Canadian people, that he caused popular measures to be passed in the House of Commons and then caused those measures to be blocked and defeated in the irresponsible Senate over which he presumably had no control, but which in reality he fully controlled. I have no doubt that Conservatives are to-day saying the same thing of the present administration. It may be, Sir, that there has been little or no ground for that suspicion in either case; but the suspicion exists, and anything that tends to lessen the confidence of the people of Canada in the powers that govern is a great loss and a national misfortune. Again, the Canadian Senate has buried within it to-day, as within a musty tomb, a number of able gentlemen who in the Senate are not capable of exercising any powers or exerting any particular influence—gentlemen who outside of the Senate, and especially if in the House of Commons, would exert a powerful influence that could only result in good for the people of Canada. It would be a comparatively easy thing to select twelve men from our present Canadian senators who could find places in the House of Commons, and who in the House of Commons would exercise even more power and have greater influence than the whole ninety or thereabouts exercise to-day in the chamber they occupy. This is an idea that was fully grasped by Sir Robert Walpole, so long Prime Minister of Great Britain. Sir Robert Walpole caused Mr. William Pulteney, his one-time friend, but later his very able and active opponent in the House of Commons, to be appointed to the House of Lords, as Lord Bath. Walpole believed that there he could not cause him any further trouble or give him any further opposition, and telling his son, Horace Walpole, what he had done, and illustrating his words with a twist of his fingers, he said: 'I have turned the key of the closet on him.' Nineteen years afterwards, as Sir Robert Walpole, then himself elevated to the peerage, as Earl of Orford, met Mr. Poultenay for the first time in the House of Lords, he addressed him thus:

My Lord Bath, you and I are now two as insignificant men as any in England.

Both of them able men, men of great experience and splendid talents, realized that each had completely lost his influence when he went from the Commons to the Lords. This, Sir, is a great loss to the people of Canada. I have argued that our Canadian Senate is not required, that it is unnecessary, that it is not worth what it costs the people. I have said that I would not particularly argue against it because of its wrong doings, because of its harmfulness and mischief. But instances are not wanting of upper chambers having effectively strangled legislation to the detriment of the country—our own second chamber included. In 1888 our Atlantic fisheries dispute, which had for a long time been a cause of trouble between our neighbours to the south and ourselves, had been amicably arranged by treaty. That treaty had been signed by Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Sackville, the British minister at Washington, and Mr. Bayard, the United States Secretary of State. It had been approved by the then democratic government of the United States, but upon a strictly party vote it was blocked by the republican Senate of the United States, which refused to the president the power to ratify the treaty, and that vexed question, then so nearly settled, has remained a vexed and troublesome question to this day. Some years ago a politically unfriendly Senate, having a majority of a different political complexion to that then existing in the House of Commons, defeated a Bill passed by this House, and by defeating that Bill lost to Canada and gave to the United States a very profitable Yukon trade. And during the present parliament a friendly Senate—a Senate politically friendly—caused to be defeated a Bill introduced in this House by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), relating to level crossings upon railway tracks. That Bill had been approved by this House and had the approval, I am sure, of the Canadian people, but it was defeated in our second chamber. And who can tell how many lives have since been lost because of the action of the Senate on that occasion. It would seem ridiculous that the stockholders, illustrating the Canadian electors, of any large commercial company should elect their directors and that those directors should elect their executive and their president, representing the House of Commons, the Cabinet and the Prime Minister, and that any power should then nominate or create by any means a second board, not responsible in any way to anybody, uncontrolled by the president, oftentimes

stubbornly antagonistic to the first board, and able to produce a deadlock in the management of the business and the control of that company's affairs.

I realize that the attempt to abolish the Senate is a very big undertaking. My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) says it is impracticable and asks: 'Can it be done?' I realize that it is a big task, but if it is a right thing to do, that is all the more reason why we should not delay getting at the work. Anything that the people of this country desire, I am confident can be carried into effect. The Toronto 'Star' and other Canadian newspapers have said that the Senate cannot be abolished because it will not abolish itself. I do not believe this. I refuse to believe that the members of the Canadian Senate or others who desire to become members of that body will be so lacking in dignity and self-respect as to attempt to thwart the will of the people, if the desire of the people be evident to abolish our second chamber. The agitation is not against the senators, but against the institution. I do believe, however, that our present senators have rights which ought to be respected and protected. It is not any part of my resolution, but I suggest that imperial legislation be sought, under which it may be possible for us to maintain our Senate as it is, except that no new appointments be made in the meantime, until by death, resignation, or otherwise, the number of the senators be reduced to say fifty. Then let the Senate be abolished and its surviving members be permitted, during the remainder of their lives, to continue to use the title hon. and be given a life annuity of say $2,000 a year. Men of much greater minds than mine have been in very serious doubt as to the wisdom of maintaining a second chamber. Let me quote from one illustrious Canadian statesman and one of Britain. Sir Oliver Mowat, one of the greatest statesmen Canada has ever had, speaking on this subject in 1903, said:

> We are agreed as to the necessity of a fundamental reform of the Senate, if, for any reason, the Senate must be or should be retained.

It is my opinion that that word 'if' is the largest word in that sentence and was intended so to be. The Hon. John Bright, one of the greatest statesmen of England, one of the most beloved, and one whose career was the most illustrious, said, towards the close of his political life, in Birmingham, on the 4th August, 1884:

> When I was young, I read books on this question and was strongly in favour of two houses. I confess that, without now having a very strong opinion one way or the other, I am not so bound up with the belief in the necessity of two Houses.

In dealing at so great length with so great a subject, it may be said I may have been guilty of great presumption. My only excuse, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe, as earnestly as I have advocated it, in the abolition of the second chamber. I am confident that a very large number of our people hold the same belief. And they hold that belief, not because of any socialistic ideas, but because they consider that the Senate is not worth what it costs. And until I hear reasons stronger and more convincing than those I have heard, in favour of maintaining a second chamber, I shall continue to be in favour of its abolition as I am to-day.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). With the permission of the House, I would like to lay on the table the result of the investigation held by Mr. Mackenzie King, at Vancouver, into the influx of Japanese labour. I lay on the table that portion of his report dealing with oriental immigration.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the House consents this is out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. We have no objection to the information coming down

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). Mr. Speaker, in 1906, when a resolution on the same subject as that of the one now before us was presented in this House, it was my privilege and pleasure to second that resolution. I desire to express, briefly, my opinion on the subject and my appreciation of the way the country has been discussing it. Since a similar resolution was introduced two years ago, this question has become a live one. It has been generally discussed throughout the country; almost all our leading newspapers have devoted a good deal of space to the question of the reformation of the Senate. I do not know that any of them have gone so far as to favour abolition, though the many different propositions presented looking toward reformation, indicate not only the importance but the difficulty of the question. This afternoon, we have had three resolutions presented; one proposing reformation of the Senate, one proposing a referendum on the subject, and the third in favour of abolition. As to the referendum, I do not think the proposal to refer a question of this kind to the people for an expression of opinion is a practical one. With all due deference to the intelligence of the people of this country, I think the question is too complicated and too delicate to be submitted to popular vote in this way. When I first began to look into the subject, I was prejudiced against the Senate and thought

little of the work it accomplished. But the more I studied the question and the more I looked into what is being done by our own Senate and by second chambers in other countries, the more was I convinced that these chambers are doing a most important work in the government of their several countries. If the referendum were made, and a majority favoured either abolition or some of the more drastic reforms suggested, would that be a sufficient reason for making the change thus favoured ? It must not be forgotten that certain of the provinces of this Dominion entered confederation under a specific understanding and contract, part of whose terms had to do with the constitution of the Senate and the mode of appointing members to that body. If a bare majority were to declare, in effect, against the carrying out of this binding agreement amongst the provinces so far as the constitution of the Senate is concerned, would that be a sufficient reason for making such a change ? It seems to me that a referendum upon such a subject would be entirely out of the question.

As to abolition, while that might seem comparatively easy, I am convinced that the more we look into it the more clearly should we see that that also is impracticable, and further, that it would be unwise, in view of our position as a country and of the practical effectiveness of the Senate as a legislative body. We find that, when the fathers of confederation discussed this question, they went fully into the merits of it. With not a single exception, I believe, they were all in favour of having a Senate under our constitution. In this connection I wish to give two brief quotations. The first is from the work of Mr. Clements on the British North America Act. Summarizing the results of the debate that took place Mr. Clements says :

By the fathers of our confederation the Senate of Canada was announced as answering both purposes, as affording a check on hasty or ill-digested legislation and also as protecting local interests and the autonomy of the provinces. The attainment of the former purpose was supposed to be made secure by the mode of appointment, the life tenure of the senators being held out as a guarantee for independence in the exercise of their legislative duties; while the equal representation in the Senate of each of the distinctly differentiated portions of the Dominion would make that body the guardian of ' provincial rights ' or at least of local as distinct from general interests.

Let me read also a brief extract from the speech of Sir John Macdonald on the same subject :

In order to protect local interests and to prevent sectional jealousies it was found requisite that the three great divisions into which the British North America Act is separated should be represented in the upper House on the principle of equality. There are three great sections having different interests in this proposed confederation. We have western Canada, an agricultural country far away from the sea and having the largest population who have agricultural interests principally to guard. We have Lower Canada with other and separate interests and especially with institutions and laws which she jealously guards against absorption by any larger, more numerous or stronger power. And we have the maritime provinces having also different sectional interests of their own, having, from their position, classes and interests which we do not know in western Canada.

These quotations show the views entertained by those who took part in drawing up our constitution in 1867. Having entered into a contract, a binding contract, with the various provinces on this subject, it seems to me that it is practically impossible for this government now to undertake abolition.

In the first place we would have the assent of every province in the Dominion, and from what I can learn I am confident that the province of Quebec would never for a moment consent to abolition, or to any proposal that would lessen the power or influence of the Senate. In this connection I would like to read a resolution that was introduced in the Provincial House of Ontario by the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat, and seconded by the Hon. Geo. W. Ross :

That in the opinion of this House, the provisions of the British North America Act, respecting the constitution and powers of the Senate of Canada are at variance with the well understood principles of responsible government, and should be brought more into harmony with those principles by an amendment to the said Act, substantially providing that if the House of Commons passes any Bill and the Senate rejects such Bill and fails to pass it, or passes it with any amendment or amendments to which the House of Commons shall not agree, and to which amendment or amendments the Senate adheres, the Governor General may, by message, upon the advice of his Council, convene a joint sitting of the two Houses, at which the questions in controversy and the final passage of such Bill shall be decided by a joint vote of the two Houses after debate.

Further, that it is the opinion of this House that the British North America Act should be so amended as to provide that senators should be appointed or chosen for a limited term of years only, and not for life, as at present.

I read this resolution to show, in the first place, that while it was passed in the Ontario Legislature, and a similar resolution was passed in the Nova Scotia Legislature, when the matter came before the Quebec Legislature the then premier of the province refused to present a resolution to the House on these lines; he refused to take the matter up at all with a view to putting the provincial government upon record, even in favour of the changes suggested in this resolution. So I contend that we have no rea-

son whatever to suppose that the province of Quebec would for a moment consent to the abolition of the Senate. And I believe firmly that all the eastern provinces in the Dominion would perhaps be almost as strongly opposed to such a proposal. I know that in Ontario there has been some feeling towards abolition, but I believe that even there, if the matter were carefully considered, and even were it practicable, the province of Ontario would be opposed to abolition. Hence I say that in discussing this question I do not think we need spend any time in considering whether it would be wise to seek for abolition.

The resolution that has been introduced by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) looks first to an age limit. That is exactly on the line of the resolution that was introduced in 1906. For myself, I think it would be wise to establish an age limit. We all know that when men get to the age of 75 or 80 years, while they may be clear-headed and able to give good advice, yet generally speaking they have passed the time when we could naturally expect them to render the best service. However, there are exceptions, and I know there are men who, at 75, are a great deal younger than some men of 65, are clearer headed and better able to do legislative work than men at 65. We readily understand that; and yet I believe it would be wise to have at least some age limit, make it 80 if necessary.

But more particularly am I in favour of making a term limit. I think that when a senator is appointed for life, he no sooner gets his appointment than all incentive to active, energetic service is in a large measure removed; he knows that he holds his appointment for life, and he is not responsible to any person for his services, whether he is active or not. I believe the resolution of 1906 proposed a term of fourteen or fifteen years, I think perhaps twelve years, or the length of three regular parliaments, would be about the right length, and in that case their election would take place in periods of three or four years. I think perhaps a term of twelve years might be as good a term as could be provided. In that case, though a man were appointed for a term of twelve years, he would still feel an incentive to put his energies into his work and give his best possible service to the country, and in that way he would be more likely to render efficient service than if he were appointed for life. I would also, with the term limit, provide for reappointment. That would act as a further stimulus to a man to do his best. I do not care how ambitious a man may be, or how anxious to serve his country in any position, we all need a stimulus to do our best, and if a man has something to aim at and knows that he is responsible to the people who elect him or appoint him, there is a stimulus to do his best in the position to which he is called. I think therefore that provision should be made for reappointment.

Another provision in the resolution is for an apportionment of the legislative duties between the two houses. I think something might be done to make the upper chamber more useful, and by which a good deal of the work that is done in this House might be lessened and thus facilitate the transaction of public business. Some have argued that the upper House is not now accomplishing very much, that the work they are doing is of little consequence. A couple of years ago I took occasion to look into the work that was being done by the Senate, and I found that they were amending quite a number of Bills, averaging about 25 every year, and that they were initiating Bills to the number of some 30 every year. Now I think that is doing pretty well for the Senate, when we remember that the preliminary work is largely due to this House. In connection with the Railway Bill of 1903, I think they introduced 97 amendments, and I understand that 70 of these were accepted by this House. I understand that a Bill was sent up from this House to the Senate a year or two ago, a Railway Bill, with some 11 clauses, and that every clause was stricken out, and the Bill was returned to this House with only the preamble, and still it was accepted by this House as it was returned from the Senate. I mention that to show that the Senate is, at any rate, doing some work, and if they were given more work to do I believe they would gladly do it. Sir Richard Cartwright, in a speech delivered in the Senate on the reform of the Senate a couple of years ago, suggested that it would be wise to allow the Senate to take charge of private Bills. That proposition might very well be put into effect; it would certainly relieve this House of a large amount of business. We know that the sessions are becoming longer, and if the work could be thus divided it would be an important consideration. In that way the Senate could be kept busy practically all the time and could do the work as well as it could be done by this House. A private Bill having been passed by the Senate would come back here simply for confirmation.

There is another clause in the resolution introduced this afternoon to the effect and with a view to consider the question whether other changes might be made and that a committee should be appointed to look into this question. Such a committee could very well deal with and might arrive at a basis of reform that would perhaps meet with the approval not only of this House but of the country at large. Some have thought that we have not had the results that were expected from the work of the Senate. I wish to call your attention to the fact that this criticism was hardly deserved; there has been little complaint, little dissatisfaction after all with the work that has been accomplished by the Senate.

We are very young as a nation. Forty years is a considerable period in the life of an individual, but in the life of a nation it is very very short indeed, we are just on the threshold of our national development. A development is taking place in this country such as has perhaps never been surpassed in the history of any country and with the great west opening up before us so rapidly, I think it is clear to every one of us who has given this matter any study that it is more important than ever that we should have a second chamber to serve as a balance wheel, as it were, on the legislation that might be passed by this House. If the arguments urged by the fathers of confederation were important, I think they are doubly so at this period of our national history. With the different races and nationalities that are coming into our country, with the immigration problem that is facing us, with other questions that will naturally arise in the opening up and development of the great western country, I think that the further considerations that were urged by the fathers of confederation and by those provinces entering confederation for the protection of local rights and local interests, are to-day just as strong as or stronger than at the time they were urged. I had not intended to speak on this question, but this afternoon, when my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre), told me he was going to name me as his seconder, I thought it was necessary that I should at least say a few words to show my complete sympathy with the resolution. I am heartily in accord with it and I believe that it is time the government was at least making a move with a view to the reform of the senate. The agitation that has taken place in Canada, I think, is clear enough proof to us on this point and I hope the government will seriously and expeditiously take hold of this question and, with the assistance of the opposition, who I understand are also favourable to reform, as announced by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in his celebrated Halifax platform, bring this matter to a successful issue at a very early date.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present to hear the speech made this afternoon by the mover of the resolution which I purpose supporting, that is the motion for the reform of the Senate. We have in our Senate to-day unquestionably many of the ablest men in political life in the country, the greatest Romans of us all, and yet there is throughout at least the portion of Ontario in which I reside a certain feeling of disappointment with reference to the Senate. I believe there is a feeling amongst the senators themselves I have heard some of them express disappointment with the Canadian Senate as it is now constituted.

My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr Miller) stated that it was not a socialistic question. Perhaps it is not, but still to a certain extent socialistic questions arise in the discussion of such a question as this. In Ontario, a few years ago, during the Conservative regime, when the farming community were not enjoying very great prosperity, they were experiencing hard times, and they felt that the officials, the salaried men in the country, were receiving their regular pay and without diminution, while their own profit, their own incomes, were much cut into, and yet they were the parties who had to pay the piper. That feeling gave rise to what is known as the Patron movement. We know that when more prosperous times came that feeling passed away and the Patron movement vanished into thin air. That there is England to-day a similar feeling of discontent cannot be questioned. I have here the 'Westminster Review,' a high-class London magazine, of November, 1907. It contains an article headed 'The Rising Storm Cloud.' The writer points out that this wave of socialism which exists in England, and the existence of which was shown during the last general election, is partly due to the Boer war.

He points out that men who in the beginning of the war volunteered their services were promised by their employers that they would get their positions when they returned, but when the time of peril had passed and the volunteers came home these positions were not open for them and there was a feeling of dissatisfaction which was probably increased by the fact that General Roberts was given a large sum of money by a grateful country for the eminent services he rendered, but in this the men of the rank and file did not share, and a feeling of jealousy was created that these gifts went to the few while the many got nothing. The fact that such things have had an influence is shown by the rise and spread of socialistic feeling in Great Britain. Before the Boer war the Fabian society, a small band which led the socialistic movement, was few in numbers, but now the writer says, they can be counted by the tens of thousands. In that way the socialistic aspect of this question has some bearing. The storm centre of the fight and the struggle—for I believe they are in England facing a struggle between the Lords and the Commons—the struggle there is not as it is here ; the struggle there is for : Which should prevail ; shall the will of the House of Commons prevail or shall it not. That is the issue placed before the British people by the present Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. The question in Great Britain is : How is the will of the people to be ascertained. I am informed that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) suggested submitting the question to the people of Canada on a referendum. A writer in the December issue of the 'Westminster Review' in an article entitled 'The will of the

people' advocates a referendum to decide the fate of the House of Lords. Possibly a referendum would be less objectionable in Great Britain than would be a referendum in Canada where the smaller provinces have representation in the Senate, so that to radically change the constitution of that House would disarrange our whole system. Probably we would not be in as good a position to take a referendum in Canada on such a question as they would be in Great Britain.

The resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) is in favour of the abolition of the Senate. I do not think the people of Canada as a whole,—I do not believe that even the majority of the people in Ontario to-day would favour the abolition of the Senate if it were pointed out to them that there were difficulties in the way, constitutional and otherwise. Why is the Senate unpopular in Canada ? That is a question that it is very proper to ask. There is a feeling abroad that the Senate is a sort of temple of rest. I do not wish to speak with any disrespect ; I am only voicing the opinions I have heard expressed and the statements I have read in the newspapers of Ontario ; there is continual reference to the quietude and peacefulness of the Senate. In fact the popular feeling seems to be that the senators go there, in the words of Goldsmith:

> To husband out life's taper at the close
> And keep the flame from wasting, by repose.

If the Senate had made good ; if the Senate had shown the people of Canada that they were worth the money ; if the Senate had been the useful check to legislation that I believe it can be—for I do believe in the bi-cameral system. I believe that history teaches us that the bi-cameral system has its usefulness. The fact that such countries as France, Spain, and others have attempted to get along with a single chamber and have gone back to the two chamber system is evidence in its favour. Mark you, I think two legislative chambers in a country is the limit ; I believe that three or four would be altogether ridiculous. But with two Houses, I think probably the best results are obtained. In this House of Commons we have certain checks on legislation; you have the first reading of a Bill, the second reading of a Bill, the consideration of a Bill in committee, the third reading you have to give certain notices ; all these are along the line of proper consideration and checks upon hasty legislation. Now, why is it that the United States Senate has deserved the encomiums it has received from statesmen; why is it that the late Marquis of Salisbury described the American Senate as 'marvellous in efficiency and strength.' Talking about this bi-cameral system I might quote Lieber, a writer on economics, who says :

> Experience is in favour of having a measure discussed de novo by a different set of men with equal powers and combined upon a different basis; that this and the three readings with notice and leave of bringing in, have a wonderful effect in sifting, moderating, discovering and in enlightening the country.

—and he goes on to say that the different stages through which legislation passes make for good government and careful consideration of measures. I think it was Washington who referred to the House of representatives as : 'A cup into which the hot legislation was poured,' and to the United States Senate : 'As the saucer in which this legislation was permitted to cool off.' Now, coming down to the elective principle, it is certainly more democratic than the nominative. We have it in Belgium where 83 are elected by the people and 27 by the county councils ; in Denmark where fifty-four are elected for eight years and twelve nominated by the government ; in the Netherlands where fifty are elected by the Staats and in Sweden where they are elected by the county councils. Even in Canada we have had the elective system. It was tried in 1856. If you read 19-20 Victoria, chapter 140, you will find a provision for an elective Senate. That law was repealed. It would seem that it was unworkable ; at least the fact that it was abolished and that they went back to nomination by the Crown shows that it was not a success at that period. Lord Elgin—I quote from Goldwin Smith's work on 'Canada and the Canadian Question,' page 164—Lord Elgin expressed his belief that :

> A second legislative body returned by the same constituency as the House of Assembly, under some differences with respect to time and mode of election, would be a greater check on ill-considered legislation than the council as it was then constituted.

There is a high opinion in favour of an elective Senate. Goldwin Smith with reference to that says :

> This elective system does not seem to have been a success, the labour of canvassing extensive electoral divisions being found so oppressive that the best men decided not to come forward.

With reference to the question of life tenure, that has been already discussed, and discussed ably, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell), and I am in full accord with the position taken by him, that there should be a time limit, as there is a limit of age beyond which members are not as capable of working and acting as they are in younger years.

If senators are to be elected, in what way will the elections be carried on ? That seems to me to be a very important point. One suggestion is the referendum. That is a direct appeal to the people, and it is a sort of irony of fate that Switzerland, that country of a single chamber, has

had to resort to the referendum as a check upon hasty legislation, and the question whether this Bill or that, shall become law is referred directly to the people. We have had experience of what might be called the referendum. We had a plebiscite on the liquor question submitted by this government in 1898, in which there was a comparatively small vote. Throughout Ontario at the recent municipal elections we have had what was practically a referendum—a reference to the people, not for a law, but of the application of a certain law to a particular place—whether this law should be applied to a particular locality or not. In 1874 the Hon. David Mills, a constitutional lawyer of very high standing, brought into the House of Commons a resolution in favour of having senators appointed by the provinces, and if I remember rightly, Sir Richard Cartwright also last year suggested election by the provinces. Now, if we are to have election by the provinces, I would favour the position taken by many of the states of the American Union. It has been found that the election of senators by the several states has not been a success; influences have been at work in the election of senators which have been anything but a credit to those states. What remedy has been applied by the several states? The 'Political Science Quarterly' of 1905, referring to Arkansas, says at page 583:

> The last state convention adopted a resolution that the candidate for the United States Senate receiving the highest number of votes in the primaries should be declared the choice of the Democratic party for the United States Senate by the state convention, just as they declare the nominees of the party for state offices, and of course the legislature has no duty depending upon them but to cast their votes for the person declared the successful candidate by the state convention. This is absolutely equivalent to election by the people.

Again, on page 584:

> The recent laws in Minnesota, Michigan, Indiana and Massachusetts provide machinery which may readily be adapted to the nomination of senators; while the new laws of Wisconsin and Illinois proceed directly to that goal.

Again, at page 591:

> In one form or another the legislatures of thirty-one states—more than the full two-thirds prescribed by the constitution have communicated to Congress their formal approval of a proposed change in the constitution: indeed, if the votes in the House be taken as a fair representation of the will of the people in their constituencies, only two states in the union have failed to give their endorsement.

Concluding, on pages 592 and 593:

> Everywhere the movement for the direct primary is gaining ground. How will this advance affect the movement for an amendment authorizing popular election of senators?

Then for better or worse democracy will take the election of senators into its own eager and strong but unskilled hands.

Another suggestion, which was referred to by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) this afternoon, is that of the Hon. James Young. As I understood Mr. Young's letter, which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' a week or so ago, he suggested that the country be divided up into certain groups, and that senators be elected directly by the people in those groups. That suggestion is along the line of what is known as the abolition of the ward system, the object of which is to extend the boundaries of constituencies so as to make personal canvassing an impossibility and to prevent the improper influencing of the electorate. If that system were put into force, the history of the past might be repeated; for in 1856 and some years afterwards that system was in operation in Canada, and was found to be a failure, because the extent of ground to be covered in each constituency was so great that good men could not be found to undertake the task of running, because of the great cost of elections, and other objections. If there were a system adopted which would be partly nominative and partly elective, I would suggest that the universities of the country be given representation in the Senate. In Scotland, the university is an institution which has made for stability. The sons of the peasantry are admitted to it on an equality with the richest in the land and take their places in the pulpit, at the bar and in parliament. In that way the university forms a link between the masses and the ruling classes and makes for stability.

To recapitulate. If the Senate is maintained, as it is at present, then I think that there should be some change or changes calculated to increase its usefulness and its responsibility to the people. In other words it should be given some special work. Let it initiate private Bills, as has been suggested by Sir Richard Cartwright. Let it be given something to do, and I have no doubt it will make good, and become deserving of public respect instead of being the object of the disappointed feeling that exists in the country to-day. If it is to be elected by provinces, then I suggest that we should follow the example of the United States, and have a law of primaries by which there will be proper regulations for each primary there will be provided safeguards such as exist in the general elections—a fixed time for voting, officials to take the vote, and punishments for infringements of the primary law. If the Senate were partly nominative and partly elective, then a selection should be made from the universities of a certain number of senators. I shall not, Mr. Speaker, take up the time of the House any longer and must thank hon. members for the kind attention they have given to my few remarks.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL. In asking the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to the few words I have to say regarding the matter under discussion, I would like at the outset to compliment my hon. friends who have introduced the motions now before us. They all have shown by their speeches that they have taken a great deal of pains and used a great deal of industry and given the matter a great deal of thought. My hon. friend from Perth (Mr. McIntyre) said he expected that any hon. member of the opposition who would speak on this subject would not fail to refer to the Ottawa platform adopted by the Liberal party in 1893. I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the suggestion. Were it not for that suggestion, I do not know that I would have made any reference to that platform ; but since he has expected some such reference, I should be sorry to disappoint him. Under the circumstances, I cannot refrain from reminding the right hon. first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he and his party undertook in 1893, when they appealed to the people to elect them to power, to reform the Senate, and the reason they gave was that the Senate was then in such a condition that it imperatively demanded reform. That was the declared policy of the right hon. gentleman and his party at that time. Yet although they have been in power some ten or eleven years, no effort, up to the present, have they made to carry it into effect. Possibly the changes that have taken place in the membership of the Senate, since the right hon. gentleman has come into office, have brought about a change of heart in himself and his followers. Possibly the right hon. gentleman may think that the Senate has now become sufficiently reformed for all practical purposes. Well, Mr. Speaker, from my point of view, I think that the Senate is in greater need of reform to-day than it was in 1893, when these hon. gentlemen made their platform. However that may be, we have before us three propositions advanced by different members—three motions, all of them intended to deal with this subject. Each of these motions deals with it in a different manner, and the mover of each gives different reasons for the faith that is in him. We have the doctors differing both as to the disease and the treatment, and this of itself, I take it, makes it absolutely plain that the subject is not by any means a simple, but rather a complicated and difficult one to deal with. If we look over the various countries which enjoy representative government in any shape or form, we find that the very large majority are governed by parliaments consisting of two houses each. One cannot help concluding that there must be some very good reason, indeed, for that great unanimity we see displayed in this matter in the governments of the civilized world. For my part, I say freely that, both from a theoretical and a practical point of view, I believe in the principle of an upper and a lower house. I believe in it, not only for this federal parliament, but also for the provincial legislatures. I have before my mind at present the province of New Brunswick from which I come, and I have not the slightest hesitation in expressing my firm conviction that that province has suffered very much indeed from the abolition of its legislative council some few years ago. Legislation has passed that provincial legislature, which, in all probability, would never have been introduced into it, had there been an upper chamber to pass upon that legislation. Our local legislature has passed legislation, some of it ill-advised, some of it vicious, which would never have become law had there been two houses instead of one. Therefore I believe I have good reason for supporting the principle of two chambers in any system of representative government.

On looking over the various countries, we find a great variety of modes and methods in which their upper chambers are either elected or appointed ; but in every case, without exception, the members of the upper house are placed in such a position that they are given greater stability in their position, greater length of time of service, and are relieved to a great extent from the necessity of yielding to party necessities and influences of that kind, and are consequently removed further than the popular chamber from any pressure which would induce them to pass panicky legislation or yield to popular clamour or passion or impulse which, though temporary, might be very strong and very pernicious. They are thus considered to be a useful check on hasty or panicky legislation which might be passed by the more popular house, or the house which has to appeal more frequently to the people for its verdict and re-election. Therefore, I think that there is very good reason and very good place in the theory of responsible government for a second chamber. A comparison is often made between our Senate and that of the United States, very much to the laudation of the latter as against the former. But, in my opinion, the senates of the two countries cannot be compared in any shape or form. The whole system of government in the two countries is entirely different. The president of the United States is elected for four years and is not responsible to parliament. No legislative body in that country can interfere with him. No one can control him. The only method by which he can be interfered with is by impeachment. He appoints his own cabinet, and that cabinet is not responsible to any one but the president himself. It is not responsible to the people. Therefore the president and his cabinet are given very great powers indeed. It consequently became necessary to devise

some constitutional check on those powers, and that check was found in the constitution of the Senate. I may say that the powers given the president appear to be greater indeed than those enjoyed by the monarch of England. In fact, it has been said that the King of England may be described as a hereditary president in a limited monarchy, whereas the president of the United States is really an elective monarch in a limited democracy.

Because I believe, as a matter of fact, the powers of the people are really less than under our own form of government—at all events it is more difficult for the people to get at their representatives who wield this power than it is for our people to get at theirs. In the Senate of the United States was found a check upon that which were it in England would be called the royal power. No treaty can be passed in the United States without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate. Officers who are impeached must be tried before the Senate. In the appointment of judges of the Supreme Court, ambassadors and various other high and important officials not otherwise provided for, the consent of the Senate is to be given to these appointments. So that when the attempt is made to show a similarity between the Senate of the United States and the Senate of Canada, we find that the differences in the systems of government and in the conditions make it quite impossible to find a basis of comparison. Our own Senate has very large powers. It has the power of veto—an immense power in itself. It has the power of amending any Bill except a money Bill. So, though these gentlemen of the Senate are easy-going at the present time, after all, if they chose to take the bit between their teeth, they could give a very pretty play to the people of this country. My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) spoke of giving more power to the Senate. It seems to me that he could not very well give that body more power than it has already. For weal or for woe they have power enough.

Certain changes have been proposed in the method of selecting members of the Senate. One of these is that our senators should be chosen, like those of the United States, by the local legislatures. If we consider the history of elections to the United States Senate I think the majority of us will not be likely to favour following the method of that country. In fact, the method has been proven so unsatisfactory that I think a majority of the states of the union, at all events more than thirty of them have made petition to Congress to change the method of election, they have had notable deadlocks in these elections. On one occasion, in the state of Deleware, the legislature took 217 ballots in which it spent 114 days, and still there was no election. The legislature of California cast 104 ballots on which it spent 67 days, and still no election. The legislature of Pennsylvania cast 97 ballots and spent 92 days, and still no election. In view of the facts, I, for one, would hardly care to advocate such a system. It has been said also that the Senate of the United States elected by this method has become simply a millionaires' club. A new gospel has been preached in the United States to the effect that it is harder for a poor man to get into the United States Senate than it is for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. And I think there is probably a good deal of truth in it, or surely not so much would be said all over that country to the effect that wealthy men and the representatives of great corporations and trusts have made a point of getting into the Senate and using the Senate for their own purposes. At the same time, nobody can deny that the United States Senate is one of the most powerful legislative bodies in the world today, and that it has given, and is giving, an example of great debating ability and other qualities for which we look in a legislature of high degree. As to wealth, I see no reason why wealth should be a bar to appointment to the Senate. I would rather see a man of wealth appointed to the Senate than see a man appointed to the Senate in order that he may get wealth. I think that is a point that we may well take into consideration. At the same time I do not think that wealth alone should be represented. All the varied interests of the country might find worthy representatives in the Senate if the senators were properly chosen. There is another important reason why we should not have our senators chosen by the local legislatures. That reason is that such a system would give the Dominion government, whichever party happened to be in power, not merely another excuse, but another reason, and a very good reason, for interfering in provincial affairs. I think that our federal governments have interfered in provincial affairs probably more than is good for the country. I believe that the country generally gets better government when the local legislatures are in different hands from the federal government.

Another proposal made is the election of senators by the people. That, as every one knows who has run elections, would be an expensive process. While it is expensive to run an election in an ordinary constituency such as those which send representatives to this House, it would be immensely more expensive to run an election as senator in a constituency which might be a whole province. How many men would you find in this country who, for the sake of a seat in the Senate, would run an election in such a constituency? Only an extremely wealthy individual could undertake it. Or, if the place were not sought by men of wealth

the contest would simply come down to the provincial party organizations putting up their several nominees. While that might not be the best plan of getting into the Senate able men who were best fitted to grace that body, I believe we would not have a better chance of getting good men than we have under the present mode of appointment. By nomination you can obtain men eminent in the various walks of life; but who would not for a moment think of attempting to run an election, and the probability is that even if they did they would de defeated. Still those men would be so highly esteemed for their character, and so eminent in their own communities, that their entry to the Senate would raise that body greatly in the estimation of the Canadian people. But you can never get men of that character by popular election, however desirable it is to obtain such men for the Senate.

There is no doubt at the present time in this country a good deal of discontent with the constitution of the Senate. In fact this is so well understood that the senators themselves I think would be glad to make a change in the direction of making that body more acceptable to the country at large. This discontent may be described as smouldering at present, but it may break out in the form of a popular agitation and become a burning question, and we all know that when the people get excited on any subject they are apt to go at too great lengths, and if they were to get excited against the Senate they would not be satisfied with simply mending it but would go to the length of ending it. Therefore I think it wise that we should preclude any such dangerous agitation by taking means at present to reform the constitution of the Senate and make it more acceptable.

The question of the abolition of the Senate has been brought up, and I agree with those who take the view that it is impossible to abolish it under the pact of Confederation. That is considered a sacred pact by the different provinces. Some of the smaller provinces indeed look upon the Senate as their only safeguard. Take the little province of Prince Edward Island. They were given four members in the Senate at confederation, and at that time I think six members in the House of Commons. Now they have four members in the House of Commons, and still retain their four members in the Senate. But as time goes on, as the province of Quebec gets more populous and as the unit of representation rises higher, the time may come when the representation of Prince Edward Island will be curtailed to such an extent that it is conceivable that it will disappear altogether. Therefore we can well imagine how strongly the people of Prince Edward Island would cling to the Senate as affording them representation, at least in one of the legislative bodies of parliament which could never be wiped away.

Then a referendum has been suggested to settle this question. Of course a referendum to abolish the Senate could only be adopted after the various provinces had consented to such a referendum. But it always appeared to me that a referendum was merely an attempt to shift responsibility from the representatives of the people to the people themselves. I have always held that the people sent their representatives here to legislate for them, to do the best they could in the public interest, and I do not accept the idea that whenever a somewhat difficult question comes up we ought to send it back to the people for their decision in any other manner than that already provided for by the election of representatives at stated intervals. But I think a time limit to the appointment of senators would be a popular move with the people; and possibly an age limit, although with regard to the latter point I feel more diffident about expressing an opinion. We know that some men are young at 70 and 80 years of age, and I think I am not exaggerating when I say that perhaps the ablest men of the present Senate are among the very oldest men in the Senate; I think there is no doubt of that. So I would be more careful about establishing an age limit. But I think that a time limit would appeal to the genius of our people, and would go a great way to satisfy them, and to remove some of the popular objections which certainly now exists against that body as at present constituted.

Again, the Senate has been accused of lethargy, and this has been attributed to the advanced years of so many of the Senators. But I do not think the lethargy of the Senate is attributable to any such cause; I think it is rather owing to the fact that there is so large a majority on one side of politics, and this has a tendency to discourage any activity and healthy rivalry between the two parties. The majority is in touch with the government of the day, and are satisfied to let things go just as they come from the House of Commons. I think it would put more vigour into the political discussions in the Senate if the two parties were more equal in numbers; if they were equal or approximately so, I am sure that the charge of lethargy now aimed against the Senate would no longer hold.

The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he was in opposition had the idea that the proper way to appoint senators was from both sides of politics, so as to have the numbers in that body nearly balanced as to politics. There would then be a healthy rivalry and emulation in that body which does not now exist. Sir, I think that the government is responsible for the Senate. It has been urged against the Senate that they are an irresponsible body. They

may be personally irresponsible, but I say that the government of the day is responsible for them. The government appoints them, the government is responsible to the people, and the government has this matter entirely in its own hands. Without any great constitutional amendment if the Prime Minister carried out in practice while in power the views which his party held while in opposition, when endeavouring to get into power, I do not think there would be discontent with the Senate. I think they would be more active and take a greater interest and have the confidence of the people to a very much greater extent than they now have.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my regret, a regret which I know will be shared by the House as a whole, that such a small proportion of the members of this House have taken part in this debate and given us the benefit of their views. On the other hand the House is to be congratulated on the character of this debate; it has been judicial in tone, high and elevated in purpose and expression, and I am sure I will voice the sentiments of members on both sides of the House when I offer my hearty congratulations to my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) for the manner in which he has introduced this subject to the attention of this body. His speech was judicious, elevated, eloquent and I may say that the tone he has started has been well kept up by all those who have participated in the debate. With reference to an observation made by my hon. friend who moved this resolution and which has been taken up also by my friend from the City of St. John (Mr. Daniel) it is a matter of history that the Liberal party for many years past, even I may say from the very outset of confederation, has held the opinion that the constitution of the Senate, such as it is provided for by the British North America Act, has been and is defective. The Conservative party were not of that opinion; but if I am to take up the last expression of their views in this matter as we have it from the leader of the party himself (Mr. R. L. Borden) in his speech delivered at Halifax, they have also come to the conclusion which we have harboured for many years, that the constitution of the Senate ought to be amended, that it is not satisfactory. Upon this point I do not believe there could be any two sets of views. But the difficulty is not in pointing out the defect, the difficulty is in suggesting a remedy. The Liberal party have been in office for twelve years and I say very candidly that up to that time we have not found a remedy which in our judgment would be adequate to the infirmity which we saw and denounced, and if the speeches which have been delivered by members of the opposition from the leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) to those of his followers who have expressed their views on this question, I have never found any concrete opinion as to what particular reform ought to be adopted. Change we may make at any time; but change does not always mean improvement and alteration is not always reform. If we are to move in this direction we would have to move very carefully in order to find out the remedy for an evil which we are all agreed in seeing. I have not at the moment to offer to the House any concrete and deliberate opinion of my own, any conviction which I have reached and would be prepared to offer to this House; but it seems to me that there are certain directions in which it is possible even at this moment, to offer some solution to an evil which they all agree exists.

In my humble judgment if any reform of the Senate is to be made,—and I think it ought to be attempted—the first reform that ought to be attempted should be in the line of reducing the number of senators. The present number seems to me altogether too large, but I shall come to that later on. Before coming to that, as no remedy has been suggested—I ought to make an exception in favour of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), who has offered a remedy and a very radical one, the complete abolition of the Senate, of the second chamber,—I must say to my hon. friend it seems to me that in view of the experience of the world and in view of our particular constitution the remedy suggested is altogether too drastic. So far as my information goes, of all the countries which have been blessed with representative institutions, I do not know one which ever had an unique chamber. An attempt has been made in some countries, but after being tried it has never been found to work and each and every country has had to return to another, a second chamber. Take for instance, France; after the abolition of the monarchy France attempted to be moved by only one body, the Convention, but the experiment did not last, and although France has attempted since that time many different constitutions, in every one we get the principle of double representation in legislative bodies. We have more reasons yet to adhere to a second chamber, on account of our federated system. The second chamber has been introduced in our constitution for the protection of the minorities. My hon. friend said this afternoon that he did not see what protection could be given to the smaller provinces in the second chamber. The protection is to be found in the fact that in the popular body, in the House in which we now sit the representation is based upon population, but in the upper chamber the principle has been adopted of equality of representation. That is the principle which ought to guide us, it seems to me, and this is the reason

why I said a moment ago that the first reform which ought to be made, in my humble opinion, ought to be made in the way of limiting the number of senators. When our constitution was enacted, when confederation was framed, forty-seven years ago, the principle was adopted of having the Senate appointed from groups. Three groups were made, one from the province of Ontario, one from the province of Quebec and one from the three maritime provinces, and to each one of these groups twenty-four senators were assigned, twenty-four for Ontario, twenty-four for Quebec, and twenty-four for the maritime provinces. This principle was adopted from the American constitution. In many respects the American constitution is not equal to ours, but in one respect I think it is superior to ours ; in the constitution of the Senate it seems to me certainly superior. In the American Congress the House of representatives is elected on the principle of representation. The State of New York sends thirty-six members to the House of representatives whereas according to population, the State of Rhode Island sends only two.

In the United States Senate, the state of New York has two members and the state of Rhode Island has also two members, so that while in the House of representatives each state speaks according to the numerical strength of its population, in the Senate each state has an equal voice. The representation of the state of New York is eighteen times stronger in the House of representatives than is the representation of the state of Rhode Island, but in the Senate the state of New York has no more power than has Rhode Island, small as it is. Under the American constitution, while the states are represented in the lower House according to their population, in the Senate each is on a footing of equality. That principle was adopted to some extent in Canada, but it was adopted in a very imperfect manner.

The first reform I would suggest would be that we should come to the principle of equal representation of the provinces in our Senate, so that each province should be represented by a limited and equal number. At present we have about eighty senators ; the province of Ontario is represented by 24 senators, the province of Quebec by 24, the province of Prince Edward by 4, the province of Nova Scotia by 10, the province of New Brunswick by 10, the province of Manitoba by 4, the province of Alberta by 4, the province of British Columbia by 3. If I had to offer a reform it would be that all these provinces should be represented on the floor of the Senate by an equal number of senators. There are nine provinces, and if each province were represented by, let us say 6 senators, that would give us a Senate of 54 members which would be a pretty strong body, a body sufficiently large and not cumbersome. Our position geographically is such that it is not probable we shall ever constitute any more new provinces. The climate of the remaining territories is such that it is not possible to conceive we could make any new provinces out of these areas, and in course of time possibly all these territories will be given to the existing provinces to administer. If therefore we were to have six members for each of the nine provinces, that would give us a body of 54, and in that body so constituted the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec would have no more power than the small province of New Brunswick. But, it may be said, if we were to adopt that principle we would have the anomaly that the province of Prince Edward Island might be represented in the Senate by a larger number than it had members on the floor of the Commons. That is quite true, but to me there would be no insuperable objection in such a proposal. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) has alluded to the fact that the maritime provinces have had decade after decade the number of their representation in this House reduced until now, New Brunswick has only 13 members, Nova Scotia, 18, and Prince Edward Island only 4. And the hon. gentleman says that the fear is entertained in these provinces that if the province of Quebec, which is the pivotal province as regards representation, continues to increase in population as rapidly as heretofore, the representation of the provinces by the sea will be still further decreased. Well, we have to stand by principle, and the principle adopted at confederation was representation by population in this House of Commons, and if the principle of representation by population in this chamber is to be maintained we must take the good with the bad. The province of Ontario has lost a certain number of members in the last decade, and she has lost them without any murmur. The province of New Brunswick has lost one member, and the province of Nova Scotia has lost two members. The representation of these provinces in the House of Commons may be still further reduced although I do not think it will. But, suppose such should happen. then, if the idea which I am now advancing were carried into effect the representation of these provinces in the Senate would always remain the same, they would have nothing to fear in that direction, and the voice of one province would carry the same potentiality in the Senate as did the voice of any other province. I would like to ask the House to consider this proposition : That the number of senators ought to be limited to a fixed number, and that each province should be represented in the Senate by an equal number of senators. I mentioned six, but that is arbitrary ; it may be 5 or it may be 7, or it may be 8, or it may be 10; I do not care which for the present moment. But what I would insist on is that each province should be represented by an equal number

of senators, that each province should stand in the Senate on the same footing, and that each province whether it be big or small should have a voice in the legislation, not according to the numerical strength of its population but according to its provincial entity. This would be the first proposal which I would submit to the House, but there is another.

At the present time senators are appointed for life. For my part I think that principle is wrong. I believe that senators should be appointed for a limited term. I care not whether it be for 10 years, or 12 years, or 15 years—it ought to be for a pretty long term—but I think senators ought to be appointed for a limited term. In the United States they are elected for six years, and experience has shown that men of very great ability and eminence have been re-elected term after term ; the late Senator Morrell represented Vermont for 25 years and Daniel Webster represented Massachusetts for almost as long a period. So, if we had men of eminence appointed to the Senate they could be reappointed after their term had expired. It seems to me that in order to preserve the independence of the Senate, in order to ensure that its usefulness and its vigour be maintained, it is preferable that the number of years for which a senator is appointed should be limited. I am sorry to say that at the present time it would seem as if the members of the Senate were looked upon as pensioners of the state. It should not be so, but it must be so if they are to be appointed for life. It was said by my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) that the Senate is looked upon as an irresponsible body because of the character of the appointments which are made to it. While it is true that the Senate may be looked upon as an irresponsible body, it is equallly true that it is not because of the character of the appointments which are made, or of the manner in which these appointments are made, but it is because of the constitution of the Senate itself and which in my humble judgment is the weakest point of all. The British constitution provides for government by a limited power. There is no absolute power under the British system. The King is not absolute, the Lords are not absolute, the Commons are not absolute. The Crown is not absolute because the Commons can refuse supplies. The Commons are not absolute because the Commons can be dissolved. The Lords are not absolute because the Lords can have their membership increased, and thereby their power can be destroyed. I think it was my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. McIntyre) who cited the instance of the Reform Bill in 1832 when the Lords were induced to agree to the Bill because of the threat which was made to appoint a sufficient number of peers to overcome opposition, and to which the King had acceded. But if under our present constitution in Canada there was a dead-lock between

the House of Commons and the Senate, nothing short of a revolution could solve the difficulty. For instance if the Senate were to oppose the Supply Bill, no constitutional remedy within our grasp could bring the Senate to a different view. They are limited in number, their number being fixed by law; therefore we could not increase it. So that we have in the constitution absolutely no remedy in that respect. This in my humble judgment is the weakest point in the constitution of the Senate. How that is to be remedied is another matter, as to which at this moment I have no suggestion to offer.

Perhaps I may say a word as to the manner of composing the Senate. At present the senators are appointed by the government of the day. I do not know that it is the best mode of selection. For my part, speaking in all candour. I wish as head of the government that we had not this power ; but it is in our hands, and we have to do the best we can, and to make the best appointments we can. But, Sir, what have we to put in place of this method of appointing senators? Some one has suggested popular election. To have senators appointed by popular election would be to go back to the system which prevailed in the old provinces of Canada in 1855 or 1856, when members of the upper house were elected by groups of counties—three or four counties at most forming a group. It was a moot question whether that system was good or bad. I think on the whole it worked fairly well. But I think we would not relish the idea of having more elections than we have now, and I do not know that this would be the best mode of appointing senators.

Then it has been suggested that we might adopt the American system of having the senators elected by the legislatures. At one time, I am frank to say, I thought a good deal of that system. There is no doubt that in the early days of the republic, up to the time of the civil war, the American Senate was one of the ablest bodies that ever sat as a legislature. Since the civil war, the Senate of the United States, while a very able body, does not in the minds of the American people occupy the position it formerly did, for character, prestige and ability. Somehow or other the impression has gone abroad that it has become an assemblage of plutocrats. I do not think that this reproach is altogether well deserved. There may be some truth in it, so far as the western states are concerned, but in the New England States the senators elected from Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire and Connecticut—have been men of very high order. At the same time, the American people, if I can judge aright from their press, are not in favour of the present mode of electing senators, and there is some talk of having them elected like the members of Congress.

Under these circumstances, perhaps it would not be advisable for us to adopt the system that has been found so unsatisfactory by our neighbours.

Then, what is to be done. The suggestion has been made, and it has perhaps some merit in it, that members of the Senate might be appointed by this House, in groups of three, each member of the House having only one vote, so that the opposition, by concentrating its vote on one, would always be sure to elect one of its own choice. There is a good deal to commend this view to one who looks at this matter impartially, though I am not sure that such a system would maintain the principle of provincial representation, which after all is essential in our federation system.

I am not prepared at this moment to suggest any final or definite system, except this, that we should adopt the principle of equal representation for all the provinces, and thus reduce the numbers of the Senate. Beyond this and the suggestion that the appointment should not be for life, but for a limited period, I would not be prepared to go.

But I think I should not sit down without offering a word of comment as to the manner in which senators are appointed. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that when I was in opposition I expressed the opinion that senators should be appointed by both parties. I do not know whether I ever expressed such an opinion. I said many things when in opposition which I may have forgotten. It is twelve years or more since I have been in opposition, and therefore my memory may perhaps be clouded on this point. At all events, I thought it would be fair that both parties should be represented in the Senate. When it comes to the appointment of senators, it is a difficult matter. With all the good will I have, if I were to advise His Excellency to take a man from the opposition side, I do not know that my action would be well received. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) would hardly expect me to submit to His Excellency the name of a man who represented us to be everything that was bad, who had nothing good to say of us, who declared that we were corrupt and wicked and guilty of all the sins in the calendar. That would be, I think, more than Christian charity could be expected to endure. For example, I could not be expected to advise His Excellency to appoint the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Even if I were to offer to His Excellency the name of one of the lukewarm Conservatives, who is not very strong on one side or the other, perhaps gentlemen on the other side would be the very first to find fault with such an appointment. Therefore on the whole I believe these appointments have to be made as all of them are made. When we come to select men who we think are worthy of representing the country in the Senate, after all, the standard of merit which we are accustomed to apply under parliamentary government it is very difficult to depart from. Sir John Macdonald in his day had many appointments to the Senate to make, many more than I have had. He appointed one gentleman from the Liberal side; but this gentleman was a personal friend of his and one who on a particular occasion had stood by him in very trying circumstances. I am sorry to say that I have not yet found in the ranks of the Conservative party a man of such independent views as John Macdonald was in the ranks of the Liberal party. With all the diligence with which I have scanned the other side, I have not been able to find such a man. For this reason we have had to advise His Excellency to appoint men from our own ranks, and I am glad to say that the appointments made have generally been acceptable. Even though we have the power of appointment in our hands, for my part I hold the same view that I had when in opposition, that the Senate ought to be reformed; but I am sorry to say that up to the present time I have not been able to satisfy myself what would be the best and most adequate reform. I am still open to conviction, I would like to have more views expressed on this question and further suggestions made, and for this reason I hope that this debate will not be concluded this evening. Therefore I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before this debate is adjourned, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words. I have no hesitation in complimenting my hon. friend who moved the first resolution (Mr. McIntyre) on the speech in which he supported his motion. He has been complimented generally all around, and I would add my tribute, if he has no objection to take it, for the very moderate tone in which his remarks were couched and which gave evidence of much thought and care on the subject. With many of his statements I agree heartily. Some of the positions he took probably would find differences of opinion, as differences of opinion have been manifested by all the speakers. In fact we have had no very strong lines of agreement except in regard to one thing which I shall mention later. But my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has just spoken, said, in one of his first declarations, that he had always thought, that the Liberal party had always thought that the constitution of the Senate was defective. I suppose what he meant was that it was based upon an improper principle. He also said that he was of the opinion that in the earlier days of confederation, the Liberal-Conservative party was not of that opinion, but that at present it had come to the conclusion that there was something wrong with the Senate, but whether that be

in its constitution or composition or in the methods of appointment, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not say. So far as I am concerned, I do not know that I would quarrel so much with the constitution of the Senate as with the methods of appointment. If the appointments to the Senate, and therefore its composition, had been carefully, loftily, honestly and in a proper spirit attended to, from the very inception of confederation up to the present, and if, as a consequence, the Senate had maintained its character and its influence, I am of the opinion that there would have been very few expressions to-day in this country of dissatisfaction with that body. The reason why people have come to canvass the matter and to express discontent with the present condition of the Senate is not on constitutional grounds at all. The question that presents itself to the public mind is whether the Senate is doing the work it ought to do, whether it is composed as it should be, and whether, in the last analysis, it is worth what it costs. The idea then that I have strongly imbued in my mind is that the discontent in any part of the country with the Senate to-day is not because of its constitution, but because of the manner and the quality of the appointments to that body. I am not going to make this a party question. I think that the discussion has been instructive so far, and it has been instructive because it has not been largely conducted on party lines. And although the temptation is great to say something with reference to the peculiar way in which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has made some of his appointments, I do not propose to deal with that part of the question to-night. There will be other opportunities to do this. What I propose to do is to compare the different views advanced in this discussion, and I think that the expression of these views will be of some good to the country. But what I want particularly to emphasize is the fact that the chief objection is not to the constitution of the Senate but rather to the way in which appointments have been made, and the evident purpose for which the power of appointment has been used. It is that which has caused dissatisfaction. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that he and his party have objections to the Senate. They believe that it was not properly constituted. They made that their canvass before the country. They held that opinion before they came into office, and so far as I can understand, they hold it still. Well, how long is my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) going to hold that opinion and do nothing? It is up to him to move. He is the leader of the government. If there is anything to be done in order to reform or re-constitute the Senate or put it on a better basis, it is for him to take the initiative and do it. That necessity was important enough before 1896, is it less important now? It was important enough then to be made a plank in the party platform. Has it lost its importance since, and is it of no importance to-day? Ten years is a fairly long span of political life for a government. How long does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suppose he is going to remain in office? If he intends before going out to carry out his pledge to reform the Senate and put it on a proper basis, he is playing with time and chance. He may get a very sudden and unpleasant surprise one of these days. He may find himself one of these days on the outside instead of the inside, and then he will be haunted by the fearful thought throughout the remainder of his political career that he wasted some ten or eleven years doing nothing, that he procrastinated during all these years doing what he and his party pledged themselves to do, and that he is no longer in a position to perform what he deemed so essential for the good of the country. I would not like to see my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suffering from so keen a remorse, and therefore advise him to lose no time in doing something besides giving utterance to nebulous and general opinions? He acknowledges that the system is bad, that the results are not good, and if he has any regard for its former pledge, it seems to me that it is the bounden duty of the right hon. gentleman and his government to propose a remedy and not satisfy themselves with merely discussing the question in an academical manner as he has done to-night. He held a very strong conviction on this subject fifteen years ago—a conviction so strong that he embodied it in a public platform, and it surely is now his duty to propose some plan based upon that conviction and consummate a reform which he and his party declared was absolutely necessary.

My right hon. friend says that he has not heard of any remedy proposed. A great many remedies have been proposed in the course of the general discussion. Remedies have been proposed this afternoon. But amongst them all my right hon. friend does not seem to choose. How long, I ask again, is he going to wait? Who, I ask again, is to propose a remedy? Is he to do nothing until, in some strange and mysterious way in the formative processes of the country, a remedy comes up readymade? It seems to me that a cabinet of all the talents ought to provide a remedy, which is demanded according to my right hon. friend's platform and his own pronouncements and contentions made many years ago and often and often since.

I do not agree that the main thing that the Senate was organized for as a part of this country's machinery of government was simply the protection of minorities. That narrows it to a basis upon which, I

believe, no great legislative body can be founded. That is an incident of the formation of our Senate, but it is not the motive of the establishment of the second chamber. The second chamber was deemed to be necessary to protect the rights of the different provinces, but not this alone. When it was thought to be necessary to have a bi-cameral institution here, with the Senate a part of it, it was considered to be part of the office of the Senate to protect the minorities, and in the composition of it, it was so guided that it did become a protection to the different provinces as regards their minorities. But the moment you put all the stress upon this point, you make the basis so small that no broad body can be founded upon it. Too much stress has been laid on this as the province of the Senate. The idea of a Senate is broader and higher and stronger than that. The idea is that it shall be a check on the popular body. But not merely that either. Above all, it is supposed to be the repository of the mature wisdom of the country. To this end, that wisdom must somehow or other be placed in the Senate and the body set a little aside from the impetuous currents, it may be the not-too-well directed currents, of popular opinion. It is supposed that in a serener and calmer atmosphere than that of the popular body, men can be more responsive to the true interests of the country than can the popular representatives who sit in this House. This is the conception of the second chamber in every great country that has the bi-cameral system; that is the ideal worked out as circumstances will permit. The object is to have a House in which calmness, sobriety of judgment and mature wisdom are the great characteristics. My right hon. friend may talk as he likes about the Senate being an irresponsible body. The Senate is an absolutely irresponsible body when it is the creation of one man, I care not who that man may be. It may be a most responsible body though not elected by popular vote. When it is representative of the great commercial interest, the great educational interest, the great agricultural interest and other interests of the country and when you have men appointed each of whom feels that his duty to his country lies in placing at the service of the country his own particular excellence the second chamber will legislate more with a view to its responsibility to the people at large and the duty it owes to them than will the chamber made up of those who have to look for the popular support, who have to trim to a certain extent in order to keep even with the thought of their constituencies and who are haunted continually with the fear of going back to engage in the turmoil of a heated election in which they must meet all kinds of opposing currents. A body composed as a Senate should be is in a better position to do high and wise legislation for the country than is even the popular body. This is one of the reasons why I would like to see such a body in this country, and hope that the time may never come when we should not have a body as near like this as possible. But if the senators are for the protection of the rights of the minority in different provinces, how careful the appointer of those senators ought to be that every senator is a genuine representative of the province from which he is supposed to come. If that be so, is my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) altogether without offence in this respect? He shaved very closely if he did not actually infringe upon that which seems to him the fundamental reasons for the appointment of senators—that they should guard the minority rights of the provinces—when, but a year or two ago, he appointed two senators who, though they may have the province as their birthplace, are certainly not so closely identified with it by residence or business as to make them come quite up to the spirit of his own statement. Now, the right hon. gentleman says he thinks that the number of senators is too large. I agree with him entirely in that. The Senate is a very expensive body as is also the House of Commons. And when we say of the Senate or of the House that it is expensive, we are not using an unfair argument, because the matter of dollars and cents must be taken into due account and in the general business of the country it is wise that as little as possible of the people's money be spent in machinery of government, consistent with making that government efficient. Now, I believe that two things would be gained by having a smaller Senate. In the first place, you would spend less money in the machinery of government and so have more money to devote to development, and you would have a more effective legislative and revising body than you otherwise could have. I am entirely in favour of a Senate smaller in number by something like about one-half our Senate to-day. I believe it would be far better, and would make us a better chamber than the one which we now have. However, I do not find very much reason given by my right hon. friend for his mechanical distribution of senators. Now suppose we were to have a certain number of senators from each province—all the provinces equal in this respect. The older provinces would scarcely be satisfied with a smaller number than ten or twelve senators each.

When you come to the fixed, arbitrary number, the pressure would be great to get as large a number as possible. There might be strong hands and strong thoughts which would keep that down to the smallest possible; but the chances are that you would not get off with less than eight or ten to each province. Now what reason is there why a small province should have ten sen-

ators and four members? No one has a more appreciative idea of the worth and value of our little sister down by the sea, the province of Prince Edward Island, than myself; but it would seem something like overloading the business if that province sent up ten senators above here and four members below here. The pyramid would seem to be inverted, it is only a mechanical subterfuge. What was the reason of my right hon. friend? By what reasoning would he support simply a mechanical distribution? I doubt very much indeed, if the United States were re-making their constitution now, they would give little Rhode Island two senators and big New York only two senators. I know that is a grievance which is much discussed in the United States. It did not amount to a disparity of a glaring character at the time the constitution was made, with their small number of states grouped in the east, and about all equal in their populations and in their influence. But the inequality is glaring to-day when, with forty or fifty states, they find two senators in each, without any reference to the greatness, size or population of the different states represented. Any way, I listened in vain to find any reason upon which this remarkable mechanical division could be made. The only reason given was that it would help out the feeling of a province which had a small representation in the House by giving a great representation in the Senate. But I doubt whether that is good reason. However, my right hon. friend has given that as a suggestion, and as such it is necessary to think it over.

I am also in favour of limiting the period of service. It seemed to be raised as an objection by some speakers this afternoon that the state legislatures practically kept old senators in. Yes, and that might be for the very best of reasons. But they always have a recurring choice, the man is not there for life, and he does not feel that he never is again to go before the elective or the appointive body, and with certain classes of men—it would not be so with all men—the fact that they are never to be called to a day of judgment has, well, not a very restrictive force upon them as to what they may do, or how they may do it. A good deal of reason for the inactivity of a body constituted for life may be that there is no thought of their coming face to face with the people whom they serve, of ending their service except death bring it to an end. I would have not more than two terms or three terms of parliament for the life of a senator. Twelve years or ten years is arbitrary, and might not fall in well with the plan of election of senators. But two terms of parliament would be long enough I think for the life of those who are in the Senate. If the appointment remains even as it is, the vicious, bad system of appointment that we have had and still have in this country for

senators, if it remains as it is, it would yet give men outside the chance to breathe when they see an improper appointment made to the Senate, for they would be able to say. Well, thank God, he can only sit there for seven or eight years, then there will be a chance for another choice. So I am in favour, as my right hon. friend and most others I think who have discussed the question, of a limited term.

Much has been said about an irresponsible body. Well responsibility is of various kinds. A member of parliament is a responsible party, because he has been elected and has to go back to the people who elected him. That is one of the elements of responsibility. But I will venture to say no one will contradict me when I state that the best member of parliament is always the man, not who is thinking he has to go back to meet his constituents in four years, but the man who is thinking what are the duties that he undertook when he came here, how he is fulfilling those duties, what are the things the country demands of him, and how can he best fulfil those demands. That, to my mind, is the highest guarantee of responsibility, and you can have that high responsibility in the Senate, even in an appointive Senate, provided the appointment is a proper one. I do not see much force then in that question of responsibility or irresponsibility.

But how do they get there—that is the question. My right hon. friend mentioned several methods, dissenting not very strongly from any, approving of none. After ten or fifteen years he knows no more than any of the rest of us. Well, there is one thing that I do not like. Turn it over from the boss of this parliament to the boss in the local legislature, and still you have the appointments of a boss. In these days when the caucus rules and parliament amounts to little, it is the man at the head who makes the appointment, it is the man at the head who is the appointing power, and who puts the man in the Senate, and the man in the Senate is his creature, to a certain extent, because the other man is the absolute creator. What good would it do in the way of improvement to transfer the appointing power from the head of the House of Commons to the head of a legislature of one of the provinces? It would still be in practice, a one man appointment, and it is the one man appointment that I object to, unless the appointing man is absolutely wise and foreseeing, as a man of that kind ought to be.

But my hon. friend has simply given his whole case away in the two or three sentences with which he closed. I was sorry to see my right hon. friend make that closing. He is simply treating as trivial an immensely important question, as this country understands it, and as this country will make the men who sit here understand it, if not now, before many years—treating an immensely important question as a man

would jolly a set of boon companions. He evacuated his high position, he burlesqued the whole question, he acnowledged the whole vicious weakness of the system, when he said, Yes, my views were good once, straight views, honest views, right views; but when the position changed the principle changed. When I saw my opponent making appointments I said to myself: The appointive system is bad, very bad, it is vicious, very vicious; but when the opportunity came to me and I had to make the appointments, I could not see it in that light. That is the cardinal defect of my right hon. friend. Not only in this matter but in other matters where he has made his public pledges and apparently meant to carry them out; when he got where he had the power to carry them out and felt the claws of party tugging at him in the opposite direction he failed to carry out the right ideas with which he started and the right pledges which he made.

And so to-night, in his few closing sentences, he simply made light of the whole question and excused himself from a great national duty by the persiflage of abdicating a position where he knew what was right, he always maintained it when others had the responsibility, but when the responsibility was put upon himself, although he knew what was right, he did not do it and how could he when the party was tugging at his coat tails ? I say that is not a position I should have advised my right hon. friend to have taken. Who should appoint them ? I say I am opposed to one man power appointment, and the confession, the rather humilating confession of my hon. friend here to-night, confirms me in my opinion. I would fear even if my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) got into power and became the leader of the government that if he had not more backbone and strength than my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) we might hear him saying in this House : I knew what was right, I believed it, I advocated it, I pledged it ; but now I am in office, shall I carry it out or not ? It weakens your faith in the possibility of such a thing being done. I believe myself that my hon. friend would carry out what he to-day believes to be right, and if he pledged it to the people would see that it was done ; but it brings a great quaver into my heart, it sends a tremor of dread through my mind, when the right hon. gentleman who stood so sturdily for the principle of right and advocated it for eighteen years, succumbed, according to the confession he made to-night, simply because he felt he could not stand the party pressure, could not do as he wanted to do. One man power then is a pretty slight reed on which to rely. If it is not to be one man power appointment what is it to be ? Where can we place an appointive power that will be just, that will be always measuring up what is best for the country, not what is best for one party ? That is where the cardinal defect comes in. I venture to say my right hon. friend has not made an appointment to the Senate by simply going into his closet, shutting himself up, taking into account the interests of this country, the best service that could be given to the country, and then, apart altogether from the clacquers or the followers, the men who wanted changes, men who should have been satisfied with the position given them by the people, deliberately, strongly, honestly sought for the best man outside of petty party considerations, and put that man into the Senate. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not do it ; I am not going to say that others who preceded him did it ; but until we have some fair ground for believing that some time a man will arise who will do that, so long I shall have my fears with reference to the appointment of a second chamber by one man, the leader of a party and the instrument of a caucus, for such it has come largely to be at this time.

My hon. friend has made the suggestion, the legislatures. This would amount to about the same thing as one man power. But my hon. friend has a brand new idea and this is really a contribution to the discussion. He rather looks favourably upon this House, this exceedingly calm-minded and non-partisan House, this House composed of men who never think of the exigencies of party, but are always fixing their minds upon the good of their country, and suggests that they shall settle themselves down into a judicial frame of mind some day and elect or appoint the senators. That would be adding another story to the House sure enough. But I think we have about all we can manage now, and to have interjected into all the opportunities for party manœuvring and party management, the struggle for the inmates of the other House, would be the last straw that would break the camel's back, would be the load above which would probably crush the institution below. I do not see how we could ever manage that.

Where in the last analysis will you go? Are you a true democrat or are you not? Does our government rest upon and take its origin from the will of the people or does it not ? It seems to me that in the last analysis you have to cut the Gordian knot of how you will make appointments to the Senate by relying on the good sense, the good temper and good judgment of the people for whom governments are made and who make governments—and I am not afraid to trust them. I would have different constituencies, I would have the term absolute, I would have recurring or transfusing parts of the Senate so that the current would be flowing in fresh from the country every six years or thereabouts, so

that the Senate would be in fair touch with the great lines of public opinion; and then I would leave it to the people to say who the senators should be. They would make mistakes but could they make such mistakes as have been made? I will venture to say the people would not make a translation of a member from the Commons into the Senate; they would fill vacancies when they occurred, but would not make vacancies for the sheer joy and delight of filling them and if you make your constituencies broad enough and give this into the hands of the people, allow them to exercise their choice, I believe the people would come up to the situation and would give you a better Senate than you can get in any other way through party management or appointments by dominant parties, whether in the local or the Dominion legislature. And I would not be very desirous of having these circuits small sets of counties in a province; when each province has its number of electors I would let that province be the electoral division and the larger it was the better it would be, the larger it was the less room there would be for electioneering and all the costs thereof. I do not know but what it would be the very best thing that could happen that your constituency would be so large that it would be impossible to carry on this kind of electioneering that we have in the straightened, narrow and comparatively small constituencies. In some way or other it has in the last analysis to be left, I believe, with the people themselves. No mechanical medium will suit the people better than to have the direct choice of its senators and there is wisdom enough in this country of ours, if we put forth our best energies, to devise a method by which these constituencies can be formed and elections carried on. This would be profitable in the long run to the country. It would cost something to carry on another set of elections, it is true; but if a Senate is worth having it is worth while to pay for wise selection.

It is better to spend a little more money and get a Senate that is an expression of the will of the people than it is to spend less money and get a Senate that is largely the expression of one man or of one party.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Deputy Minister of Labour on Japanese immigration—Mr. Lemieux.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will have a statement to-morrow, as I understand, with respect to the mission of the Postmaster General to Japan, after that what is proposed?

Mr. FOSTER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply; the Public Works estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 21, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—Mr. Power.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—Mr. Worthington.

Bill (No. 76) respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—Mr. C. Marcil.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker as follows:—

GREY:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the address which you have adopted in reply to the speech from the Throne.

Government House,
Ottawa, January 20, 1908.

GRAND TRUNK HOTEL SITE, OTTAWA.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) moved that the House go into committee on Thursday next, to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to confirm the sale and transfer to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada of part of Major's Hill Park, in the city of Ottawa, for the sum of $100,000, and to authorize an agreement to be made with the said company in the terms of an order in council under date of September 26, 1907, and further to authorize payment of the proceeds of such sale, viz.:—the said sum of $100,000 to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, to be applied by them for the purposes of the commission under the instructions and directions of the Governor in Council.

He said: I desire to acquaint the House that His Excellency the Governor General

has been informed of the contents of this resolution and recommends the same to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion passes I would like to ask whether the order in council referred to has been laid on the table of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it has been and it is attached to the motion. The clerk has a certified copy of the order in council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I think it is desirable, before the motion is taken into consideration, that the order in council should be before members for a length of time in order that they may make themselves acquainted with its purport.

Motion agreed to.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when we may expect the detailed information that has been so often asked for in reference to the French treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. It is being printed and in so far as it may be possible to comply with the various requests I think most of the requests will be covered by the return. It is now in the printer's hands.

SUPPLY—JAPANESE IMMIGRATION—MR. LEMIEUX'S MISSION.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). Mr. Speaker, I must crave the indulgence of the House for more than a few minutes, so as to state as fully as possible the result of my mission to Japan. Before doing so, however, I wish to declare most emphatically that none of the reports which have appeared in the press concerning the negotiations themselves, or their result, and which have unfortunately found place in the Canadian press, are accurate. Nothing has transpired of the conferences which were held behind closed doors at the Foreign Office at Tokio, and I am inclined to believe that that very secrecy is perhaps the cause of the onslaught made on the Canadian representative by the correspondent of the associated press of America. I have no apology to offer, nor will I claim any credit for the silence I have kept. I simply did my duty.

The object of my mission to Japan is clearly defined in the report of the committee of the Privy Council on the 12th October, 1907. It reads as follows :

The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier recommends that in view of the recent unfortunate occurrences which have taken place in British Columbia, as a result of the largely increased influx of oriental labourers into that province, and in view of the fact that there has been a treaty of Peace and Commerce between His Majesty the King and the Emperor of Japan since the year 1894 and that Canada became a party to that treaty less than two years ago, the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Postmaster General and Minister of Labour, do proceed immediately to Japan to discuss the situation with His Majesty's ambassador at Tokio and the Japanese authorities, with the object by friendly means of preventing the recurrence of such causes as might disturb the happy relations which have under the said treaty existed between the subjects of His Majesty the King in Canada and elsewhere, and the subjects of His Majesty the Emperor of Japan.

The committee concurring in the foregoing recommendation, submit the same for approval.

The House will notice that I was to discuss the situation with His Majesty's ambassador at Tokio and the Japanese authority ; not with the ambassador of any other country.

Having received the above direction from council, I accordingly left Ottawa on the 23rd October, proceeded to Vancouver, B.C., where I sailed for Japan on the 29th, reaching Yokohama on the 13th November following. Before relating the negotiations which have taken place at Tokio, between the Japanese authorities, the British ambassador and myself, I may state briefly the causes of the anti-Asiatic agitation existing in British Columbia and which culminated in the deplorable riots of Vancouver in the month of September last. For many years past, and beginning with the discovery of the gold mines of Cassiar and Caribou, and later on, with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, what is known as Oriental labour has been gradually imported in British Columbia. Practically, it is the only province in the Dominion where any strong feeling exists against Asiatic immigration, it being the only one where that immigration is settled. The Chinese coolies were the first to come. As long as the construction work of the Canadian Pacific Railway went on, their presence was not considered so objectionable. Labour was scarce, and the speedy construction of the new transcontinental in the mountain section, required a large number of labourers. But soon after the completion of the road, when the coolies left the railway camps to become residents of cities, towns and villages, there to compete in the field of labour connected with various industries, a strong prejudice began to manifest itself, a prejudice more or less apparent wherever the two races, Mongolian and Caucasian, have come into contact in every part of the world.

In 1884, a commission was appointed by the Dominion government consisting of the late Sir J. A. Chapleau then Secretary of

State, Mr. Justice Grey of British Columbia commission, by the late Nicholas Flood Davin, who afterwards became one of the most distinguished members of the House and who prepared the very able report of that commission. That commission was to investigate and report upon the question of Chinese immigration, from its various aspects. As the result of the report of that commission, in 1885, the government of the day introduced a measure imposing a head tax of $50 on every Chinese immigrant. Later on, as the Chinese still came in large numbers, this head tax was doubled. The legislation imposing a head tax of $100 was passed in 1900. As the agitation against Asiatic labour was not abating and as exclusion was demanded, a new commission was appointed by the present government in 1900. I well remember as a younger member of the House in 1900 listening to the speeches delivered on the subject by the British Columbia members, that one of the ablest of these speeches was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Maxwell, then a talented member of parliament. After a thorough investigation, the commission came, as regards Chinese immigrants, to the following conclusions:

> Your commissioners are of opinion that the further immigration of Chinese labourers into Canada ought to be prohibited;
>
> That the most desirable and effective means of attaining this end is by treaty supported by suitable legislation;
>
> That in the meantime and until this can be obtained the capitation tax should be raised to $500.

As a treaty such as the one contemplated by the commissioners could hardly be negotiated with China, parliament increased de novo the capitation tax from $100 to $500. Whilst it cannot be said that this head tax has stopped immigration from China, it has, however, effectually restricted it to such numbers as to cause no more alarm, and to-day there is practically no Chinese question in British Columbia.

Besides, the anti-Asiatic feeling existing in British Columbia is not directed so much against the Chinese population as against the Japanese and the Hindus. This differentiation is due to the fact that the Chinese do not assert a position of equality with the whites. They confine their activities to certain limited menial work, thus avoiding competition with the whites who look after more profitable work. They are generally in demand as domestic servants, laundrymen, cooks, labourers in clearing forest lands, market gardeners, inside workers in canneries, and above ground workers in collieries.

As already stated, the importation of oriental labour into Canada was confined to Chinese coolies. The Japanese immigrants were also coming to British Columbia, but in much smaller numbers. In the last report alluded to (page 399) the commissioners expressed the opinion that as long as the immigration to Canada did not abnormally increase, the imposition of a head tax on the Japanese might be deferred. The commissioners had been made aware of the instructions sent to the local authorities in Japan by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, which reads as follows:—

> Department of Foreign Affairs,
> Tokio, August 2, 1900.
>
> To the governors of the prefectures—
>
> You are hereby instructed to prohibit entirely for the time being the emigration of Japanese labourers for the Dominion of Canada or for the United States.
>
> (Sgd.) VISCOUNT AOKI,
> Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman where that is to be found?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is in the report of the commissioners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have seen it there, but I did not know where they had got it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. After having recommended this policy of the Japanese government as 'most opportune and eliminating all cause of friction and irritation between Canada and Japan,' the commissioners state:

> Nothing further is needed to settle this most difficult question upon a firm basis than some assurance that the action already taken by the government of Japan will not be revoked.

That such an assurance as that suggested by the commissioners was given, at the time, is quite certain. There was, so to speak, between the Japanese authorities and the Dominion government a tacit understanding that the flow of immigration from Japan would be so regulated by the governors of the several prefectures as not to exceed a reasonable figure.

The existence of that understanding is disclosed by the many communications exchanged on this subject between His Imperial Majesty's consul general in Canada, Mr. T. Nossé, and the Prime Minister. I will have to refer at some length to that correspondence, but the outstanding fact remains that the Japanese authorities so regulated the emigration from Japan as to cause no feeling of alarm in the labour market of British Columbia.

It was only after Canada's adherence to the treaty concluded in 1894, between Great Britain and Japan, that the question of Japanese immigration became acute.

But before dealing with the sudden influx of Japanese immigrants in British Columbia, and its consequences, it may be of interest to state here that, until 1894, the only treaties which Japan had concluded with other nations were, owing to peculiar circumstances, one-sided, and considered by many as highly detrimental to the interests

of Japan. The presence in them of provisions about extra territorial rights, tariff rates, &c., had long subjected Japan to serious material disadvantages and to a keen sense of humiliation.

I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to be historical in the statement I have to offer the House this afternoon, but having visited Japan, having seen a little of official Japan, having read a great deal about that country, may I be permitted to state that there are in the history of modern Japan three days which must ever be borne in mind. These three dates are the three landmarks of modern Japan. They are, first, the revolution which restored the emperor to the throne of Japan, after dissensions which lasted during centuries, during which the authority of the emperor had been baffled by the shogunate. That revolution took place forty-five years ago. Then there was the introduction of parliamentary government in 1889, and finally what is now called in Japan the treaty revision of 1894. That treaty revision marks a new era in the history of Japan. Before that time Japan was not considered a great power but placed on the same footing as China by the powers of Europe and America. As I have already stated, the treaties of Japan with the other nations gave foreign nations in Japan, extra territorial rights. Besides, she had been obliged to give humiliating tariff rates, and indeed was subjected to keen indignity. But in 1892, the Japanese government decided that at last Japan should unshackle her bond and revise her treaties with the great powers.

For many years Japan had concentrated her efforts in the problem of what is now known as treaty revision, and every possible obstacle that stood in the way of that great goal was steadily removed. When, in 1892, this long standing affair was taken up, Great Britain was of all the powers the first approached, as she held larger interests than any other in the question. The negotiations bore fruit, and a revised treaty was concluded with Great Britain on July 17, 1894. The other powers followed suit. The revised treaties were put into force on July 17, 1899. Thus, for the first time, Japan gained admittance into the comity of nations on the status of equality.

By Clause XIX of the treaty of 1894 it was made optional with Canada and other British colonies to adhere to the treaty. Article XIX of the treaty reads as fillows:

> The stipulations of the present treaty shall be applicable, so far as the laws permit to all the colonies and foreign possessions of His Britannic Majesty, excepting to those hereinafter named, that is to say, except ten:
>
> India, the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, The Cape, Natal, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia, New Zealand, provided always that the stipulations of the present treaty shall be made applicable to any of the above-named colonies or foreign possessions on whose behalf notice to that effect shall have been given to the Japanese government by Her Britannic Majesty's representative at Tokio, within two years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty.

For various reasons, which I will mention later on, it was only in 1905 that by a minute of council dated September 26, that Canada became a party to the treaty.

This minute of council is based upon a report from the Secretary of State, in which he recommends:

> That a cable despatch be sent to Mr. Lyttelton advising him that the government of Canada is prepared to adhere absolutely and without reserve to the treaty of commerce and navigation made between Great Britain and Japan in 1894 and supplementary convention signed in Tokio in July, 1895.

In view of the expiration of the two years allowed by Article XIX of the treaty of 1894 for the adhesion of British colonies, it became necessary to conclude a special convention so as to give effect to the stipulations of the treaty applicable to the intercourse of commerce and navigation between the empire of Japan and the Dominion of Canada.

The convention was signed at Tokio on January 31, 1906. It came into effect immediately after the exchange of ratifications and, as stipulated:

> It shall remain in force until the expiration of six months from the day on which one of the high contracting parties shall have announced their intention of terminating it.

The treaty was submitted to and sanctioned by parliament during the session of 1907. It will be noticed by the first paragraph of Article 1 of the treaty that the Japanese are unequivocally given the same rights as any British subject in Canada. It reads as follows:

> The subjects of each of the two high contracting parties shall have full liberty to enter, travel or reside in any part of the Dominions and possessions of the other contracting party, and shall enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property.

Before I proceed any further, I wish to answer at once an objection which has been raised by some newspapers. It was stated that the government should have accepted the suggestion made by Mr. Chamberlain several years ago, namely, that Canada might adopt a policy based on the Natal Act. It has also been stated that we should have striven to obtain an arrangement with terms similar to that of Queensland. The National Act would be nothing less than a means of excluding the Japanese from Canada, and I have no hesitation in saying that it would be a most unfriendly act towards Japan. As regards the special arrangement with Queensland, it is contained in the protocol, signed in Tokio, March 16, 1897. In that protocol, Queensland, although adhering to the treaty, reserves her rights

as regards the immigration of labourers and artisans. The treaty can be abrogated on six months notice. I must say that the Foreign Office at Tokio emphatically declare that Queensland has never availed herself of this protocol.

There was one reason why Canada could not at that time have an arrangement such as that of the Queensland protocol. The offer was made to the Canadian government, soon after 1894, to adhere to the treaty. But you will find in the minutes of council the reasons given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and by the Minister of Customs, why Canada could not, especially in 1897, adhere to the treaty with Japan. We had just inaugurated the very wise and popular fiscal policy of the present Minister of Finance, the chief feature of which was the giving of a preference to the mother country. It will be remembered that we had heavy battles to wage in order to obtain the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, under which those nations were to participate in most favoured nation treatment. In the treaty with Japan there was a most favoured nation clause. It was not yet decided whether we could obtain from Great Britain the denunciation of the German and Belgium treaties so as to give full benefit of the preference to the mother country. That being so, we might well hesitate before we enter into any bargain with any other nation.

Now, coming to the merits of the case, let me say that, during my stay in Japan, I inquired whether the provisions of that protocol were still in existence. I was told, not only by the Japanese authorities, but by the British Ambassador at Tokio, that since Queensland had become a member of the Australian commonwealth—Australia having refused to adhere to the treaty—this protocol was a dead letter. Besides, in the correspondence exchanged at the time, between the British minister at Tokio, Sir Ernest Satow and the Minister of Foreign Affairs in England, Lord Salisbury, the former pointed out that, though Japan had temporarily agreed to the protocol with Queensland, yet, at the moment any British colony should exclude the Japanese, Japan would simply give the necessary six months notice and the treaty and the protocol would be at an end. Therefore the objection counts for nothing, for the reasons I have just stated. The policy of this government has always been to let Japan herself regulate and restrict voluntarily the emigration of her subjects; any other policy would not have been successful with that nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I proceed any further let me ask this question: What has been the real cause of the agitation in the province of British Columbia? It is unquestionably the unreserved interpretation of that Article 1 by some enterprising immigration companies, that has of late given rise to the agitation against Japanese immigrants in Canada. This Article 1, in spite of instructions given by the Japanese government, in spite of the assurances supplementing those instructions given to the Canadian government by the Japanese consul in Canada, this Article 1 has been taken advantage of by some enterprising immigration companies operating at Vancouver, in the province of British Columbia, at Tokio in Japan and in the Hawaiian Islands. I stated a moment ago that there was a tacit understanding between the Japanese government and the Canadian government. As a matter of fact, during the years which elapsed from 1900 to 1907, there was hardly any complaint from the province of British Columbia as regards the flow of Japanese immigration. In fact, the Japanese government cannot be charged with bad faith, the Japanese government adhered to their policy of restriction, and respected pledges repeatedly given by their consul. Not only have they sent instructions to their governors, but in order to set at rest the minds of those who believed that they were intending to flood the western coast of America with their subjects, the Japanese government passed a law known in Japan as the law for the protection of immigrants. In his very able report, Mr. Mackenzie King refers to the application of that law. The House will see at once how cautious the Japanese government are as regards the emigration of their subjects.

Mr. J. D. REID. When was this law passed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In 1896. I will read a synopsis, which the members of the House will find on page 4 of Mr. Mackenzie King's report:

> Emigration from Japan is regulated by the general Act which gives the government power to issue instructions from time to time as to the passage of persons who may be permitted to emigrate, and under what conditions this emigration will be allowed. These instructions are issued to the governors of the several préfectures into which Japan is divided. Under this policy, emigration from Japan can take place only with the consent of the government.

I wish to draw attention to this feature of the policy of the Japanese government:

> Under this policy, emigration from Japan can take place only with the consent of the government, which consent is given by the foreign office issuing a passport. Without the permission of the foreign office no one can obtain a passport, and without a passport no one can emigrate. Emigration may take place upon the initiative of individuals desirous of going to another country, or at the instance of emigration companies formed for the purpose of promoting emigration. All emigration companies are under the supervision and control of the government. They are obliged to carry on their business in con-

formity with the Emigration Act and instructions issued by the government, and to give security in the nature of bonds that their duties will be properly discharged and the obligations placed upon them duly met.

The application of the law referred to in this report and known as the Law for the Protection of Emigrants being concomitant, if I may so speak, with the tacit understanding arrived at between this government and the Japanese government, had the desired effect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question at this point? He has referred three times to a tacit understanding. I merely wanted to know what it was and by what means it was arrived at.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A little later on I will refer to the tacit understanding and will give the terms. I was saying that the application of that law, the synopsis of which I have just given, being concomitant with the tacit understanding arrived at between the Canadian government and the Japanese government, had the desired effect. First of all, it prevented any undue inflation of the labour market in British Columbia; secondly, it justified the Dominion government in refusing to give their assent to any drastic legislation adopted by the legislature of British Columbia against the subjects of a friendy power, and, thirdly, it also justified the Prime Minister in using language which I will shortly quote. We all remember that objection was taken by my hon. friend the representative for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) to our adhesion to this treaty. It was a mild objection in this sense, that the hon. member only referred to the possible difficulties and troubles that might arise in the future as regards the large number of Japanese and oriental labourers in the province of British Columbia. The Prime Minister used the following language:

My hon. friend has brought to the attention of the house once more a question which has for many years been the cause of much agitation in British Columbia. There is not only in British Columbia, but in every Anglo-Saxon community quite an aversion to any kind of Asiatic labour. I would, however, observe that so far as Japanese labourers are concerned, my hon. friend will agree that for the last five or six years there has been no Japanese immigration to speak of into British Columbia. Some few years ago when we increased to $500 the poll tax which had been in existence for many years against Chinese immigration, we persistently refused to extend the same prohibition against Japanese immigration. The reason which we gave at that time was that Japan was an ally of Great Britain, and we could not treat the Japanese as we had treated the Chinese population. This was accepted by British Columbia itself, and I may say that our task in that respect was made easy because the Japanese government has restricted the immigration of their own people. At the present time the Japanese government does not allow immigration from its own provinces, with the exception of a very few from each province. I think it is not more than four or five from each province, that is all that the Japanese permit to leave the Empire of Japan, and therefore, practically there has been no emigration to British Columbia from that country.

That was on January 15 of last year. Thus, on the faith of that tacit understanding, and after that statement officially made by the Prime Minister in Parliament—not only hon. gentlemen who sit at your right, Mr. Speaker, but hon. gentlemen who sit on your left—sanctioned unanimously the treaty with Japan. It is in that light that Canada's unreserved and absolute adhesion must be read. Our expectations that Japan would not avail herself of the letter of article 1 of the treaty were, however, disappointed. No sooner had the treaty been passed, no sooner had it been mooted in public that Canada had adhered unreservedly and unconditionally to the treaty than suddenly, for causes which we know too well, the flood-gates were thrown open wide and oriental immigration began to pour into the province of British Columbia. It poured from two different sources, first, from Japan direct, and, second, from the islands of Hawaii. Some of the immigrants came to Victoria and Vancouver as bearers of permits to Canada, some others came with permits for Hawaii only, some others came with permits for the United States only, and many of them came without any permits at all claiming their rights under the treaty.

Let me give this House a few figures. During our fiscal year 1904-5, that is to say, from the first July 1904 to the thirtieth June 1905, three hundred and fifty-four Japanese arrived in Canada. From the first July 1905 to the thirtieth June 1906, one thousand nine hundred and twenty two Japanese arrived. In 1906, the beginning of the fiscal year was changed from July first to April first. In the six months, from the first of July to the thirty-first of December, two thousand two hundred and thirty-three Japanese arrived and from the first of January to the thirty-first of October 1907, eight thousand one hundred and twenty-five Japanese arrived in the Dominion, thus showing an exceptionally large and progressive increase.

Sir, the first question that we must ask ourselves is: Who was responsible for that large influx of labour? I answer without any hesitation that the Japanese government themselves are not responsible for the violation of the understanding existing between the two countries. No charge of bad faith can be made against them. The parties responsible are mentioned in the report prepared by Mr. Mackenzie King and which was distri-

buted to members of this House last night. The parties responsible were the members of an imaginary company existing at Vancouver and having some ramifications in Japan and another firm operating from the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We should get the names of these companies.

Mr LEMIEUX. They are in the report. Speaking again of the responsibility of the Japanese government I wish to impress the House with this fact—I cannot state it too often—that the Japanese government are opposed to any such immigration from Japan. For economic reasons, the Japanese government are not anxious to see their subjects coming in such large numbers to America. We all know that the sphere of influence of Japan to-day in the far east is Korea and Manchuria, and the Japanese government are doing their utmost to channel immigration and colonization towards Korea and Manchuria. Every Japanese subject who comes to Amercia or Canada is a decided loss to the treasury of Japan, and I cannot repeat too strongly, Mr. Speaker, the Japanese government cannot be charged with bad faith. They are not responsible for the large and sudden influx of October last.

I have already explained that the most objectionable oriental labour in British Columbia is not the Chinese labour. The most objectionable and for totally different causes are the Japanese and the Hindoos. It is rather a compliment, as my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) said the other day, to the Japanese to say that they are more objectionable than other oriental labourers in British Columbia, and Mr. Speaker, it is easy to understand the compliment. The Japanese in British Columbia do not confine their activities to menial work.

The strong objection against the Japanese is owing to the fact that they enter into closer competition with white labour than the Chinese. The consensus of opinion is that they are keener competitors against the workingman, as they have more energy and more independence than others. The Japanese are employed in the fisheries and in the lumber industries, and occupations incidental to these, such as boat building and getting out shingle boats, cord wood, &c. They are also employed in the mining industry, on railways, in sealing, as domestic servants, in farming, land clearing and market gardening, and as tailors. Many are also employed as waiters at hotels. Some of them, and not a few, are also engaged in business. As I have already stated, this sudden influx of Japanese immigrants was brought about by the combined action of enterprising emigration companies, who operated at Vancouver and Tokio. By referring to Mr. King's report, the House will see that there was one large company, having headquarters at Vancouver, which, working in conjunction with another firm at Tokio, was engaged in bringing Japanese labourers under contract direct from Japan. Another firm was working at Honolulu, but its work was distinct from that of the Vancouver company. I need not dwell at any length on the modus operandi of these various companies. My deputy minister, Mr. King, in his very able report, shows clearly how their combined efforts at Vancouver, Tokio and Honolulu, brought about the crisis in British Columbia. To prevent the recurrence of such influx in the future, and to revert by friendly means to the understanding which had heretofore existed between Canada and Japan, was the chief object of my mission.

Let me now describe as graphically as possible the state of public opinion in British Columbia. That there is in that province, as well, as in some of the western states of the American Union, a strong prejudice against the Asiatics in general, is too obvious. The increased membership of the Exclusion Leagues at Vancouver, Seattle, San Francisco, the dissemination of anti-Asiatic literature, and the several riots that have taken place during the last few months, clearly indicate the existence of an organization, the influence of which cannot be over-estimated. Whilst it may be argued that the present agitation in British Columbia as the outcome of —on one hand—the greed of employers who import cheap labour, and on the other, the resentment of labour unions, who, as a result, clamour against the lowering of wages, yet it must be borne in mind that the interests at stake in the Asiatic immigration problem are far more serious, far more complex, than the quarrel between the unions and the corporations.

I have already stated that the anti-Asiatic prejudice has always asserted itself wherever Mongolian and Caucasian had come into contact. More especially, in an Anglo-Saxon community like ours, where democratic institutions prevail, the introduction in large numbers of alien races not familiar with our principles of self government, cannot but by itself, be fraught with danger. One must bear in mind that there are now over 25,000 Asiatics in British Columbia, practically all of whom are male adults. There are about 75,000 male adults of the white race in the province. So that, if to-day, every fourth man in that province competing for a living is an Asiatic, are not the reasons for effectual restriction far more compelling than one would at first imagine? These orientals belong to a civilization developed through the centuries, along lines totally and radically different from ours. There is a well nigh impassable gulf between the two. On the other hand, a circumstance which

makes this question still more complex and exceedingly difficult to handle, is the fact that the stream was started by our own people. Otherwise, the orientals would have found no employment in Canada. It is the difference of interests between labour and capital that these races enter in, and it is by virtue of that difference that the tremendous economic weight of their industrial efficiency is brought to bear upon the whole industrial system of British Columbia. It is a truism in political economy that men who can work fourteen and fifteen hours a day, who live with a frugality of which we have no conception, must prove formidable competitors in the field of labour. Be that as it may, the fact remains that British Columbia object to a vast alien colony (exclusive, inscrutable, unassimilative, with fewer wants, and maintaining intact their peculiar customs and characteristics, ideals of home and family life, with neither the wish nor the capacity to amalgamate) which gradually by the mere pressure of number may undermine the very foundations of their province. They have to safeguard the future and the distinctiveness of their race and civilization, and in their passionate and unalterable conviction, they cannot be protected unless the free ingress of orientals is restricted and regulated. As in every Anglo-Saxon community, there exists a deep-seated popular determination to exclude from even the sparsely settled territories, the concentrated masses of the orient.

Such are the economic factors coupled with race antipathy and incompatibility of ideals, that are at the bottom of all agitation against the influx of oriental labour.

There are, Mr. Speaker, two sides to every question. I have dwelt briefly upon the strong racial prejudices that exist against the presence of Asiatic labour in British Columbia, as well as in all white communities, and it is only fair that I should now endeavour to sum up in a few lines the result of my investigation as regards public opinion in Japan on that vexed question. In doing this, I am merely enunciating in the briefest, and perhaps crudest form, such views as were expressed to me, privately and publicly in unofficial circles. Being a proud and sensitive people, the Japanese cannot admit that such racial prejudices will last for ever. Japan, they say, owes her recognition by the nations of the world, to her successful wars and the proof of military and naval power which she has displayed. But, above all, they claim that her new form of government, her educational progress, should be an object lesson to dispassionate and fair-minded observers; that her standards of civilization are on a par with those of western nations. Japan can not, will not and must not be expected to give away the rights which belong to her subjects as units of a nation claiming and deserving to receive at the hands of western countries the consideration that marks their intercourse with one another.

But what they regard as the crux of their grievance against not only Canada, but, even to a greater extent, the United States, is this: America admits immigrants from Europe and refuses or proposes to refuse to admit those from Japan. This, they claim, is not only unfair in itself, but is a flagrant contravention of the treaty in which they are guaranteed equal treatment with that accorded the subjects of all other countries. They cannot well refrain from viewing this as an aspersion on their nationality, and consequently will not be satisfied until this discriminatory treatment is removed. From a purely business point of view, the Japanese naturally deplore that such unfortunate incidents as the Vancouver riots should be allowed to occur, as it is most certainly to be feared that unless they are speedily prevented, the ill-feeling which their countrymen are now constrained to harbour against the people of a single section, may finally have an unhappy effect upon the development of commercial relations between the two countries.

They use another argument which seems to me to be very eloquent indeed. They say that in 1853, when Commodore Perry came to Japan, he invited Japan to open her gates to foreigners, and that she would gain admittance to the comity of civilized nations only on condition that she would have free intercourse with all their people. They say: 'We had many revolutions; we had bloodshed in the streets of Tokio, Kioto, Kobé and Nagasaki. Many refused to admit foreigners, but the central authority, listening to the advice of the western nations, open the gates of Japan. To-day the very people who gave us that timely advice fifty years ago, are refusing to open their own gates to our people.' They say further: 'Japan is a favoured country; we have the broadest form of toleration; our constitution allows any minister of a Christian church to come to Japan and enlist the Japanese people in its ranks. We listen to ministers of the Gospel. We know from what we hear that Christianity is a religion of love and charity. Is it love, is it charity, which is being taught in America against the Japanese? They say all these things, Mr. Speaker, and when one listens to such arguments, one is silent.

Let me now refer, Mr. Speaker, to the understanding which existed between the Canadian government and the Japanese government prior to 1907. Before I proceed to fully acquaint the House with the negotiations which have taken place at Tokio, I wish to refer for a moment to the assurances given by Mr. Nossé, Consul General of Japan, of a voluntary restriction on the part

of his government. These assurances are subsequent to the instructions of the 2nd August, 1900, given by Viscount Aoki, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The letters and telegrams addressed by His Imperial Majesty's Consul General to the Prime Minister, on various occasions, establish beyond the shadow of a doubt the existence of a system of voluntary restriction on the part of Japan. A brief synopsis of Mr. Nossé's correspondence bearing on this point naturally finds its place here.

In a letter dated Montreal, February 3, 1903, Mr. Nossé answers as follows, a query made by the Prime Minister about the number of Japanese who are allowed to emigrate each year :

In answer to your inquiry as to why so large a number of Japanese were allowed to emigrate to Canada during the past year or so, I beg to say that the Japanese government has been restricting for more than the last two years, the issuing of new passports to all intending emigrants to Canada. It is total and absolute restriction, and there is not any limited number allowed for each year as you have stated. The only Japanese who are allowed to leave Japan, under the present system, for Canada are:

1. Those who hold passports and also certificates for the Japanese consul at Vancouver certifying that they are residents in Canada and only returning to Canada.
2. The families of Japanese residents in Canada coming out to join them, upon approval of the Japanese consul at Vancouver.
3. The merchants and students duly qualified.

On the 5th February, 1903, the Prime Minister again made inquiries of Mr. Nossé, to ascertain what regulations are made by his government as to the number of Japanese allowed every year to emigrate from Japan to Canada. He answers as follows, in a letter dated Montreal, February 6, 1903 :

I beg leave to state that prior to the fall of 1900, the number of her passports issued to Japanese emigrants for Canada used to be about fifty per month, but since then the Japanese government have wholly stopped the issuance of new passports to any intending emigrants for Canada, under a provision of the Emigration Protection Law, and no passports are, therefore, issued at present, to the new emigrants, except to the merchants, students and tourists, duly justified. It is, therefore, practically the total restriction, on the part of the Japanese government of the emigration of their people to Canada. The system is most rigidly observed in Japan, as every passenger is examined on board the steamer prior to her departure, and those who are found without passports are ordered back on shore by the police authorities, under the penalty of heavy fine.

On February 2, 1903, Mr. Nosse writes as follows, from Montreal :—

I have the honour of transmitting to you herewith inclosed, the lists of Japanese arrivals in British Columbia for the months of November and December 1902. I beg to call your special attention to the considerable decrease in the arrivals in British Columbia of Japanese who intend to stay there permanently, the proof of the Japanese government strictly observing their policy towards the emigration of their people into this country. I regret to note, however that there was an unsually large number of Japanese arrivals at Vancouver from the Hawaiian islands through the notoriously dishonourable work of an American concern there, but I am glad to say that by the combined efforts on the part of the Japanese consuls at Vancouver and Honolulu, the practice was timely stopped. As you may understand through the newspaper cuttings herein inclosed. I am informed by the Japanese consul at Vancouver that these passengers were ordered to leave British Columbia for the United States, where they originally expected to go, but not to British Columbia.

In the lists referred to in the above letter, it appears that 255 Japanese had arrived at Vancouver and Victoria in November 1902 and 261 in December, 1902.

The next communication from Mr. Nossé to the Prime Minister is in the form of a telegram, dated Montreal, March 30, 1903. It reads as follows :

In answer to my cablegram to the Imperial Japanese government advising them to continue the policy of restricting their people emigrating in any large number into British Columbia. I have received a cable instruction to the effect that I have to give your government the renewed assurance that the Japanese government are not desirous of forcing their people into British Columbia against the wish of the province; and that they are willing to enter into an agreement with your government by which they may bind themselves, if their present policy of rigid restriction is not deemed satisfactory to your government.

(Signed) T. NOSSE,
Consul General of Japan.

In a letter dated Montreal, July 18, 1903, he says :

I have the honour of assuring you once again that the Japanese government is not disposed to issue the passports any more than necessary. Any number of new permits under 200 per annum cannot be said to be very large, considering the fact that in this number not only the wives and children of the old residents, but also merchants and students and even the consul and his family are included.

On the 13th August, 1903, Mr. Nossé transmits a statement showing the number of passports issued by the Japanese government for emigrants to Canada in the years (1901, 1902, 1903) and he adds :

In this table, you will please notice that during last three years, the number of passports issued has not exceeded 200, and not a simple permit was given to an immigrant.

In a letter dated Montreal, March 19, 1904, Mr. Nossé informs the Prime Minister that he has served His Excellency the Gov-

ernor General with an official protest on behalf of his government against the re-enactment of a British Columbia Immigration Act and he adds :

My personal explanations to you at our last interview, I trust, have convinced you that the Japanese government has been faithful to her promises and the people in British Columbia have no real cause for agitation.

He concludes by asking the disallowance of the Act. In his answer of the 21st of the same month, the Prime Minister says :

I told you at our last interview that the government of Japan had fulfilled their engagement towards us, and that on our side, we should act accordingly.

In a letter dated Ottawa, May 9, 1905, Mr. Nossé tenders thanks on behalf of his government for the prompt measures taken by the Dominion government in disallowing British Columbia legislation, and he adds :

Whilst trusting in the Canadian government's justice and good faith, the Japanese government will always adhere to their policy of voluntary restriction on their people emigrating to British Columbia.

Can anything be clearer than these assurances given the Canadian government by the Japanese government through its consul general ?

Now comes another feature. On September the 18th, 1905, six or seven days before this government acceded to the treaty with Japan, which they did by minute of council passed on September the 25th or 26th, 1905, Mr. Nossé wrote to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I must state the circumstances under which that letter was written. The Canadian government had decided to accede to the treaty with Japan, subject however to certain restrictions concerning (1) coastwise navigation, and (2) immigration.

Having learned that such conditions would be asked by the Canadian government, Mr. Nossé wrote a letter in which he stated, amongst other things, that :

The emigration will be always restricted voluntarily by Japan, and I do hope very much that Canada will depend on our good faith and will not try to put any restrictions by right of treaty.

This letter was communicated to council and as it contained an assurance of 'voluntary restriction' and a 'pledge of good faith', the government adhered to the treaty unreservedly.

Mr. GALLIHER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) please give the date of that letter ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That letter was sent on September 18, 1905. The treaty was adhered to by minute of council September 25 or 26, if I remember well.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I ask whether these documents which are being read here have already been laid on the table of the House ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They are all public documents ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not private and confidential ?

Mr. BUREAU. They are only copies.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have already explained that, as the delay of two years, mentioned in article 19 of the treaty, had expired, and this government had adhered to the treaty on September 25, 1905, a special convention was rendered necessary, in order to ratify, so to speak, the position of the government.

Mr. D. ROSS. If the minister will allow me a moment, his dates do not fit in. On September 25th, the telegram was sent by this government asking the imperial government to secure ratification of the treaty. The treaty was not ratified on September 25, 1905.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Duncan Ross) is right. But, at all events, the important point is this—that the letter written by Mr. Nossé containing that unqualified assurance on behalf of his government, and pledging the good faith of the Japanese government was anterior to the minute of council adhering to the treaty. The first minute of council, which was discussed and which was about to be passed when the reservations regarding the coastwise navigation and restriction of immigration, was, perhaps, the minute of council of September 25th. But my point is that this letter was given between that first minute of council and the final minute of council by which Canada adhered to the treaty. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that, beginning with the letter of Viscount Aoki of August 2, 1900, until this last letter of Mr. Nossé, pledging the good faith of his government, the chain of assurances is perfect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask whether the order in council to which the minister has just now alluded containing that exception or restriction has been laid upon the table ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The first minute to which I alluded was not, properly speaking, a minutet of council, because it was just being prepared when Mr. Nossé heard of the reservations which would be made as regards our adherence. This order in council was null and void and the formal order in council was passed later on. The first one was not passed ; it was only a draft.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Whether a draft or not, it is part of the negotiations up to that

time, and, as the minister has alluded to it, it ought to be brought down.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. In what capacity was the letter of September 18th addressed to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) by Mr. Nossé ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He had only one capacity ; he was consul general——

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. No. What I wish to ask is why was the letter addressed to the Minister of Agriculture ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The reason is obvious. The Minister of Agriculture had taken, as he has done ever since, a very deep interest in the commercial relations between Japan and Canada. This was just a year or so after his return from Japan, where he had represented Canada as commissioner at the Osaka exhibition. And Mr. Nossé, being more intimate, probably, with the Minister of Agriculture, addressed himself to him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the draft order in council which has been referred to was based upon some recommendation. Would there be any objection to bringing it down ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The whole correspondence has been carefully brought down. If there is anything my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) desires after he has looked into the matter, he can request the production of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not wish to interrupt the Postmaster General ; but, in the course of his statement he has seen fit to allude to a draft order in council, which, even though not passed, must have been based on some recommendation, and which, up to that time, expressed the views of the government with respect to the proposed adhesion to this treaty and in consequence of which certain communications now relied on came from the consul general of Japan. I should suppose that, in all fairness to the House to which that argument has been dressed, the draft order in council, though not passed, should be brought down.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may tell my hon. friend that whether it was an order in council or only a memorandum, I cannot say positively. I was not then a member of council. But my impression is that the question had been discussed and the adherence of Canada to the treaty was made known to the Japanese Consul, subject, however, to the reservations I have mentioned. I cannot say positively if it was an order in council or a memorandum or a discussion. But, at all events, the letter will show.

Mr. D. ROSS. May I ask if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has that letter ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not it here ; it has been laid on the table. At all events, as I was stating, since August 2, 1900, when Viscount Aoki issued his instructions prohibiting all emigration to Canada until the adhesion of Canada to that treaty, I claim that there ws a perfect chain of assurances that emigration would be restricted and so regulated as to cause no alarm in the province of British Columbia. The investigation made by Mr. King shows that, from January to October, 1907, inclusive—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) leaves the other question, would he be good enough to give us information on one point. It would seem pretty obvious that the draft order in council to which attention has been called must have been communicated to the Japanese consul in some way otherwise he would not have referred to it in a letter to the Prime Minister ; and, for that reason also, I think that memorandum, which obviously formed part of these negotiations, ought to be brought down immediately, before the discussion proceeds. But there is one point on which I expected the hon. gentleman to speak, and he has not spoken. What was the apparent authority—I use that expression advisedly—what was the apparent authority of the consul general of Japan to bind the Japanese government in respect of this matter ? I ask that question because the hon. gentleman has repeated over and over again that every assurance made by the government of Japan has been kept, there has been absolute good faith. Does he included in that these assurances given by Mr. Nossé.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly I do. Mr. Nosse was the consul of Japan in Canada, he was the representative of his government, and surely when he gave the Prime Minister of this country written pledges, written assurances, bearing the crest of the imperial government, the Prime Minister was bound to accept them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am afraid I have not made myself very plain. We all understand of course that he was the representative of the government of Japan in this country for certain purposes, but not for all purposes. He could not make peace or declare war, to give an extreme illustration. What I desire to know is whether a purpose such as this was within the scope of his apparent authority as a representative of the Japanese government ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, that is another question. But surely my hon. friend will not deny that in a country like this, the natural channel between the two governments is the consul general. If my hon. friend will look at the correspondence—I do not know if it is included, it had no reference to the question of immigration—he will see in that on one occasion the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, after the war was declared between Japan and

Russia, sent a memorandum of the Japanese government to the Canadian government through His Imperial Majesty's consul. Therefore, he was the channel, the only channel of communication, between this government and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan. But at all events, this is an academic discussion. Perhaps assurances coming from the Japanese ambassador in London, and through the foreign office in England, might have been more regular; but still we had here the Japanese consul, and when he was offering those assurances to the government, we could not consistently deny his authority and refuse to accept his assurances.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman state if at any time he was asked to exhibit his authority for such an important engagement as that ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There was no necessity of asking him to exhibit his authority, inasmuch as the assurances were kept from 1900 to 1907. There was no occasion to question his authority. The assurances were that the Japanese government would so regulate and so restrict emigration as to cause no influx of Japanese labour into British Columbia. They kept their promises, they lived up to their assurances ; this government therefore had no occasion to question the authority of the Japanese consul.

Mr. BRISTOL. When these representations came from the Japanese government, was a treaty virtually signed by the consul at Montreal ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The treaty was signed at Tokio.

Mr. BRISTOL. One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, the assurances were given, they were lived up to, and the policy of this government in accepting those assurances that had been lived up to was a wise policy.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Did the government of Japan ever repudiate the authority of the consul general in this matter ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am going to refer to that in a moment. I state now that the Japanese government has redeemed in an absolute and complete manner the pledges, the assurances given by Mr. Nossé. In a letter from Mr. Nossé, of January 24, 1904, to the House, this passage occurred, which I will read :

I had the honour of addressing Lord Minto, Governor General, transmitting to His Excellency the highest appreciation of the imperial Japanese government on the action taken by the Canadian government upon the British Columbia legislation. Baron Komura instructed me to convey his sincere thanks to you, and further to express to you his personal appreciation of your good and friendly feeling towards his countrymen in Canada. With this purpose I am going to Ottawa next Monday, and I wish you would be good enough to receive me at your convenience, as I am to stay at the capital for a few days.

So the House can see that Mr. Nossé, the imperial consul, was the natural channel in negotiations between the Japanese government and this government. On that question there can be no doubt whatever.

Now I come to 1907. The investigation made by Mr. King shows that from January to October, inclusive, 1907, 8,125 Japanese immigrants arrived at Vancouver and Victoria, of which number 3,690 went to the United States, leaving a total for Canada of 4,429. Let me now examine how these figures are made up. Of this latter number, 2,779 came from Hawaii, over which the Japanese government claim no jurisdiction and no control, as the Hawaiian islands are American possessions. Then 900 came direct from Japan, brought over by the Canadian Nippon Supply Company through emigration companies in Japan. It is true that passports were given to those immigrants, but I repeat again, no bad faith can be impugned to the Japanese government, because false representations were made to them that the men were really wanted in British Columbia by certain companies, and contracts to that effect were produced.

If you distribute the balance, 741, deducting the returning residents to Canada, and 151 immigrants destined for the United States, you come to the conclusion that the number of Japanese coming into Canada in the ordinary way was 290.

That large immigration, however, alarmed British Columbia, and I was sent to Japan, as I have already stated, to make such representations as would stop in the future any recurrence of these troubles.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. A Japanese emigrant cannot leave Japan without a passport ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Have those who leave for Hawaii passports also?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. From the Japanese government?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. It seems to me, Sir, that if, as a result of my negotiations with the Japanese government, we have succeeded in barring the avenue from Hawaii and if, on the other hand, it is now possible to so restrict the immigration from Japan, as to revert to the order of things existing before 1907, when, on account of special circumstances, the regulations were relaxed, not through the fault of the Japanese government, but through false representations, which were made, as is evident to any one who reads Mr. Mackenzie King's report, my mission might not have been unsuccessful.

It seems to me, Sir, that if I have found

the Japanese government not only willing but anxious to meet the views of the Canadian government so as to stop for ever any large influx of immigrants, and consequently any further agitation in British Columbia by redeeming in the most absolute manner the assurances repeatedly given by their consul between 1900 and 1907 my efforts might not have been in vain.

And, Sir, I claim that this is the result of my mission to Japan. Let me now refer to the negotiations—that is to say in so far as I am authorized to make them public—because one must bear in mind that the question at issue is one affecting not only Canada, but also, as a result of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, the British Empire itself.

Upon my arrival at Tokio, on November 14, I immediately called at the British embassy. Our ambassador, Sir Claude MacDonald, had been instructed by the Foreign Office in London to present my credentials to His Excellency Count Hayashi, Minister of Foreign Affairs, which he had already done. It was agreed that for negotiations both countries would be represented as follows: Japan: by His Excellency Count Hayashi, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Baron Chinda, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Ishii, Director of the Bureau of Commerce; Canada; by His Excellency Sir Claude MacDonald, British ambassador; the Hon. F. O. Lindley, secretary of the British embassy, and Mr. Joseph Pope, Under-Secretary of State for Canada, and myself.

I cannot refrain from stating here at once that Canada owes a debt of gratitude to His Britannic Majesty's ambassador at Tokio. From the early stage of the conferences he took a deep interest in the question itself. Not only did he identify himself with the case, but—a circumstance of the greatest advantage and of far-reaching consequence—he also secured for the Canadian contention the 'full support' of His Majesty's government. He was present at every conference and spared no effort to bring the negotiations to a speedy and successful issue. It is my duty to declare that I received from this experienced diplomat so well versed in all the intricacies and undercurrents of politics in the far east, such aid and counsel as proved invaluable to me. I also received from the Hon. Mr. Lindley and Mr. Pope all the assistance which a long experience and thorough knowledge of the various points at issue could give. Indeed none could have evinced more interest and displayed more intelligence and more loyalty in the discharge of their duties.

From the Japanese authorities, and more especially from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, I am pleased to state that I received the most courteous hearing. In Count Hayashi I found a true friend of Canada and a true friend of Great Britain. He was animated with a sincere desire to reach such an arrangement as would be mutually beneficial and equally honourable to both countries.

The House will easily understand that in dealing with such a delicate problem I am not at liberty to divulge conferences and documents of a confidential nature.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend tell us how he was accredited to the government of Japan? I did not quite understand that part of his explanation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I read the order in council by which I was appointed at the beginning of my remarks this afternoon. I will read it again if my hon. friend desires.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MONK. That is not what I was asking. I was asking how the hon. gentleman was accredited to the government of Japan.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend will read the order in council he will see what my authority was to be there.

Mr. MONK. That is not what I was asking. What did my hon. friend bear as an ambassador accredited from Canada to Japan? In what quality was he there? That is what I am asking.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is rather inquisitive. He has the order in council and he is reading it now. I went to Japan. The Canadian government did what should be done under similar circumstances; the home government in England was informed that I was leaving Canada to discuss this question with the British ambassador; instructions were given by Sir Edward Grey to Sir Claude MacDonald to present my credentials to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Tokio, and, these credentials being presented and I being personally introduced, we began immediately to negotiate the arrangement which I will explain.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but he has not answered the question I put to him. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) during my hon. friend's absence asked my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in what quality the Postmaster General had gone to Japan, and, if I am not mistaken, my right hon. friend could not state, or did not state at that time, exactly what was his character upon that mission. What I am asking my hon. friend is, was he there as the plenipotentiary or had he other powers and from whom did he hold those powers?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman resumes I would like to say that two telegrams which would evidently show that seem to be omitted from the corespondence.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Which telegrams?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Telegrams of the 17th and 22nd of October. Lord Elgin in a despatch of the 30th October refers to two telegrams, one from him of the 17th October and the other from His Excellency the Governor General to Lord Elgin on the 22nd of October, and I do not find either of these in the correspondence.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would like to know whether I was a plenipotentiary or an ambassador. I do not claim any such titles. I was there as the representative of my colleagues, as the representative of the Canadian government; this was a labour issue and I was selected because I happened to be Minister of Labour. But, Sir, although I represented a colony, although I was not wearing the insignia of an ambassador, I am pleased to state, very modestly and very humbly, that I was royally received by the Japanese government; and I may assure my friend from Jacques Cartier, that the British ambassador himself, who is probably the best known diplomat in the far east, did not feel humiliated to associate himself with the simple minister of the Canadian government. I have learned the principles of international law from the lips of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) at Laval University, and I am surprised that my professor should question the power of a Canadian minister to represent his country abroad. It is from the teaching of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that I realized that I had some authority to go officially to Japan especially with an order in council appointing me.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) seems to have difficulty in answering my question, although the question I put seems to me a very simple one. Was he accredited by the British government in some special quality? It seems to me that is not a very complicated question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has forgotten his spectacles this afternoon and he has apparently not read the order in council. Had he read the order in council he would find in what capacity I went there. As to my credentials I have already stated twice that they passed through the proper channel; there has been no revolution in Canada since October last, we are still a self-governing country; the home government in England was advised that Sir Edward Grey was going to Japan to discuss a purely Canadian question, and immediately wired to the British ambassador at Tokio to accredit me at the Foreign Office, which was done.

Now, Sir, I was proceeding to say that in a question so delicate I was not at liberty to divulge the result of conferences and the contents of documents of a confidential nature. The interests involved demand that in a circumstance like this, I should be guarded in any statement I make, lest they should suffer from any indiscretion. After all, this is more than a party issue; it is a national issue. Whilst an ill-timed word might elicit commendation on this side of the ocean, it would, perhaps, have a contrary effect on the other. Remember that public opinion in Japan is as keen, as sensitive as it is here. The Diet of Japan is as instinct as our own parliament to the greatness of its country. Our duty is not to unduly embarrass a friendly government, but to look forward to the results achieved. I will, therefore, ask parliament to trust the representatives of Great Britain and Canada in this matter. First, the written assurance I have received from the Minister of Foreign Affairs that Japan will in the future restrict her emigration to Canada is the best evidence that the new arrangement or accord is now on a satisfactory and permanent basis. It reads as follows:

Tokio, December 23, 1907.

Monsieur le Ministre,—

In reply to your note of even date, I have the honour to state that although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees to Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the imperial goverment to insist upon the complete enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranteed by those stipulations when that would involve disregard of special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

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

Although, as stated in the note under reply, it was not possible for me to acquiesce in all of the proposals made by you on behalf of the Canadian government, I trust that you will find in the statement herein made proof of the earnest desire of the imperial government to promote by every means within their power, the growth and stability of the cordial and mutually beneficial relations which exist between our countries. I venture to believe, also that this desirable result will be found to have been materially advanced by the full exchange of views which has taken place between us, and it gives me special pleasure to acknowledge the obligation under which I have been placed by your frank and considerate explanations regarding the attitude and wishes of your government.

I avail myself, &c., &c.,
(Sgd.) TADASU HAYASHI.

The Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux,
Postmaster General and Minister of Labour for Canada, Tokio.

In this letter, the Minister of Foreign Affairs gives Canada the official assurance that the imperial government have decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration from Japan. I will be asked at once: What are those efficient means, and where is the guarantee of that restriction? My answer is that during the course of our conferences, a series of most stringent regulations accompanied by instructions addressed to the local governors and to the consuls in Canada were adopted. I can assure the House that the British ambassador and myself are satisfied that these regulations are sufficient for our purpose, and that they will be honestly enforced by the Foreign Office at Tokio.

Mr. OWEN. Will the hon. minister tell the House to what extent the Japanese government promised to restrict emigration?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is too inquisitive. I will not answer, not from disrespect for him, but because if I did answer, I would commit an act unworthy of a Canadian representative and unworthy of myself. There is, however, one feature of those regulations which I am authorized to make public. We all know how strongly has been resented in British Columbia the presence in large numbers of Asiatic labour. As Minister of Labour, I was most anxious to decrease the pressure of surplus alien labour in that province. As a result of the negotiations, all emigration of contract labourers, artisans included, is now prohibited—unless they come at the request of the Canadian government. This means that, hereafter, such companies as the Nippon Supply Company, the real cause of the whole trouble last year, will be unable to co-operate with the emigration companies of Japan in sending labour under contract to this country. Of course, bona fide students, merchants and tourists from Japan will, as before, continue to enjoy freedom of entrance into the Dominion.

As regards emigration from the Hawaiian Islands, the question is settled..

Mr. SLOAN. Might I ask on that point if the attention of the hon. minister has been called to a despatch from Vancouver in the Toronto 'Globe' of January 17, in which it is stated: 'Upwards of a hundred Hawaiian Japanese arrived here on Sunday?'

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior sent a telegram the day before yesterday inquiring whether or not that report was true. I also know that he has received a telegram in reply; I have not seen it yet; but I see in the 'Evening Journal' of to-day the following despatch, which may be an answer to my hon. friend's question:

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Victoria, B.C., Jan. 21.—Advices received here per the Australian liner 'Miowera,' from Honolulu, state that the steamer 'Dean of Ruthven,' chartered to carry Japanese from a Hawaiian port to British Columbia, sailed without any of them owing to the attitude of the Canadian immigration department and the increasing difficulties in effecting a landing at this port.

At all events, I may tell my hon. friend, as regards all immigration from the Hawaiian Islands, except tourists, students and merchants, the question is settled for ever. The Japanese government admit that they have no jurisdiction and no control over the emigrants coming from Honolulu to Canada. Our Alien Labour Act provides against the importation of contract labour from the United States. Hawaii is an American possession, and, therefore, our Act applies. If its provisions are not found sufficient to meet all requirements, they can be amended accordingly.

It may not be necessary to amend our Alien Labour Act, in view of a recent order in council prohibiting immigrants from landing or coming into Canada unless they come from the country of their birth, or citizenship by a continuous journey, and on through tickets purchased before leaving the country of their birth or citizenship. This regulation applies to the Atlantic and Pacific ports, and applies indiscriminately to all countries. It will exclude the Hindus coming from Hong Kong and Shanghai. The position of the Japanese government is this: 'We do not wish to impose our people upon countries where they are not wanted, where their presence is liable to draw us into international entanglements, but we object to any discrimination against them; if you treat them as you treat all other immigrants, we shall have no objection.' The order in council passed by this government will in future prevent any Japanese coming from the Hawaiian Islands, because they do not come from the country of their origin or citizenship.

With the avenue from Japan carefully regulated, and the avenue from Hawaii completely closed, I can announce to the country that we have eliminated from this issue any features that could give rise to apprehension of any future trouble in regard to oriental immigration. Besides, we are all aware of the propaganda of certain emigration companies operating in Japan. My deputy minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, points out in his report that such companies are chiefly responsible for the large and sudden increase of contract labourers in British Columbia.

At my last interview with Count Hayashi, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, I called his attention to this fact. He informed me officially and he has authorized me to state before the Canadian parliament, that he had practically suppressed emigration companies in Japan. There were, I think,

seventeen of these companies. The deposit required by the government was increased so much that three of them only have been able to continue, the other fourteen have been suppressed. He stated to a deputation of shareholders in those companies, that in future as between high diplomatic interests and those of emigrants, the latter would yield. The three emigration companies remaining in Japan are especially subsidized to invite emigrants, not to the United States and Canada, but to Manchuria and Korea. In future the companies would be prevented by special regulations from carrying on any work of emigratiotn to Canada and the United States.

I hope I have convinced the House, Sir, that the arrangement concluded with the Japanese government is satisfactory, though I am prevented for state reasons, from unfolding many of its essential details. It is not the first time in the history of parliamentary government that in matters of foreign policy, a minister upon his own responsibility, has withheld from the public such information as he may have judged contrary to the interests of the Crown. The principle has been sanctioned on many occasions in England, and there is a wealth of authorities on the subject.

The House, I feel confident, will accept the assurance given officially by Japan to the British ambassador at Tokio and to His Majesty's government in Canada. A trial of six months—or even less—will be the best proof that this assurance has been given in good faith.

After all, Sir, there are only two alternatives. Canada must either abrogate the treaty or accept the arrangement. Assuming that we would abrogate the treaty, which can be done by giving six months' notice, what would be tne result? The abrogation of the treaty would, in so far as Canada is concerned, result in the loss of important commercial advantages, with a market of 50,000,000 people. Look at the possibilities of our trade with the orient. The question of our wheat trade alone with Japan, where during the last ten years, the consumption has increased by 800 per cent should ever be borne in mind, not to speak of the many other articles which Canada can supply her with, such as oatmeal and oats, lumber and pulp, lead, copper, asbestos, aluminum, leather and hides, butter, cheese, fish, horses, cattle, canned milk, canned fruits, wool, bacon, agricultural implements and machinery of all kinds. We may not as yet, have derived from the treaty such advantages as were anticipated, although our exports to Japan have risen from nothing to the half million dollars mark, in a very short time, but the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the increase of transportation facilities, with cheaper rates than the existing ones, cannot fail, especially in the case of our cereal trade, to be productive of most satisfactory results.

On the other hand, would Canada impose upon the Japanese a poll tax of $500? This is practically exclusion, and it is contrary to our policy, in so far as the Japanese are concerned. It would be resented, and rightly so, as a most unfriendly act by Japan, a great nation which admittedly, during the last half century, has risen to a high level of civilization, and has become one of the world's great powers.

The dignified assurance given by Count Hayashi on behalf of his government, is a solemn engagement which Canada is bound to accept in good faith. The fact that it is given of her own free will, makes it the more binding to Japan.

This question brings us on very delicate ground. Exclusion would mean a serious breach in the treaty of alliance between the mother country and Japan. Can we consistently ask the allies and friends of Great Britain to brand themselves before the whole world, as an inferior race—which they are not? They are, on the contrary, the rising power in the far east.

I have already stated that the revision of the treaties in 1894, had been for Japan, the means of entering the comity of civilized nations on a status of equality. To now recede from that position would arouse her national pride and rekindle with renewed intensity the anti-foreigner's movement in the orient. Indeed, this question is of supreme interest to our allies. No government, no public man in Japan, could attempt, without courting popular anger, to disregard it.

In conclusion, Sir, this arrangement is, in my humble judgment, a fair and honourable one. The Japanese government, I know, are not anxious to encourage the emigration of their labourers where they are not wanted, more especially where their presence is liable to draw their country into international entanglements. The fact that they have already suppressed the emigration companies on the ground that they became a dangerously exasperating factor, shows plainly what course they are determined to take.

Acting in that spirit, and with a view to meet our desires, they will voluntarily take such measures as will prevent any further trouble, thus maintaining the cordial relations which should exist between allies, and restoring peace and order in that fairest of the fair provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) May I venture to congratulate the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, on the very eloquent speech he has just made, and although I was not absolutely able to follow the line of his argument in some instances, no doubt I may be better able to do so when I read his remarks in 'Hansard' later on. I observe that he did not answer

the question which was put to him by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. MacPherson), although he promised to come to that later on. Perhaps before the matter is resumed, he may be able to give the House information on the particular point which was touched by that inquiry. I should like, also, that the missing documents among the files be brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What documents?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One is a despatch of October 17th from Lord Elgin to His Excellency the Governor General, and the other is from His Excellency the Governor General to Lord Elgin, dated October 22. I observe also that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) did not, so far as I was able to follow him, refer to the document mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in his speech of 1903. During the sitting just before the Christmas holidays, that hon. gentleman told us that he had that document in his hands at the time, though he did not produce it or lay it on the table of the House. I think it desirable that this should be before us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What document is it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know. It was not produced. It was referred to by the Minister of Agriculture in 1903, immediately after his return from Japan. The document, as the hon. gentleman stated it, was a written assurance given to him by the Japanese government to the effect that the policy adopted by the Japanese government in the past would be persevered in for the future. No doubt, the Minister of Agriculture can enlighten the Prime Minister on that point. And the Prime Minister himself certainly knows more about it than I do. Then, I venture to suggest that the document alluded to by my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) the minute of council, the terms of which were alluded to, should be brought down that we may know what considerations were before the government when they undertook to engage in this treaty.

In view of the enormous mass of correspondence brought down this afternoon, and in view of the exhaustive report of Mr. King, Deputy Minister of Labour which has only now been laid upon the table of the House, and also in view of the very long statement made by the Postmaster General, I would not propose to dscuss the subject at this juncture. I should prefer to look over this correspondence and read carefully the report which has been made and which has a very important bearing upon the whole subject. And, as I propose, for the present, Mr. Speaker, to introduce another subject to the House. I shall be glad if you will call it six o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the draft minute of council referred to, the Postmaster General was not in the cabinet at the time negotiations were concluded. I am not aware that there was a draft minute of council. There may have been only discussion. If there was a minute, it will be brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not profess to know what it was. I was relying altogether upon the observations of the Postmaster General and upon one letter from the Consul General of Japan which conveyed to my mind the idea that a proposal of some kind had been submitted to him as a basis for a treaty between Great Britain, in right of Canada, and Japan.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Saskatoon Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'the Standard Fire Insurance Company.'—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

Bill (No. 72) respecting Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—Mr. Clarke.

SUPPLY—JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

House resumed on the motion of Mr. Fielding for Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the House took recess at six o'clock, some of my hon. friends from British Columbia spoke to me of their desire to proceed with the debate upon the matter which has been the subject of the remarks of my hon. friend the Postmaster General. I at once announced my readiness to yield the floor to any of those hon. gentlemen in order that they might proceed with the discussion of a subject which is of very great moment to their province, and indeed the whole Dominion, but especially at the present moment to the province of British Columbia. However, coming to me again just now, they asked me as to my own intention of bringing up that matter. I explained to them,

as I have already explained to the House, that on account of the large mass of documents brought down to-day, and on account of the somewhat voluminous character of the report of Mr. Mackenzie King, I did not feel inclined to discuss the subject this evening, but preferred to make myself somewhat better acquainted with the documents to which I have just alluded. But I said to them also that, if possible, I would proceed with the discussion of the subject on Thursday next, and certainly not later than Tuesday next, provided an opportunity were afforded by the House being moved into Committee of Supply. I understand that the dates I have alluded to are satisfactory to the gentlemen from British Columbia. But as I have said before, if that suggestion is not satisfactory I shall be happy indeed to yield the floor and let them proceed with the discussion of the subject at once. The proposal I understand is satisfactory to the hon. gentlemen from that province.

PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another matter I would like to bring to the attention of the House, which is not connected with the subject that has been under discussion this afternoon, but it relates to an incident that has taken place during the present session, I mean the question as to how far the representatives of the people of this country assembled in parliament are entitled to access to original documents connected with the transaction of public business in this country. This is a very suitable occasion to bring that subject to the attention of the House, because all the liberties of the Commons of England, and our own are founded upon this right. All the liberties of the Commons of England were in the first place obtained by their insistance upon the right to refuse supply until grievances were redressed. In the earlier times of the parliamentary history of Great Britain that fact stands out prominently above all others that the rights of the Commons of England not only to the redress of grievances, but their very right to enact the laws of the land, depended upon their firm insistence on their right to withhold supply, unless the laws they demanded were framed and unless the grievances for which they sought relief were redressed. So the old tradition stands to-day not only in the parliament of Great Britain, but in the parliaments of all the self-governing countries in the empire, that upon a motion to go into Committee of Supply you can always discuss grievances, because the redress of grievances must precede the granting of supply to the Crown. This subject to which I propose to devote a few minutes this evening, is one which depends upon certain general principles. So far as those principles are concerned, there cannot be, I am sure, any great difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen in this House. In the great work of Mr. May upon Parliamentary Practice, a work recognized as the standard authority in all English speaking countries having parliamentary institutions, at page 507, of the Tenth Edition, the principle is laid down in these words:

> Parliament is invested with the power of ordering all documents to be laid before it, which are necessary for its information, Each House enjoys this authority separately, not in all cases independently of the Crown. Accounts and papers relating to trade, finance and general local matters, are ordered directly, and are returned in obedience to the order of the House, whence it is issued, but returns of matters connected with the exercise of the royal prerogative are obtained by means of addresses to the Crown.

The practice was in this parliament before 1876, that documents of all kinds were brought down by means of an address to the Crown. Later on that practice was modified, and the rule to-day is that documents of a purely departmental nature are brought down under order of the House, while documents which are technically in the possession of the Crown are brought down by means of an address to His Excellency the Governor General. Then in the first volume of Todd's work on parliamentary government in England, the principle is stated still further:

> It is imperative that parliament should be duly informed of everything that may be necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government in any part of the empire, and the fullest information is communicated by the government to both Houses from time to time, upon all matters of public concern. For it is in parliament that authoritative statements are made, or information it given, by ministers upon public questions and no action in parliament should be based upon declarations of policy made elsewhere.

That refers of course not only to information respecting policy, but it refers also to all proceedings or actions in which the representatives of the people assembled in parliament can have any interest.

Now, the cabinet, as constituted in English speaking countries to-day, may be said to have three distinct functions. In the first place, as members of the Privy Council—a very old institution indeed in Great Britain and an institution which has been in existence in this country from the earliest times—they advise the Crown. As heads of departments created by statute they have the very important function of presiding over those departments and dealing with the expenditure of vast sums of public money. Then, I think they may be said to have a third status, that is to say as, in a sense, a committee of the House of Commons, as members of the

House of Commons constituting the cabinet and being liable to be removed from office whenever they have lost the confidence of the majority of the representatives of the people. In this country they administer the public domain by virtue of a statute passed by this parliament, and it is in connection with the administration of the public domain that the incident to which I have just now alluded had its origin. They administer the public domain and they have power, under the authority conferred upon them by statute, to make grants of the public domain under certain conditions. The incident to which I have alluded arises in connection with the asserted right of a member of this House to have access to certain public documents connected with the grant of a portion of the public domain, and that assertion has gone to this extent that the member in question believes it to be his right—and for that reason he has challenged a vote of this House—not only to have copies of these papers brought down, but, upon his statement as a member of parliament that he believes an inspection of the originals to be essential, he has asked that he be allowed to inspect the originals either in the office of the department, in the presence of the deputy head of that department, or to have these originals brought into this House in order that they may be inspected here.

I understand thoroughly that the rule, or the general principle to which I have called attention this evening, is one that has certain limitations and certain exceptions. Perhaps the two exceptions, or limitations, to which attention may chiefly be called in the discussion of this subject are, in the first place, that documents of a confidential nature may not be disclosed to the House, because, of course it is absolutely clear that in the carrying on of government, especially the government of a great empire like Great Britain and, to a more limited extent, in the carrying on of the government of a great dependency of the empire, such as Canada, there must be documents of a confidential nature and the House should always be willing to accept the words—the assurances—of a minister of the Crown that certain documents are not of a character to be brought down, and that it is not in the public interest that they should be brought down and disclosed to the representatives of the people. Sometimes the reasons are only of a temporary nature, as for example, when negotiations are proceeding and documents which may not be brought down while negotiations of a public character are proceeding may afterwards be brought down without any detriment to the public interest. Then, there is another restriction, another limitation which is that you must not create, by your demand, whether for originals or copies, such inconvenience as would be detrimental to the public service, such inconvenience as would prevent the public service from being carried on in the ordinary and usual way and in the public interest. I am thoroughly prepared to admit this qualification, but I am bound to say that, in so far as the incident to which I have alluded shows, no detriment to the public interest, which is apparent at least to my mind, can be created by the inspection on the part of a member of parliament of a half dozen documents in one of the departments of the government. There is no possible ground of inconvenience that can be put forward as a good answer to that right which has been asserted by one of the members of parliament during the present session. The best proof of that is that the right has not only been asserted, but has been conceded by the government from time to time up to the present session. In the discussions which have taken place in this House it has been asserted that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) was endeavouring to create a new precedent. It is not my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, who is endeavouring to create a new precedent; it is the gentlemen on the treasury benches who are endeavouring to create a new precedent by denying to that hon. gentleman a right, which, up to the present time, has been conceded to him and has been conceded to him without any public inconvenience as far as I am aware. If the argument of inconvenience were a good one, what would follow? It would follow that any committee of this House—the Committee on Public Accounts for example—could not legitimately or regularly call for any original documents to be placed before it, because, if the assumption put forward by ministers of the Crown were correct, the public business of the country could not be carried on because of the temporary absence of certain files from a department of the government. The argument of inconvenience either does not go far enough or it goes too far. If it will absolutely paralyse the Department of the Interior, or any other department of the government, to permit members of parliament to look at certain documents in a file of that department, if it will paralyse the operations of the Department of the Interior, or any other department of the government, to have certain files brought and placed in the custody of the clerk of this House, for twenty-four hours, then, it can equally be said—it might be said with even greater force—that it will paralyse the operations of any department of the government to have their files carried into the Committee on Public Accounts and allowed to remain there day after day. Therefore, that argument will not do as far as this is concerned, and some better answer to what has been asserted as the right of the mem-

bers of this House must be put forward on behalf of the government if they desire us to believe that it is sincerely put forward.

Now, another suggestion has been made and that is that these documents should not be inspected because they relate to title. I am not aware of any principle of parliamentary procedure or practice which would prevent any member of parliament from having access to the original or a copy of any public document because that particular document related to a title to a portion of the public domain granted by the gentlemen upon the treasury benches as trustees for the people of this country. This public domain does not belong to these gentlemen. The public domain which they are administering belongs to the people of the country and no department of the government, administering that public domain as trustees for the people, should have the right to say: We will grant titles of such a character, under such conditions and under such circumstances that we cannot permit and we will not permit the representatives of the people in parliament to see the documents affecting those titles. That cannot be any answer, but if it could be conceived that under any possible circumstances it would be an answer, it certainly cannot be an answer to the demand which has been put forward in this House for this very simple reason that these documents have fulfilled their office as the title has been granted and that title cannot in any way be affected by a perusal of these documents by any member of parliament.

Now, the other chief exception to which I intended to call attention was the rule as to confidential documents. I have already alluded to that briefly. But, surely, it cannot be pretended that any documents relating to a title granted by a minister of the Crown, or by the cabinet as a whole, or by the Department of the Interior, can be of a confidential character. I submit therefore that upon that consideration there is no possible reason whatever why documents of this character should not be brought down, and I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the rule which has been put forward by the government, in the first place by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and acceded to, I regret to say, by my right hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), is absolutely subversive of the public interest, and I trust that it will not be persevered in by the gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches.

It has been said that production of copies is enough, and so it is sometimes, and for the most part it is accepted. But if any member of this House, upon his responsibility as a member sees fit to say that he desires the production of the originals or the inspection of the originals, why should not his motion in that respect be acceded to for the very same reason that his motion is accepted when he demands copies to be laid on the table of the House. It has not been the practice of this House in my experience to demand any special reason from any gentleman in this House who moves for copies of documents connected with the government of the country. The motion is acceded to as a matter of course, and for the same reason, when an hon. member rises in his place and declares that he believes it necessary in the public interest that he should have access to these documents his request should be granted, unless the case can be brought within one of the exceptions of which I have spoken. The suggestion has been made that the production of copies would subserve every possible purpose that can be subserved by the production of the originals. It is only necessary to allude to two or three of a dozen illustrations to show that that reasoning will not hold good. The handwriting may be of the utmost possible importance, the date of the receipt of the document may be of the utmost possible importance, and it did prove of the utmost importance in one case which was discussed in this House either last session or the session before. In that case the stamp of the department, showing the date that a particular document was received in the department proved to the satisfaction of every hon. gentleman in this House that a particular letter which purported to be written in Montana was really written in Ottawa and, that an application for a grant of the public domain made in that case was not really made in the interest of or on behalf of the man who purported to make it, but was made on behalf of another man and another interest altogether. I need not multiply these illustrations; it is necessary to give only two or three to justify any hon. gentleman of this House in coming to this House or going to a department and demanding that as a representative of the people of this country he shall be permitted to inspect the original of that document, a copy of which may have been brought before the House. I admit that you can impose limitations so as to prevent public inconvenience or to prevent the business of the country from being unduly hindered. That is all well enough and to that I take no exception, but I do take exception to a rule laid down by the Department of the Interior or any other department which says that a representative of the people shall not be permitted to inspect an original document and shall not be allowed to have that document laid upon the table of the House. Under these circumstances I beg to move:

That all the words after the word 'that' be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case it

is the undoubted right of the peoples' representatives in parliament assembled to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business; and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have no objection whatever to take to the principles which have been enunciated by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) both in his speech and in his motion; but I want to call his attention to one fact in connection with it. The whole matter arises out of a discussion which took place a few days ago in this House and to which I shall have to advert. No one denies and certainly no one on this side of the House intends to deny, that it is the right of the members of parliament assembled here for the purpose of carrying on the business of the country to be informed of everything that concerns the public interest. No one denies either, that members of parliament have the right to have access to all the records of the government and to all the archives, if they believe that in the public interest they should have such access. Nor do I conceive that this privilege has been denied on the occasion to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say most advisedly that the principle had not been at all denied on the occasion to which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) alludes. Nay, more, this right is exercised daily in the House of Commons. But, in the exercise of this right as in the exercise of every right there are certain rules to be followed. The hon. leader of the opposition, who is a distinguished member of the Bar, knows, perhaps better than any one else that in the enforcement of rights whether in the high court of parliament or the subordinate courts of the realm, certain rules have to be rigidly enforced because a deviation from them would result in confusion and loss, perhaps to the parties themselves. It is a privilege exercised every day in the House that members on one side or the other call for information, but every one knows that demand is made in a manner fixed by the rules of the House, that is, by the government bringing down copies or perhaps extracts. Todd says:

> When copies of correspondence are moved for by private members it is customary to ask for extracts, leaving to ministers the discretion as to despatches which it may be advisable to lay before parliament and as to those which it may be expedient in whole or in part to withhold.

That is to say, a member of the House has the right to ask for information and this information is conveyed in the form of copies of the documents, and sometimes it may be advisable to bring down the whole record and sometimes extracts only should be brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is with respect to documents, portions of which may be confidential.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not qualify, but I will even accept the qualification, at all events some reliance has to be placed on the discretion of the Crown as to whether entire copies or only extracts shall be brought down. But the point I want to come at is, that as a rule the information which a member desires is conveyed to him by the copies of the documents which are on record. I can see very well that there would be occasions where a member, for good and sufficient reason, may think that the information he is seeking would best be obtained by viewing the originals and not the copies. But as a matter of fact, ninety-nine times out of a hundred the object of the member asking for this information is served by producing copies. But there may be other occasions where, perhaps, for reasons which are known to himself, and which I would not question, and which he can state to the House, a member may think that the copies would not give him the information which the originals would. So far so good, and if he so states, it seems to me that he is entitled to have the originals. But what was the position taken the other day and again to night by our hon. friends opposite? It is that a member of the House, in asking for information which he is entitled to demand from the government, and which parliament ought to force the government to bring down, he can ask indifferently for originals or copies as he chooses. I ask my hon. friend if this is a reasonable interpretation of the rule. The rule is to produce a copy, but the position taken by my hon. friends was that a member, without giving any reason at all, could ask for either the original or a copy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But if he gives a reason is he not entitled to the original?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then the demand ought to be complied with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the right hon. gentleman like me to answer him at once?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suggested, in an endeavour to make the matter plain, that there is really no difference in his position with regard to the one or the other. The copy may be denied him if he makes an oppressive demand; the original may be denied him if he makes an oppressive demand. But the rule with regard to the original is exactly the same as with regard

to the copy; it depends on his stating in the House by his motion as a member of parliament that he desires that information in the public interest.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I deny that proposition. The rule of the House is that he can have the information and the invariable custom and practice of the House is that he shall have it by means of copies. First of all, the House itself is to judge whether or not the information is to be supplied to him. On this point I quote Bourinot, at page 371 of the last edition:

> It is clearly laid down by the most eminent of English parliamentarians that it is incumbent upon the mover to state the reasons upon which his motion is founded, that the House may judge of the necessity, importance and expediency of calling for the papers which are the subject of that motion.

As a rule, when a motion for papers is made we do not challenge the motive of the member making it, but if the motion is challenged, and we say there is no good reason for bringing down the papers, then it is for the member to give reasons which will satisfy the House. I will quote also from Todd on the same point:

> It is the rule of parliament that no papers shall be laid on the table of either House unless some sufficient reasons have been stated for their production. It is irregular to move for the production of papers merely to further the interests or views of private persons, or except for the purpose of founding or facilitating parliamentary proceedings. Government have refused to grant papers unless it be intended to found some proceedings upon them.

For my part I would not go so far as the authorities. This is a democratic age and the rights of democracies are perhaps more extensive now than they were at the time that rule was made. For my part, the moment a member gives a good reason for the production of papers, the production of the papers shall take place. But the rule of parliament is sufficiently served if copies of the archives of the government are brought to the House. The matter is not very important, and I think we ought to be able to agree, as men of common sense, as to what is a fair interpretation of the rule of parliament on this point. I agree that hon. gentlemen opposite, as representatives of the people, are entitled to full information in order properly to discharge their duties. But let me call attention to the rule just now laid down by my hon. friend, not in his motion, but as a deduction from it. We have up to the present time already granted some 75 or 80 motions for papers. Now, if it be the privilege and the right of every member when he moves for papers to insist on having not the copies but the originals, we should have laid upon the table of this House at this moment 75 or 80 files of the archives of the government. Does anybody conceive that that is a reasonable interpretation?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never stated any such rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, my hon. friend never stated any such rule, but he stated that whenever a member of parliament asked for information it was his right, without giving any reason, to ask either for originals or copies. If that is his right, he can insist upon it, and we might have, without any rhyme or reason, 75 or 80 of the files of the departments at the present time on the table of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my right hon. friend will permit me, I said that even a demand for copies might be so oppressive that the government of the day would be justified in resisting it. I conceded that at once, but I said that it seemed to me that the same principle applied to originals as to copies. You grant copies on the statement of a member on his responsibility as a member; you should also grant access to originals, within certain limitations, for the same reason.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well. I will take my hon. friend's statement. He says that on some occasions it would be the privilege of the government to resist such a request for papers. How are we to judge whether a request ought to be resisted or not if a reason is not given for it? This justifies the rule which I have quoted from Todd and Bourinot, that a reason must be given before a demand is made.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg pardon. The reason may be given after the order is made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend will have to revise his memory. In the ordinary discharge of business we do not ask for the application of this rule, but the papers are granted as soon as the motion for them is made. But if the hon. gentleman makes a motion of that kind and has good reasons for making it, he should give his reasons at once so that the House may judge on the necessity or expediency of granting the motion. Coming to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), he has taken a more rational view of the case than my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart). The leader of the opposition admitted that there may be circumstances in which such a demand might be oppressive. That admission shows that reasons must be given for the demand. My hon. friend puts on the same parallel the production of originals, but there may be occasions when a demand for the production of an original would be oppressive and when therefore it would be proper not to accede to it. What was the position which we took the other day? It was this. We said, show us

some reason, if you have any, why the originals called for should be brought down. Was that the position taken by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames)? Let me quote the language of my hon. friend, and if I refer to a past debate, I ask the permission of the House before doing so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is what my hon. friend said :

> We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must plead very good reasons to justify it in refusing access to such papers.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But my hon. friend is reversing the position. He makes a motion without giving reasons, and contends that it is for the government to show reasons why the papers asked for should not be produced. Well, I submit that he should have stated his reasons for the production of these papers. If he had stated them, his demand would have been complied with at once. But he made this a test case, and he drafted this motion purely and simply to test whether or not hon. members have the right to insist on the production of originals——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not all the originals—nine out of ten.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test whether or not hon. gentlemen are entitled to obtain originals without giving any reasons for their demand. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) may have had good reasons for his request. That I am not denying, and if he had said we ask for those papers because we have good reasons for looking at the originals, his demand would have been complied with at once. But that was not the point of view he took. The point of view he took, in bringing this motion, was to make it a test case in order to decide whether, without giving any reason, he is entitled to the production of the originals. I say that he is wrong, and that is why his motion was refused the other day.

I now come to the motion of my hon. friend which reads as follows :

> Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right of the peoples' representatives, in parliament assembled, to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government, and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business; and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

I have not a word of exception to that motion. It meets my views. It states a truism ; but in the application of this truth, I simply go back to the position taken by the authorities and by my hon. friend himself, namely, that in the exercise of this right an oppressive demand might be made which the government would have the right to refuse. That being the case, it is necessary that the reasons for the demand should be given. If my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) or any other member should ask for the original papers and give good reasons for his request, certainly his demand will be immediately complied with. But when he says that without any reasons whatever he claims the right to have the archives of the government brought down and laid on the table, I do not agree with him. For the reasons I have given I have no objection in agreeing to the motion of my hon. friend.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) gets down out of a tight place quicker than he crawls up to a good one. This is about the most remarkable exhibition of agility I have ever seen. The right hon. gentleman saw fit to ignore every thing that preceded the absolutely tyrannical refusal made the other day in this House, and which was initiated before the other day in the hon. gentleman's department in which the question arose. This case has a history. A year ago or less, when a member on this side wished to look at original documents in a department, when he wished, for instance, to examine some part of a file, he could call for the papers to be brought down and then the minister of the department in question would have to put the department to the expense and trouble of having those copied. But frequently, as a matter of courtesy, the minister would inform him that as there might be certain papers in the file which he did not require, he could come to the department and look through the files and find out what papers it was necessary he should have, and thus save the inconvenience and expense of having copies made of those which were not necessary to him. That practice is well known to all members of the House. Again instead of asking for the papers to be brought down, an hon. member would mention that there was certain information he desired, and invariably the minister would be kind enough to ask the hon. member to come to his department and look over the papers and thereby perhaps do away with the necessity of having copies made of any part of the file. Up to a few months ago, that course of procedure was invariably followed. But then my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver)—I do not know for what reason, and I am not aware that the door of his department was ever strongly barred or bolted or bang-

ed in the face of members of his own political persuasion—took a crotchety opinion into his brain, as he sometimes does, and decided to become an autocrat in his own department. He forgot that he was simply the hired man, the paid servant of the people, and supposed that he bossed the whole job or owned it. Therefore he came to the conclusion that he would entrench himself behind some authority, which he supposed to be good, and issue his ukase. He deposited himself upon the broad bulk of his deputy minister, and his deputy minister, after sundry labourings, brought forth a document which was to serve as a basis for all after action. There were no 'ifs' or 'buts' in the document prepared by his deputy. Mr. Cory reasoned out the whole matter as his minister wished him to do. He came exactly to the conclusion that his minister desired, and that conclusion was absolute. He recommended to his minister that, in all case the copies alone should be given and that the originals should not be allowed to pass out of the possession of the department. The deputy came to that conclusion and made that report after my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) had asked in the motion first put by him before the House, for the originals of the applications which he wanted and wanted for a very good purpose. That, then, is the precedent history. The hon. member for St. Antoine, having been used to the courtesies of the department in other years, expected to be treated in the same way this year. But he received a letter from the Minister of the Interior that he, the minister, had made a new rule in the department, the new rule being that no member of parliament should be allowed to examine the original files in his department. Now, that was a rule absolute—no reason given, no discussion, no discretion allowed. Under this rule, the masters of the situation became subservient to the servant in the situation.

But there is more. Never until this session have I known any serious attempt made to prevent the members of the Committee on Public Accounts from having opportunity to peruse at their leisure the papers brought before the committee. Original documents brought before the committee were always left where they could be examined by the members. But we had not been assembled in the Public Accounts five minutes this year when notice was served upon us that the latitude of previous years would not be continued, and that we were not to be allowed to peruse original documents as before. More than one minister gave it to be understood that these documents were necessary in his department, and could not be given out, because they might be lost, causing inconvenience to the department. Further, a minister, new in his department issued instructions to his officer: If the Public Accounts Committee call for documents, I will deliver the documents into your charge; take them to the committee; whilst the committee is in session, these documents may be inspected, but as soon as the committee disperses, bring back these documents to the department. I need not tell the right hon. leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that under that procedure no business can be done by the Public Accounts Committee. These documents are bulky, in many cases, and it takes hours and hours of quiet, of study, of assiduous attention, to cull from them what you need for the examination of witnesses. I have stated what actually happened in the committee. The matter was brought up in this House, I believe, and the Prime Minister caused his minister to climb down, so far as this matter was concerned. He did not give his ultimate decision, but he declared that it should be the rule hereafter—and he might have added that it has always been the rule hitherto—that these original documents were to be left in the charge of the clerk of the Commons. Then this other matter supervened. My right hon. friend must recollect the position in which members of the opposition are. They are thwarted in every move they make towards free investigation. The leader of the House and his party made it a chief plank in their platform that the parliament of Canada has an inalienable right to the utmost freedom of investigation of charges made, and of examining into public business. And they moved vote after vote of censure upon us when we were on that side of the House, because, they said, we would not give them the facilities for this free examination of public documents. So the opposition, headed off at every turn in this House and in the committee, must stand firm; it must not allow any of the rights sanctioned by custom, even of recent times, to be taken away; otherwise their function disappears, their usefulness is gone. These antecedent and concomitant circumstances must be taken into account in discussing this question.

Now, as to the point that there was no reason given for the production of these original documents. In the first place both speeches of the hon. member for St. Antoine give reasons. Moreover every hon. gentleman on this side who spoke cited one or more examples to show that it would have been impossible to gain required information had not original documents been supplied. They also cited features of almost any set of papers which could not be fully understood except by viewing the originals—memoranda upon the documents, dates, signatures and so on. Every man who has examined evidence knows that, very often, if these cannot be seen, you cannot get at the facts. But I want to remind my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of one most specific state-

ment made by the hon. member for St. Antoine. That hon. gentleman came down to particulars. I would like the right hon. gentleman to listen to this :

It is my right in the House to ask this information to be placed where I can see it, and in due time I will give all the information I have with reference to these limits in a form that will quite satisfy the Minister of the Interior. Here is the return we have been speaking about.

This motion was founded upon a certain return asked for. My right hon. friend goes into an analysis of the reasons why, in this specific instance, a refusal was given :

Here is the return we have been speaking about; it contains 453 pages. I have read that return from cover to cover. Now, there are nine pages of that return which can be illumined if I may see the originals. As to all the other pages the copies are all I want. But there are nine pages there with respect to which the copy does not tell me all I want to know or which I have the right to know if I understand my rights in this House of Commons.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend say that these nine pages differ from the originals?

Now you see the whole purpose of the Minister of the Interior. And the Prime Minister and every other hon. gentleman who spoke on that side laid down the dictum : Make your complaint, swear to it and we will take into consideration whether we will let you have the original documents or not. This is all implied in the question of the Minister of the Interior : Does my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) say that these nine pages differ from the original.

Mr. OLIVER. He could not and tell the truth.

Mr. FOSTER. So, neither by the courtesy of the Minister of the Interior nor by the will of this House, was he allowed to have a look at these originals.

An hon. MEMBER. Did you hear what the minister said ?

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to repeat what he said.

Mr. OLIVER. I said he could not say they were different and tell the truth.

Mr. FOSTER. He could not say that they differed and tell the truth. The member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) tells the truth and does not lie, and the minister simply gives him a chance to get these original documents by forcing him to lie in this House. Let him tell me, says the minister, that the originals and the copies are different, and he shall have the originals, and if he gets up and says he could not if he were truthful say they were not, he would not get them. Therefore my hon. friend from St. Antoine has to give a lie in this House in order to get original papers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could he tell unless he sees the originals?

Mr. AMES. I say that these nine pages will in all probability clear up certain doubts which I have regarding peculiar events in connection with some of these transactions, and I say that the handwriting of some of these nine pages may have a very important bearing on the case.

My hon. friend goes into particulars, he gives the only reason he can possibly give, being a truthful man. He cannot swear to it before this House; or pledge his word that the original differs from the copies. But he has made an investigation into these 450 pages, the atmosphere of that transaction invites him; he gets, as every man gets in the examination of a file of papers, into the spirit of the transaction, and to a certain extent into the mind, and wish, and development, and trend of the men who are making applications and are following out the business. That inevitably takes place, and after having devoted that time to it he says, I see things in those nine pages which lead me to believe that if I had the originals I could clear up for myself doubts which I now have. Could there be a more reasonable reason given?

I say that the handwriting of some of those nine pages may have a very important bearing on the case.

So it might. Applications for timber leases, for grazing leases are made by different persons; in the copies that come down there is not the handwriting of the different persons, it is simply a typewritten copy. I have looked over those papers myself, and I know exactly the point of view of the member for St. Antoine, and I agree with him in saying that he is absolutely at sea unless he can see those applications and see the handwriting upon those original applications with reference to the matter, and maybe some other things in connection therewith. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) made an argument to the effect that a man's title to his timber limits might be involved. Now, my right hon. friend will see the insufficient case upon which the Minister of the Interior and himself refused to the House the information that the member for St. Antoine wished. Not a state reason, those were not state papers; yet one of his humble followers based his whole argument, as denying this motion, because these might be state papers. They were not state papers.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. My argument, if the hon. gentleman will read my whole statement, was to this effect, that original papers had been laid on the table of the House and had disappeared, and there was no good reason why they should not disappear again, and as they were appertaining to titles of people who were doing business with the Interior Department, that was a very good reason why the original

papers should remain in the custody of the department who was responsible for them and not laid on the table of the House where they might disappear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's reasoning is not good. In the first place, is it possible or impossible for a paper to disappear in a department? Did that ever occur?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, my hon. friend has not had much experience in administering departments; I have had some, and I have known papers to disappear, and I think there are few ministers in this House that have not known papers to disappear. The Minister of Justice himself came into this House no later than last year and had to explain rather an intricate case by declaring that those papers some how or other had got mislaid and he could not get them, and therefore his answer was incorrect. Papers do get mislaid in the departments. What would my hon. friend think if I made a motion in this House that all the papers should be taken out of the Department of the Minister of Justice simply because in some way a paper had disappeared? But the disappearance of a paper is not the essential thing. Let the Minister of the Interior, let the clerk of the House, let the clerk of the committee, take any means that are reasonable to protect the papers. That is what they have to do. The main thing is to get the information; the responsibility for guiding the sources of information and there guiding them back again to the proper repository is for the minister to see to. It is no reason to say that because a paper may disappear you should not have the information. Where would we be on an assumption of that kind? Again, I take exception to my hon. friend's argument in this respect. The title of a man to a coal lease or a grazing lease might hang upon these. Might hang upon an absolutely closed and settled set of applications. That is all this means. These are applications, they are dead papers; that is, they are dead in so far as they have lived out their usefulness. The claims of a dozen applicants, we will say, have been submitted, a decision has been made, the successful applicant has been singled out and the proper title has gone to the successful applicant.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Does the hon. gentleman know that in this instance the title has gone to the successful applicant?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a two-year old concern.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Well, I do not know anything about it; I do not know the particular application. As I understand these regulations, the applicant does not get his title until he completes his survey of that particular timber limit. My point is that when he has not got his perfected title to this timber limit, all that he has to show that he has any claim to it at all are the papers in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will undertake to say that if my hon. friend looks into the departmental file of those applications as they lie there to-day and are passed upon perhaps he will find that no title is dependent on those papers. So the particular circumstance upon which the minister has chosen to fight out this question—and the right hon. gentleman took occasion to back him up very strongly—is the weakest case there could possibly be. Not a state paper; not something which is in progress, the bringing down of which might militate against the interests of the parties involved, as for instance, when tenders are in, and a member of the House should ask for those before they had been passed upon and the award had been made. Those going things, public documents, international papers and the like of that, those are papers of which I am quite willing to admit the greatest care should be taken, and if an imprudent member like myself were to ask for them in the course of their progress, before they were in a position to have been passed, relating to unsettled affairs, then I should consider the House was perfectly right if it felt indisposed to give them. In England that has been done over and over again. Just the other day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when asked for a set of papers by motion, said, Well, they have not yet filled their course; they are matters of still unsettled correspondence between ourselves and the home government and I cannot bring them down. Nobody made any objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend contend that a member of the House, entitled to full information, can ask indifferently for originals or copies without giving any reason at all? Is that his contention?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, two cannot stand at once. I will wait until my right hon. friend gets down. My right hon. friend asks me whether I think a member can simply ask for these papers without giving any reason at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For originals or copies?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that never took place. I will just leave that for a moment until I refer to what my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) says:

In the first place——

My hon. friend says referring to the matter of papers being lost:

—the minister can take any precaution he likes to see that these papers when they are laid before this House are properly safeguarded.

In fact my hon. friend said: Let me go and look at them; you may bring in the whole Dominion police, you may stand them all around me, you may have a whole cordon of these policemen around me—I do not care how many—all I want to see are these nine pages; put all your artillery and infantry of watchfulness at work, but just simply let me look at these papers in your office. No, Sir; the door is to be closed and no member of parliament is to come into my department and see any of the papers of the country in which he is a business partner! That was where the first trouble arose and my right hon. friend, before he got up in the House and said: I fully endorse the position taken by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior—should have acquainted himself a little more as to the position that the minister took, and if he had done so I do not think he would have made such a statement.

Ten minutes will suffice me to look through them.

A pretty reasonable thing for a member of parliament who wants to see papers! After detailing all the things that he has detailed, why he wants them, he goes on to say that he does not desire to cause the department any inconvenience:

Ten minutes will suffice me to look them through; he can have them back in ten minutes in his department if he wants them. What I am asking for is not the original lease which has been passed between the various owners of these timber limits and the government; that is the official document in which the rights of the lessees have been set forth. What I am asking for are three applications made for timber limits and six tenders in connection with timber limits, in all nine documents, nine pages. Is that a very enormous amount of work for the department to produce these nine pages?

The inconvenience is there reduced to a minimum. If the wheels of the Department of the Interior had been stopped for five minutes it would have been a very short time and would have caused very little inconvenience. The argument of inconvenience as it is there is at the worst for my right hon. friend and at the best for my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, because if anything it only involves five minutes of inconvenience. My hon. friend says simply: Let me in, put the documents on the table, let me have five minutes at them, surround them by all the safeguards and then take them back to the minister of the department. Then my hon. friend continues:

Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle that when we on this side of the House have what we consider good and sufficient reason we may have the right to see an original document, or else, be prepared to take the odium throughout the country that you do not wish an original document to come to light.

Did not the position taken by my hon. friend fulfil every condition that the right hon. leader of the government laid down here this night? And yet, in the most curt, arbitrary manner the Minister of the Interior, the right hon. leader of the government himself, and every man who stood up to fight the opposition on that request of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, refused it, and refused it, as I have said, with scant courtesy. Now, the right hon. leader of the government has had a little time to grow cool. I hope it will be a lesson for the Minister of the Interior and also a lesson for himself. But, the Minister of the Interior must learn, as he ought to have learned from the lessons which have been administered to him in this House, that he is not the autocrat of the House and that he is not the autocrat of the department in so far as to keep the partners in the country's business out of his office, and the right hon. leader of the House, if I may advise him, would learn wisdom if he would not take it for granted that all his ministers are as wise as himself. He has saved the situation to-night, and I think he deserves the thanks of the House, and of you, Mr. Speaker, for that. He climbed, not as gracefully as I have seen him do other evolutions in the House, but still he climbed down.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I would like to take exception, in so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned at any rate, to the very definite statement made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in the early part of his remarks that every endeavour was made to prevent the opposition from getting information. Since I have had the honour of having charge of the Department of the Interior, the members of the House will bear me out in saying—their remembrance will be the same as mine—that never in the history of parliament has there been such a demand for information from the Department of the Interior, or any other department of the government, and never has that demand been acceded to as fully and as readily and with as little question. My hon. friends on the other side of the House absolutely tied up the business of the Interior Department during the session before last until I had to place the facts before the House and put upon them the responsibility for the fact that the business of the country could not be properly carried on through that department. I say that my hon. friend is not warranted in any degree

in that statement in so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, a fact that must necessarily have been within his knowledge from his long parliamentary experience. I repeat that never in the history of the country has there been a demand upon a single department for information such as had been made upon the Department of the Interior during this and the past two sessions, and never has the demand been acceded to as readily and as fully.

In regard to the matter in question, or which is stated by my hon. friend to be the matter in question, that is, the right of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, to inspect original documents on the files of the department, my hon. friend no doubt changed his point of view when he changed his seat in the House. I understand that the business appertaining to the Department of the Interior is placed under my control as a trust to be discharged in the interest of the people of the country. That while it is the right of parliament to have all information in connection with that department it is only the right of parliament to have that information, and it is my understanding of the trust placed upon me that it is not the right of any individual, whether he be a member of parliament or not, to have access to the documents in that department. As I understand the trust placed upon me, in discharging the business of the people—the people who are behind members of parliament and who send them here—it is that documents placed in that department, the property of the people, or representing the property of the people, shall be duly and properly cared for. If parliament sees fit to issue an order, parliament is supreme. Parliament can turn the Department of the Interior inside out if it pleases, but it is not the privilege of an individual member of parliament to do so, I submit. If I am instructed to the contrary, well and good, I will accept the instruction. But in so far as I understand my duties and responsibilities, they are to carefully guard and care for every paper and every interest that is in that department, and the fact that a certain gentleman has been honoured with a seat in this parliament does not give him any more right to investigate the private business of other people which is in charge of the Department of the Interior, than it does any other citizen.

Mr. LAKE. If this resolution is passed by the House, does the minister still intend to refuse to members of parliament the privilege of looking at the files in this department.

Mr. OLIVER. Unless otherwise instructed by the House I certainly do. I do not accept this resolution as instruction on that point. If the House so instructs me then the responsibility is taken off my shoulders and I care not. But so long as the responsibility rests on my shoulders I feed bound to discharge that responsibility according to my conscience.

Mr. BRISTOL. I would ask the minister if it has not been customary in his department for a long time past, to allow members of parliament to examine original documents, just as Mr. Ames said he was allowed to examine the Galway-Brown papers ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BRISTOL. Was it done without your knowledge in the department ? When did you first learn that your officers had been accustomed to show original documents in that way ?

Mr. OLIVER. I never learned they were accustomed to show original documents in that way. If they have been accustomed to do, as I will take occasion to show, it was contrary to my orders and contrary to the orders given before I entered the department.

Mr. BRISTOL. I understood from statements made here that it was quite customary to do so formerly.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has a misunderstanding in that connection as he has in many others.

Mr. BRISTOL. Never mind the others, I am speaking about this one now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the minister say there are no files out of the department now.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say. They are not out with my knowledge. Will the hon. gentleman say there are files out of the department ?

Mr. FOSTER. How about that sacred trust of yours if they are going out without your knowledge.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the leader of the opposition say there are files out ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know it but I have heard it on good authority.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be glad to have the information more accurately.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You had better go and find out.

Mr. OLIVER. I say I don't believe there are.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did not the minister invite members from this side of the House to go over to his department last session and the session before, to inspect original documents ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not. But in the case mentioned by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) there was a question raised before the House as to the correctness

of a return and in order to facilitate business, in order to assist in clearing up any doubt or question there might be in that direction, permission was given to the member to look over the originals.

Mr. J. D. REID. That were in your department.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, as a matter of courtesy and for the purpose of facilitating the business.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is the very point we are raising now.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely, but that was an exception and not as a rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Any more exceptions besides that ?

Mr. OLIVER. There may have been other exceptions but I will take occasion to show that they were exceptions and not the rule. I think my hon. friend will agree, before I am through, that it would be a very improper rule. Let us understand what is the nature of the documents that are in charge of the Department of the Interior and which are particularly the object of the curiosity of my hon. friends opposite. They are transactions between the government as representing the whole people, and individual citizens. They are transactions, which if they are not completed those papers should not be put in jeopardy by being released from the responsibility of the department. My hon. friend knows that transactions in regard to timber limits are never closed ; that the license is renewed from year to year ; and that at any time a question may be raised as to the right of any person who holds that license, and that the only evidence there is as to the right is the documents upon file in the Department of the Interior. It is not a matter of interest particularly to the government whether these files are here or there, but it is a matter of very definite interest to the people whose title to their property rests upon these files. It is in the discharge of the duty of the department to these people that I say I do not think it is advisable either that the files should be released from the custody of the department or should be available to any person who may choose to inspect them. But, my hon. friend may say that a member of parliament, not only has the standing of being a member of parliament but that his position as a member of parliament places him so that he only looks over these files as a matter of public interest. Unfortunately, members of parliament represent individuals—individual voters and people having individual interests—and there is nothing to hinder any individual who wants to acquaint himself as to the business of another individual asking a member of parliament to go into the department and discover for him information that he wants, information in regard to the personal interests of that other individual, using the member as a medium for acquiring information. Now, I think my hon. friends will agree that it is not proper that the business of a department should be so conducted as to permit that. The files are there and copies of them have never been refused the House, so that all the public interest in connection with the transaction can be decided by the House and so that every member of the House has an equal opportunity to inform himself in regard to the business upon these files. But if these files are to be kept in the department subject to the inspection of individual members of the House at pleasure, one member informs himself and the rest of the House which is equally entitled is not informed, and the hon. gentleman who informs himself, whether for his own benefit or for the benefit of private individuals for whom he is acting or for the purpose of discussion in the House, is placed at an absolutely unfair advantage as against other private individuals or against other members of the House. What I say in regard to timber limits applies to other transactions dealing with the public resources of the country. We are not asking for secrecy because of transactions in which the government or its friends are or may be improperly interested. We are not asking for secrecy at all, because, as the leader of the House has pointed out, if any member of the House will give a public reason for the production of these documents all risks will be taken and they will be produced.

Mr. BOYCE. Did the Minister of the Interior give that as a reason when he refused access to these documents to the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) ?

Mr. OLIVER. What I said to the hon. member (Mr. Ames) was that I did not wish him to examine the documents in the department because I did not want to allow anybody to do so and I did not wish to make an exception in his case. I said that if he wanted to get the documents the proper course was to get a resolution of the House and then the responsibility was lifted from my shoulders.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you voted his resolution down.

Mr. BOYCE. What I referred to is the ground taken by the minister in the House when the motion was made.

Mr. OLIVER. What I said in the House was that if my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) would show cause, would give a public reason for the production of these documents I for one would certainly agree to produce them and he would undoubtedly and unquestionably have a right to them. But he did not give any public reason. In all the reasoning my hon. friend from North Toronto read in the report of the speech made by the hon. member for

St. Antoine, no reason was given except the reason of curiosity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, will my hon. friends say what reason was given? Was it because the documents before the House were not copies of the originals ? Did he say that he believed they were not ? He did not say that ? Did he say that the originals were forgeries ? Did he give any reason except that of curiosity for the production of those documents ?

Mr. BRISTOL. Will my hon. friend allow me ? He seems in search of information. He has information of his own as to what a public reason is, and when he states it we shall all know. Now, Mr. Ames said :

I say that these nine pages will in all probability clear up certain doubts which I have regarding peculiar features in connection with some transactions; I say that the handwriting of some of these nine pages may have a very improtant bearing on the case.

That is all he reasonably could say unless the Minister of the Interior will suggest some public reason.

Mr. OLIVER. He might say that he believed the handwriting was a forgery.

Mr. BRISTOL. How could he say that without seeing it ?

Mr. OLIVER. The fact that there was in the mind of the hon. member for St. Antoine a suspicion that there might be something wrong in those documents, I submit to common sense people was not a reason why he should be put in possession of other people's property.

Mr. BRISTOL. On what principle then does my hon. friend think the courts of this and other countries require the production of original documents ?

Mr. OLIVER. Because they have a substantial reason.

Mr. BRISTOL. What about the titles to land ? You could not proceed for a moment without producing the originals.

Mr. FOSTER. Better give it up.

Mr. OLIVER. No, I do not think I had better give it up. I say that the rule is laid down very clearly that if a reason is given, the documents can be produced.

Mr. BOYCE. Will my hon. friend allow me a question ? He says that if a reason is given for the production of the documents they can be produced. Does he remember that in objecting to the production of the originals on January 13, he gave as a reason a letter from his deputy, dated December 6, which closed by saying, with regard to those papers : 'I would strongly urge that any attempt to compel the department to produce the same should be resisted.'

Mr. OLIVER. That is the advice of the deputy.

Mr. BOYCE. Which you follow.

Mr. OLIVER. Which I follow unless I am otherwise instructed by parliament, and so far I have not been otherwise instructed by parliament.

Mr. BOYCE. Because you helped to vote it down.

Mr. OLIVER. Because my hon. friend from St. Antoine did not give a reason for what he wanted. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to just one or two other points in this connection. My hon. friend from North Toronto said that there was not any danger of any documents being mislaid. I have made some inquiry in this connection.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, I think, misunderstands me. I could not have stated that there was no danger of any documents being mislaid. That would be a general assertion which no man of any common sense would make, surely. But I did say that even though there was a danger of their being mislaid, that was not sufficient reason for their being denied.

Mr. OLIVER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement ; possibly I was wrong. What I would like to say is that there is a possibility of documents being mislaid, and it is fair for the House and fair for the country that the responsibility for those documents should not be divided—that there should be no responsibility for them outside of the department. I think everybody will agree that that is in the public interest in the transaction of public business.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I ask my hon. friend a question. Suppose the Crown has a suit and certain papers of the department are absolutely necessary to that suit being carried to a conclusion. Suppose the Crown's lawyer says, I want those papers to take to my office and have them thoroughly looked over, and I want them taken to court. Will my hon. friend go so far as to say that the moment he delivers them over, his responsibility ceases ? Surely not.

Mr. OLIVER. His responsibility remains, because he allows them to go out of his hands ; but if the House orders those papers to be brought down to the House, then surely the responsibility of the department ceases.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely the responsibility is then on the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister must follow them.

Mr. OLIVER. Should a paper be mislaid, the proof of the fact could not then be made. If the department were anxious to

shuffle off responsibility, it would be glad to have original papers brought to the House, and have the responsibility placed on other shoulders. Let me draw the attention of the House to a fact which occurred during the session of 1906. An order was issued for a return, on a motion of the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, for papers relating to timber berths Nos. 1158, 1175, 1192, 1219, 1231 and 1232, including the original tenders and copies of all other papers. The return was prepared in the usual way, that is, by having copies made of all the papers, and the return was sent down to the House of Commons in this form. The hon. Mr. Foster raised the objection that the original tenders should have been included in the return. On his request the original tenders were therefore produced, and have not since been returned to the department. The department has not now the original tenders in these cases, but only copies thereof.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know how that matter stands. This is the first I have heard of it since two years ago. Where has the Department of the Interior been all that time that it has not asked me for those papers ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend took the responsibility or got the House to take the responsibility for those papers. It is no concern of ours where they are. They were taken out of our custody, and the parties who were the owners of those timber limits are short to that extent of their titles to the timber limits.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me. Of course, a good many persons handled those papers. I am not saying where they are at the present time. I am very free to say that I have not them in my pockets, nor do I know that I have them anywhere amongst my earthly possessions.

An hon. MEMBER. You did not take much care of them.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not follow. I might have taken the greatest care of them, and they might have been lost in transmission through the hands of others.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. How can the Department of the Interior get them back without a resolution of this House ?

Mr. FOSTER. Ask the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It is a matter of procedure.

Mr. LAKE. Has the minister asked whether they are in the records of this House at the present time ?

Mr. OLIVER. What is the point?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. FOSTER. As to whether these original documents are in the records of the House at present.

Mr. OLIVER. These documents were called for on the responsibility of this House and, on the demand of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), they were taken out of the custody of my department. I presume they are in the custody of the House, but they cannot be a part of the record of the House and a part of the record of my department at the same time. Parliament, of course, is supreme. If parliament decides that these papers must become a part of its records, that decision must be complied with. It is not my business to find fault with the decision of parliament. I assume that my hon. friend had good reasons for his demand. Is he now going to persuade the House to the contrary by informing us that he had no reasons when he moved for the original documents, that he knew nothing about the transaction, and that he actually tampered with property belonging to these people without cause or provocation ? That is a fair statement of a simple question, and I must say that, charged with the responsibility of administering the Department of the Interior, I cannot conceive, except subject to the dictation and authority of the House, that this is a proper discharge of the responsibility placed upon the department.

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to fight that out with the First Minister.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no dispute between us. The incident I have mentioned occurred in the session of 1906. In the session of 1907, on the occasion of a discussion regarding grazing leases, my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) was allowed, at his request, to go into the Department of the Interior and inspect the original documents in that particular case, but that permission was granted as an exception and not as a rule, as I will have occasion to show a little later on. What happened this session? On the opening of this session, there were placed upon the Order Paper notices by the hon. member for Algoma West (Mr. Boyce) asking for original applications and tenders with regard to four timber berths; by the same hon. member for original applications and tenders regarding five timber berths; by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) for similar papers regarding four timber berths; by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) regarding five timber berths, and by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) regarding three timber berths. Thus, at the very beginning of the session we had demands made for the original applications and tenders with regard to twenty-one timber berths. So that the instance which I have already alleged as occurring in the session of 1906, at the re-

quest of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was to be repeated in twenty-one cases at the very beginning of this session. I submit, if I have any responsibility at all for a proper discharge of the work of the Department of the Interior, that it is desirable that the question should be brought to an issue, and that we should know whether the responsibility placed in our hands with regard to private individuals, transacting their private business, shall be dealt with in this way or not. I submit to the judgment of the House whether or not I was justified in asking that the motions be changed so that the originals should not be called for, and the hon. gentlemen acceded to my request.

Mr. FOSTER. You should let me have the title page or number, or whatever it is, of the subject of these papers, and I shall try and perform the duty which the hon. minister wishes to divest himself of, namely, of seeing that these papers are brought back.

Mr. OLIVER. Whose duty is it?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the hon. gentleman's, not mine. If this is to be taken seriously, something more has to be said. I ask and receive an order of the House for certain papers. For what reason? In order that I may examine them. I get those papers, as any other member may, and have them sent to my room where I can examine them. I am carrying out my parliamentary duty when I get the information and make the examination, and it is my duty then to see that they are sent back to the record office whence they were sent to me. I do not suppose my hon. friend meant to say that I was tampering with the papers.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. It is possible that among the multiplicity of papers I do examine every session some may have, in some way become inclosed in a drawer of my desk, but I do not think so. My impression is that the record office is very careful to send me in each case a notice that I have such and such papers and notify me to return them. I assure my hon. friend that I did not mean to purloin any paper or in any way tamper with it at all. I was perfectly honest in the matter, but I shall take care to trace the thing out, so long as he has not the willingness or the ability to do so and see whether he can get them back from the record office or not.

Mr. OLIVER. We all agree with that that the hon. gentleman was not dishonest, but he was absolutely regardless of the private rights concerned in these particular interests.

Mr. FOSTER. I must enter my caveat against that.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to repeat that the House granted the motion of my hon. friend that these documents should become a part of the record of the House. Well, they cannot be a part of the record of the House and at the same be a part of the record of the Department of the Interior, and until they are released from the custody of the House, they are not at my disposal, even if I be the autocrat my hon. friend suggests I am.

Mr. FOSTER. If you wanted them badly you could get them.

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly would not expect to get them out of the custody of the officers of this House, in whose hands they were placed by the order of the House. It has been suggested to me that if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) had taken the interest he ought in these matters, which he apparently did not, when he had satisfied himself regarding the documents, he would have asked for a resolution of the House to return the papers to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. My only interest was to get the papers and examine them, which I did. My next interest was to get them back to the record office from which I got them. If my hon. friend had carried out his duties as trustee, he would have had a motion made to have them returned to his department.

Mr. OLIVER. I might mention also that if there were a fair amount of give and take as between members on the other side and the government departments, it would greatly facilitate business. Let me bring before the House the instance of the documents relating to the North Atlantic Trading Company, which were produced before the Committees of Agriculture and Public Accounts in the session of 1896. These documents, which are not of course private matters in the same sense as documents regarding timber berths, and which were documents perfectly proper to be brought before a committee of the House for investigation, were furnished to the committee on the 4th April and they were returned on the 23rd July. I submit that, speaking for the department interested in those papers, that was not a fair or reasonable way of transacting public business and was not giving that department a fair opportunity to transact public business. I think it was an arbitrary exercise of the authority of the two committees to retain the documents for that length of time. So far from the Department of the Interior in any of its branches having attempted to conceal anything or prevent the House from getting information. I have placed these instances before the House to show that the Department of the Interior has been seriously hampered in the transaction of the public business at the instance of mem-

bers on the other side of the House without due cause or reason.

Now, with regard to the precedent in connection with examining original documents in the department: I have already pointed out why it is not fair, it is not reasonable, it is not desirable that there should be a general right, on the part even of members of parliament, to go into the department and demand an examination of these documents. It is not fair to the people whose business is contained in these papers. It does not matter whether it is fair or not to the department or its officers —that is not the question. But it is not fair to the people whose business is carried on the files of that department. As to the rule in that matter, I notice that on June 16th, 1905, a memorandum was addressed to the chief clerks and heads of branches of the Department of the Interior, as follows:—

It is requested that, in future, no papers or documents attached to the official files of the department are to be shown to any person or persons outside of the department without a direct order from the deputy minister.

Be good enough to note the above and instruct the officials of your branch accordingly.

By order,
(Sgd.) P. G. KEYES,
Secretary.

I note further a memorandum dated October 14, 1904, which was before I took office, addressed to the chief clerks and heads of branches of the Department of the Interior:

Attention has been called to the fact that copies of departmental orders in council, and other important documents have been given to outside people without the knowledge or approval of the head of the department. As the Minister of the Interior is the custodian of the records of the department, and he alone has the power to authorize the giving out of any information contained in departmental papers, no such information should be furnished to any one without his consent. Even when an official of the department is summoned by subpoena of the court to produce departmental documents, such documents should not be produced or any information given without the knowledge of the head of the department.

The officials of the department are asked to remember that its records must be regarded as confidential, and that no one has any right to disclose to outside inquirers the contents of any files or public documents of the department. Such information can only be given out through the proper channels.

I am to request that you will be good enough to impress the importance of this matter upon the officials of your branch.

(Sgd.) P. G. KEYES,
Secretary.

I notice this memorandum also, dated May 7th, 1898:—

With reference to persons coming into the department and examining papers, it is to be understood that only those files with which they have to do directly and for which they have authority to make an examination are to be shown to such persons. This rule applies to every person coming into the department to examine documents.

(Sgd.) JAMES A. SMART,
Deputy Minister.

That is to say, the man whose business is shown upon a certain file may examine the file in regard to his own business, or his authorized agent may do so, but no other person should be allowed to examine that file with regard to that man's business. This was addressed to the chief clerk of the patents branch, and also to the chief clerk of the registration branch.

Here is another memorandum from Calgary, dated December 4th, 1897, which throws some light on the subject, showing that this was not a new autocratic ruling on my part, but simply carrying out the thoroughly understood principle of the department and insisting that it should be acted upon:

Office of the Superintendent of Mines,
Calgary, Alberta, December 4, 1897.

Sir,—On reaching my office on the 3rd instant I was served with a subpoena by the counsel for the defence in the case of the Queen v. Arthur Collyns and Romain Gervais, and the subpoena ordered me to produce all the papers in my possession regarding the entry to the west half of 34-16-1 west of the 5th meridian. There has been, as you are aware, considerable correspondence over the entry of Romain Gervais to the southwest quarter of said section. I collected all the papers in my possession regarding this matter and appeared in court. When I was called upon to produce them I protested against doing so unless ordered by the court. At first the judge was inclined not to insist on their production, but afterwards he decided that I must produce them. I had a discussion with the judge over the principle at issue, that is whether any official of the department could be compelled to produce documents out of his office unless under the authorization of his minister. Had I considered that in the case at issue there was anything in the public interest that should not be divulged I should probably have refused point blank to produce the papers even had the judge ordered me to do so, but as there was nothing in them which was detrimental to the public interest in the slightest degree, of course I saw no reason to refuse or demur to the order of the judge. However, I would desire instructions in this case. When I appeared in court the counsel for the defence asked me to hand him the papers. This I refused. I told him that if he desired to see the papers that he had plenty of time to have written to the department to ask for authority that I should show them to him and obtain, if he desired, certified copies of any document he might require. Would you therefore kindly instruct me what is to be done in cases like this. It might be well that a general circular be issued to all officers of the

department giving the necessary instructions on the point raised in this.

Your obedient servant,
WILLIAM PEARCE,
Agent.

The Secretary,
Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Mr. Pearce had been an officer of the department for many years at a time when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was a member of the administration, and this letter of Mr. Pearce was written a year after this government acceded to power. In reply to Mr. Pearce, the following letter was written:—

Ottawa, 21st December, 1907.

Dear Sir,—I duly received your letter of the 4th instant, Ref. 13945, with regard to the production of the papers in Court in the case of the Queen *vs.* Collyns and Gervais. In reply I beg to say that the ruling in this case is that no papers which belong to the Department should be taken out of the offices, either at Ottawa or at any of the outside agencies for any purpose whatever, without special authorization from the Minister.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JAS. A. SMART,
Deputy Minister.

William Pearce, Esq.,
Superintendent of Mines.
Calgary, N.W.T.

I have a circular dated 11th May, 1892, which reads as follows:—

It has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice that, in some instances, persons having claims against the government, either in preparation or in suit have been allowed personally, or through their solicitors, to have access to departmental records connected with the claim or to inspect departmental files for the purpose of obtaining therefrom desired information and that such a course has been found to be prejudicial to the government's interests.

The Minister of Justice is of opinion that no inspection of files or records for the purposes above-mentioned should be allowed unless under the advice and direction of this department and he desires me to request that in future any such application should be referred to this department.

You will understand, of course, that the present letter is not written for the purpose of making any charge or conveying any blame in respect of past matters, but simply with a view of safeguarding the interests of the government in respect of claims, present or prospective.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant.
(Sgd.) ROBERT SEDGEWICK,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

The Deputy Minister,
Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

And that was followed by the following:—

Ottawa, July 14, 1892.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, and inclosures, and in reply and to state that the interpretation placed upon my recent circular on the subject of the production of departmental files for examination by outsiders is not correct. The suggestions of that circular were not intended to apply only to such papers as might be made the foundation of a claim for damages or other monetary considerations but generally to all files of correspondence and other papers. So far as your department is a registry office, any one desiring to do so ought to be permitted to see instruments affecting title, but departmental correspondence and documents dealing therewith should not be shown except, perhaps, in special cases.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
ROBERT SEDGEWICK,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

My hon. friend from North Toronto has entertained this House for a considerable time to-night, denouncing me personally for having, as an autocrat, introduced an arbitrary rule into the administration of my department; which, on the evidence of the records, was a rule which, was a standing rule and a confirmed rule when my hon. friend was a member of the government of Canada; a rule which, on the evidence of those documents, have been continued ever since, and which I leave to the judgment of this House is a reasonable and proper rule, and necessary for the proper safe-guarding of public business. I want to draw this distinction between the position as it has been taken by myself and the position taken when my hon. friend was a member of the government. The first of the two last circulars I have read intimates that information is to be denied for fear information will be acquired that may be used as an attack upon the government.

For the purpose of obtaining therefrom desired information, and that such a course has been found prejudicial to the government interest.

Now, I want to point out that this case brought before the House by my hon. friend from Montreal, and emphasized so strongly, and I think so unfairly to-night, was not a case of protecting the government against the people, but it was a case of protecting the people whose business was in charge of the government. We do not ask for any advantage in protecting the government; but we do ask that if we are to be held responsible for the safeguarding of documents which are necessary to the title of the people's property, we be permitted a fair and reasonable opportunity so to safeguard them. So far as the government interests are concerned, the right hon. leader of the House has said on a previous occasion, and said again to-night, that private interests will have to take second place, and that if any member will give a reason, a public reason why these original documents should be placed before the House, they will be placed before the House without the slightest hesitation. We

are in the position of undertaking to safeguard the interests of the people, and all we ask is that when our friends opposite have an argument to make, they substitute statements for insinuations and responsibility for innuendo.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM (East Huron). As a representative of one of the constituencies of this Dominion, I feel called upon to rise and enter a protest this evening. The Minister of the Interior who has just sat down has been continually referring to the House. The House will do this, and the House will do that. Well, we know only too well what that means. We know that it means that there is a very large and subservient majority sitting at the back of the present government, and we know how fairly sometimes that majority acts in regard to these matters. Now, I have been in the House for three or four years, and I have been very carefully, and I think impartially, watching the trend of affairs, and I notice that there are very few ministers who have so much trouble, so much agitation and worry about their departments as the Minister of the Interior has. See what occurs when we are going over the estimates. Take the Minister of Agriculture. I know some people try to badger him, but how seldom have they been able to put their finger on any suspicious circumstance in his department? Very seldom indeed. I think there must be something wrong in the Department of the Interior when we find the minister so often in trouble. Another thing I have noticed is that that hon. gentleman cannot apparently quote correctly anything that a member on this side of the House may have said. I think we can put him down as the champion misquoter of the American continent. He always twists, and turns, and gets things wrong end foremost. Now, a man with the experience he has had as editor of a newspaper, certainly should know better. I cannot think it possible that he deliberately and wilfully does these things. He seems to have no idea whatever of logic, no idea of what reasoning is. He thinks that an assertion, if made with sufficient vehemence, is a proof. Why, Sir, his logic is something like that of the man who said that because a pair of boots cost $2.50, a load of hay should cost $20. There is no relation between the things at all. I notice also that when he finds a difficulty in defending himself, he loses his temper and abuses those poor men who were in this House twenty years ago, he attacks old time Conservatives. Now, I suppose there are not now more than half a dozen of those old men in this House at the present time. What is the use of attacking dead men? They cannot come here to defend themselves. The questions of to-day are live questions, and they should be treated by live people and not by dead people. Anyway, if those Conservatives did make mistakes in their day and generation, were they not punished for it, were they not driven from power? Does the Minister of the Interior mean that the Liberals of the present day, having committed offences similar to those which the Conservatives in the old days committed, that in all justice, and fair play, and common sense the Liberals should be treated as the Conservatives were, and that they too should be driven from power? I scarcely think that was what he had in his mind. But certainly it is the natural and logical conclusion to be drawn from the line of argument that the minister generally adopts. In future then let him talk to living people and leave the dead ones alone.

Now, I think that I am not a very stiff politician, I think I am able to see the good points in the government. I think this government is not managing things quite so badly as some people appear to believe. I can see that some of the departments are being run fairly well. I am well pleased, for instance, with the department of the Postmaster General; and there are others. But I must say that I think the Minister of the Interior has entirely lost his head, he has simply gone wild. He has been entirely spoilt by the very large and subservient Liberal majority which sits at his back. Well, if they were all like him we could not live in this House. He simply feels himself too strong, and consequently he is arrogant, he defies public opinion. Now, just imagine a case. Suppose that some person in this House, or in some city, has a large factory or a large establishment, and he has a number of managers employed to look after the different departments. Suppose that the owner of that factory goes in some day and wishes to look over the books, and as he looks them over he finds that a certain company has been getting something like $300,000 of his money.

He says to the manager of a department: What did you do with this $300,000 ? The manager replies : I will not tell you, Sir ; if I did somebody would commit suicide ; I will not tell you ; it would not do. Mind you the proprietor might say, it was my money and I want to know what you did with it, Sir; you are only the manager of this department. Would not the proprietor become suspicious ? I say that is what is happening now. The members on this side of the House are becoming suspicious and therefore they want to see the original documents. That man who owned that factory might come down next morning and he would send his attorney, or his accredited representative to this department. I am the accredited representative of 20,000 of the people who own the whole of that department, who own the documents in it and on behalf of these people I am asking the manager that I may be allowed to see

these documents. But, we are denied that privilege. What would the proprietor of a large establishment believe if he went into one of the departments and found that $300,000 of his money had been paid away and if upon investigation he had found that there was no company of the name given at the time the money was paid, would he not get suspicious ? That is what is wrong here. The people of Canada are getting suspicious of the Minister of the Interior and they want to investigate the affairs of his department to see whether their suspicion is well founded or not. In the interest of the minister himself it would be far better for him to have these documents carefully examined. The people are the owners of this country, the government are simply the managers and we the people's representatives have the right to know what is going on. I would ask the minister to comply with our request, because I, myself, do not think there is nearly as much wrong as his peculiar way of acting leads us to suppose. I do not think that things are as bad as he makes people believe they are, and I think that if he would just be a little more civil and let some parties see these documents it would be all right and I would be very glad, for his sake, if he would do so. I am going to say right here that I have gone down to his department time and again since I came to the city and I have always been treated with the greatest civility. I do not think he is as bad as he looks. I think if he would just keep his temper a little better and if he would use a little more of that sunny smile and learn some lessons from the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this whole matter might be satisfactorily settled. I hope however, that he will let us see the documents so that we may see what there is to justify this suspicion that is abroad. I do not think that there is as much wrong as some others do.

It has been referred to time and again that original documents have to be taken into court. This is the highest court in the land. What would a judge think if a solicitor were to take into court copies of original entries? Would he not wish to see the day book and blotter and would not the proprietor of a large establishment want to see the day book and blotter if he became suspicious as the people of Canada are at the present time? I hope the minister for his own sake will let us see the original documents. I have risen as much for his sake as for the sake of the people, and I therefore hope that he will accede to our request.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this discussion, but as one who has considerable business to do with the Department of the Interior I am bound to say that the other members of parliament have some rights in respect to this matter as well as the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). I represent 175,000 square miles of territory.

Mr. J. D. REID. And how many people ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I represent over 8,000 electors, a great many of whom have business with the Department of the Interior. They are 3,000 miles away from the Department of the Interior ; they want homesteads, they want timber limits, they want grazing leases, they want all these things from the Department of the Interior. The man who has to see about getting them for them is the member for the district.

Mr. FOSTER. It is hard work, too.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It is hard work. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I know will sympathize with me in that regard. I have to do the business of these people with every other department of the service here. I surely have some rights as well as the hon member for Montreal, St. Antoine.

Mr. BRISTOL. Have they been disputed?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They have been invaded by the suggestion of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did the hon. gentleman ever see any original documents in a department ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If you will be patient I will tell you what happened. Generally there is a good deal of red tape in the Department of the Interior as well as in other departments, and it requires a member to be persistently after the officials of the department to get what he thinks should be got for his people. I call up the deputy, or the head of the patent branch, or some other official with whom I want to do business, I tell him what I intend to go for, I tell him that this business will be found on a certain file, or he tells me that, I go over there but he cannot do the business of that particular settler, or homesteader, or of that particular man who wants a timber limit or a grazing lease without having that file in his hands. He cannot have that file in his possession if the demand of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, is going to be acceded to. It will be in the possession of this House, not in the possession of the proper officer of the Department of the Interior and, consequently, it makes it impossible for me to transact the legitimate business of the people of my constituency with that department. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) asked me if I had ever seen an original file. I have seen hundreds of original files. I have seen them this way: I go there for the purpose of facilitating the business of my people who have bus-

iness to do with the department. The file is in the possession of the officer who has to do with that particular business.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not understand in this particular case, where the difficulty that the hon. gentleman speaks of, would arise, because as I understand it, the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, went over to look at the file of the department.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not know anything about this particular case; I do not know the merits of this particular case. What I object to is that parliament should lay down the rule that it has the right to transfer the original files and documents from the Department of the Interior, the essential machinery with which the business is done, to the custody of this House so that it is absolutely impossible to transact the business of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CROCKET. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he did not know the merits of this particular case?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I said so.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the hon. gentleman not vote on the resolution the other night?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Yes. What has that to do with the merits of the case?

Mr. BOYCE. Was the hon. gentleman ever refused access to an original document in the Department of the Interior or any other department?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I never asked for access to any file in the Department of the Interior in the same manner that the hon. gentleman for Montreal, St. Antoine, asked for access to a file in that department. I have not any curiosity to find out what other people's business is in connection with the Department of the Interior. I go there for a business purpose to transact the business of my people. I am not like the hon. member (Mr. Ames) who never did anything in his life but find fault with what everybody else did. I go to the Department of the Interior for a legitimate purpose, I do not go poking my nose into other people's business. Now, in discussing this matter the other night I challenged the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) to give me a single instance in which he brought down original documents, when he was minister, in response to a motion made by a member of this House. I repeat the challenge.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of the Interior has just stated that he brought original documents down in answer to a motion, and they were lost.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is not an answer to my question?

Mr. BARKER. You have challenged any member of this House to give you an instance, and I can tell you that in the investigation of the purchase of 1,300,000 ties by the then Minister of Railways, the whole of the original papers were brought down.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Investigation where?

Mr. BARKER. In the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKER. But the original papers were brought to this House and I saw them here before they were in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I don't see what that has to do with the statement I made. I challenged the ex-Minister of Railways to show one single instance, wherein while in charge of the Railways Department or any other department of the public service, he brought down original documents and laid them on the table of this House in response to a motion moved by a private member. I repeat the same challenge to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who was rather the 'Poo-Bah' of the past administration.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. And I will say to him, that if ever original documents were brought down in response to a resolution moved by a private member of this House in connection with any department over which he presided, it was during the week he was on strike. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had a great deal to tell us to-night about this matter. Surely the House should take a reasonable and a business view of this question. Let me give you a homely illustration. A man does business with a bank, he is doing an ordinary mercantile business, he does business by the usual system of monthly accounts, he gets a large advance from the bank, this bank has a perfect right to say to this man: We want a statement of your business affairs; but if that bank said to the man: Take your books on the 31st day of the month and put them in this bank and we will keep them as long as we please, and if in consequence he could not make out his monthly accounts because he had not his books, that man would go broke. Let me give you another illustration—a man is in the newspaper business, he does business with a large number of people, one of his customers comes in and says: You have overcharged in connection with last month's account; the newspaper man turns up his books, shows that particular individual his personal account, discusses the account with him, but he does not show him the account of every body else who does business with that particular office. What the hon. member (Mr. Ames) wants the Interior Department to do is just as if the newspaper proprietor showed this particular customer every other person's ac-

count. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) wants to lay it down as a principle that he or any other private member of this House has a perfect right to go into the Department of the Interior and to look into the files of every body who does business with that department. He wants to go further than that, he wants to lay it down as a principle that these files should be transferred from the Department of the Interior and placed upon the table of the House, but surely the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) knows the procedure of this House sufficiently well to know that once official documents are placed on the table of this House they are no longer the property of the Interior Department and cannot be returned to the Interior Department without an order of the House. The hon. gentleman had one experience himself, quoted by the Minister of the Interior, wherein he very carelessly asked for original documents two years ago and to this day they have not been returned to the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Interior has absolutely no machinery by which it can get these original documents back, and that, as the result of a motion which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself tells us he forgets all about, does not know it ever happened, was not of sufficient importance to charge his mind with. But it might be of very great importance to the man who had business with the Department of the Interior and whose original documents those were. It might be of great importance to him that they are for ever lost to him so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned. Surely, hon. gentlemen opposite are not anxious in their legitimate search for knowledge, to disturb the ordinary business methods of the departments of the public service in this country. They are simply playing politics when they say: They have a right to get original documents from the various departments in whose custody they are and placed in charge of a responsible minister.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a question ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Certainly; three.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman said there was no machinery whereby the Department of the Interior could get these documents back.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I said so.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman overlook the fact that the Minister of the Interior who presides over the department might make a motion in this House to get the documents back and that the same power that took them has the right to return them.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I said the Department of the Interior had no machinery.

Mr. BOYCE. It has a minister in this House.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The House can order them returned if it chooses to do so, but the Department of the Interior itself has no machinery to get these documents back.

Mr. BOYCE. It could get them back by a motion of its minister in this House.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). The right hon. gentleman who leads the House having so kindly accepted the amendment of the leader of the opposition, I think the least I can do in common courtesy speaking on this side of the House, is to defend him from the attack just made on him by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross). Of course, I do not wish for a moment to say a single word that could in any way be offensive to the hon. member (Mr. Ross), because as he frankly told us, he knew nothing whatever about the merits of the case, which all who listened to his speech must recognize as a superfluous observation. Now, as reference was made to the motion discussed in the House the other evening, and as I have charged the hon. member (Mr. D. Ross) with stabbing his leader in the back—unintentionally I admit—perhaps I may be allowed as other members have done to refer to the record to see what really did take place ; what the position of the Minister of the Interior then was and what his position to-night is. I am quite willing, in justice to the Minister of the Interior, to admit that if one could shut his eyes to all evidence and obliterate every impression from memory, and then listen to the hon. minister, he possibly might be convinced and remain convinced until the hon. gentleman spoke at another time. What was the position the hon. gentleman took the other night? There is no room for any difference of opinion in regard to it. The motion made by the hon. member for St. Antoine was not a motion that he had a right to do this or that or the other thing, but a motion asking the House to order the return of certain documents. In support of that motion he made a few remarks, among other things saying that he wanted the originals down.

We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question.

The issue is surely simple enough. The hon. member for St. Antoine moved for certain original documents, and brought his motion to test the question whether or not this House would order those original documents to be laid on the table of the House. The Minister of the Interior was not taken by surprise at this question being raised, because it occurred in consequence of his

own acts. He had advised the hon. member for St. Antoine to make this motion, and had fortified himself in this very case by appealing to his deputy to lay down rules to govern this House; and so, when the Minister of the Interior came to speak, he spoke deliberately, after full consideration, and with reasons to advance to justify his supporters in voting down the motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine. Therefore I think I am justified in saying that he gave his best reasons, the only reasons he knew, why that motion should be voted down; and what were the reasons he gave? He told us that he had referred the matter to his deputy and his deputy had given him a memorandum. The memorandum of the deputy was clear and distinct, and it took these grounds. It said:

While it has been customary in some cases, in answer to an order from special or standing committees of the House, to submit original documents for examination, such documents have never been left with committees of the House, except in the case of this department, when on one or two occasions original files were left with committees of the House, and were not returned until after considerable delay, which caused great inconvenience to the officers of the department dealing with the matter to which these papers related.

In the case of other departments I learned that while in some cases they have been required to produce original documents, such documents, as a matter of fact, never left the hands of the officers of the department submitting the same, and under the circumstances I am strongly of the opinion that this practice should be followed in future. I need not point out that, if in answer to an order of this kind, original papers were submitted to the House they would therefore become a part of its own official record, and would for ever after remain in its custody. This, in so far as the general transaction of public business is concerned, would lead to serious complications, and if the practice of calling for original documents were thereafter indulged in the result would be that the records of the department would soon be depleted.

As regards the production of memoranda or statements of facts passing between the heads of branches and the minister or deputy minister of a department, the deputy ministers whom I consulted have expressed the opinion, in which I fully concur, that these do not as a matter of fact form part of the official record, but are merely written communications which otherwise if time permitted could be conveyed verbally as between the officers concerned, and that the same can have no direct bearing upon the consideration or settlement of the cases to which they may refer. With regard to these papers, therefore, I would strongly urge that any attempt to compel the department to produce the same should be resisted.

And here is the ground on which the deputy minister has presumed to lay down a rule for this parliament:

In my opinion these notices of motion should be amended by providing for returns of copies of the documents which constitute the official record of the transaction under notice.

That was the argument which was submitted to the minister by his deputy, and adopted by the minister, as will appear from the following quotation. The minister made very few remarks, occupying less than a column of 'Hansard,' so that there is no room for difference of opinion as to the ground he took. He took only one ground, and that was clearly and distinctly taken. The only reason he advanced up to that moment for justifying his refusal of the motion is thus stated in his own words:

Under these circumstances it seems to me necesary in the public interest—the very public interest that my hon. friend alluded to; the interest of the state—that this request should not be granted. If it is necessary and in the public interest that this document should be produced in the original, as this memorandum says, what has been done in the past may be done again. The files may be called for by a special committee, an officer of the department may bring these files before the committee, they may be examined by members of the committee in the custody and under the responsibility of the officers of the department and then be returned to the department.

He has no objection to the original documents going before a committee, because they would continue under the control of one of his officials, but so far as the House was concerned, he said:

But to transfer the original documents from the department whose business they form an essential part of, to this House where they will only constitute a record, as has been set out very fully in this memorandum, is an infringement upon business methods which it is impossible for the department to consent to.

Now, you will see that it was a matter of utter indifference to the department what ground was given for the production of the documents, because the reason the minister alleges for not producing them is, not any informality in the manner of asking for them, but simply the inconvenience to the department; and when the minister finished his remarks, dozens of his supporters, convinced by his elaborate argument, applauded him to the echo, and felt that he had given them sufficient ground for voting against the motion. But the right hon. the Premier followed. He was shrewd enough to see the utter absurdity of the defence put up by the Minister of the Interior and did not attempt to follow him. He gave a distinct reason of his own for declining to produce the original documents. It was not because the House had any objection to bringing down these or any other original documents; but he said, we must have a reason given to explain why they are asked for. As I said before, what possible difference would it make to the officers of the Interior Department whether a reason were given for the production of the documents or not?

Their reason for refusing their production was the inconvenience to the department. The right hon. the Premier says:

My hon. friend says that the inconvenience or convenience of any officers of the departments of the government should not stand in the way of information being given. I agree to that entirely; the convenience or inconvenience of any department is not to stand in the way of any legitimate information that is asked for being supplied.

The right hon. the Premier gave as a reason for declining to produce certain documents that sufficient reasons had not been alleged, while the excuse given by the Minister of the Interior was that it would be inconvenient to the department to produce them. In the fact of these adverse reasons, the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) comes in at half past ten at night and informs the House that he knows nothing of the merits of the case.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the hon. gentleman is going to quote me he should quote me fairly. I did not say that I knew nothing of the merits of the case. I said that I did not know anything of the merits of the particular application that was the subject of the motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine. That is an entirely different matter. I did not know anything of the merits of the particular timber limits he was asking about.

Mr. NORTHRUP. That illustrates my hon. friend's conception of the question before the House on which he voted, it is to be supposed intelligently. What possible difference could it make to any member of this House what were the merits of that timber limit in British Columbia? The question before this House was not whether John Smith, Thomas Brown or William Jones should have the timber limit, but whether this House should order that certain original documents in possession of the Minister of the Interior should be brought down.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What are the merits of that particular case, except voting on a question of practice?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am afraid that at this hour of the night it would be impossible to enlighten my hon. friend, but if he will read the speeches made the other night on the one hand by the right hon. the Premier and on the other hand by the hon. Minister of the Interior he will find at least two explanations of the vote he gave, and they differ entirely from each other. But it is an advantage which my hon. friend frequently has of taking his choice and justifying his vote either way he likes. I have said enough to show that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), when he asked his supporters to vote down this motion, had not any just defence for his request, according to the opinion of his right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) judging by the statement of the right hon. gentleman that the convenience or inconvenience of his subordinates was of no importance compared with the convenience of the House. I was rather amused at the zeal displayed by the Minister of the Interior the other evening to protect the interests of the people whose title deeds were in his possession. Such was his zeal in their behalf that he could not let these title deeds come before the House, and he deliberately stated that such a thing had not been done in the past and would not be done now. And to-night to prove that it had not been done in the past, he declared that it had been done once on the request of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and that the papers never came back. That is logic for you. And so interested was he in those documents that although they had been brought down a couple of years ago on the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and had not been returned to his department, he had not taken the least care to see that they were again returned to his custody. Why, how does this bear out the argument he made that the business of the department could not go on without these files being brought back to it?

Mr. D. ROSS. How could he get them back?

Mr. NORTHRUP. My hon. friend has been told so often that I think I would be called down by the House if I were to repeat what has been so frequently said. The hon. minister gave us some rather amusing episodes of occurrences in days gone by. It seems that some official was at one time served with a subpœna to produce certain documents, and he consulted some legal light and was told he should not obey the subpœna without the consent of his minister. If that consent were given it was perfectly legitimate and proper to take the documents in question to the uttermost ends of the earth, but if the consent of parliament were given, it was most improper to bring them from the eastern block to this chamber. I acknowledge that it would be improper that solicitors and their clients should be allowed to go into the Department of the Interior and pry into documents that might be used in law suits. A sounder doctrine the hon. minister never gave utterance to, but surely he can see the difference between a solicitor and his client going to the department to pry into documents which might be useful for private purposes and a representative of the people going to that department to inspect documents that belonged to his clients, the people, and which may be utilized for the benefit of the people. If he cannot see the difference between the two cases, it is impossible to make it clear

to him, but on that point he differs entirely from the right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Mr. E. BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). We have heard a great deal of discussion to-night on matters which are not before the House. The question before the House is a simple one, and perhaps it would not be out of place to call attention to what we are really discussing. The resolution before us is this:

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right of the people's representatives, in parliament assembled, to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government, and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business, and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.

We have the right hon. the First Minister agreeing with the leader of the opposition in this principle, and I think, therefore, we need not discuss the points that have been brought up by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross), who evidently does not share the opinion of his leader, and confine ourselves to the subject before the House. Let us examine the resolution which was moved by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames). On the 13th January the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) moved for a return laying upon the table of this House the original applications and tenders in respect of timber berths 1107, 1108 and 1179. That is what I would call a specific instance of the general proposition here laid down. The right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not state that there was any good question of public policy on which to base a refusal to pass this order, but says that he does not find that the hon. member for St. Antoine division gave any reason for his application.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He said himself that he might give reasons, but would not because he wanted to make it a test case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He did give reasons before the debate was concluded.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. BRISTOL. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that if the hon. member for St. Antoine division had given some reason for his motion, which a reasonable man would accept, he would certainly have agreed that it was the undoubted right of parliament to have these papers. I would ask the right hon. gentleman why, if the hon. member (Mr. Ames) did not state his reasons in opening his remarks, but did so before the close of the debate, and gave good reasons for making the application, the right hon. gentleman should be so technical and object to the motion because the reasons were given not at the beginning of the application, but at the end. That is the most extraordinary proposition I have ever heard and one which I fail to comprehend. I am not able to find any precedent, nor is the right hon. gentleman able to refer to one, to show that the time for giving reasons must be in the first part or the middle or the concluding sentence of the speech supporting that motion. But when we talk of reasons, we are met with some considerable difficulty, because the Minister of the Interior says there must be some good public reason. He will not find that laid down in any of the authorities, and he did not say what in his opinion constituted a public reason. If he did, that would be of great assistance to hon. members who might desire to give some reason for a similar motion which would be satisfactory to the minister's mind. I myself am afraid that no reason we might give would be in the minister's opinion a sufficient justification for calling for the production of the documents asked for.

Mr. OLIVER. The statement by an hon. member of any specific impropriety in the dealings of the department with the matter in hand would be a sufficient public reason.

Mr. BRISTOL. I think that the hon. gentleman is asking more than any parliamentary body in the world has ever asked. He is asking an hon. member to state there is some impropriety. Well, in the first place, it is not necessary that there should be any impropriety alleged in respect of public documents as a reason why they should be called for and examined. There might be many reasons apart from any impropriety. There might be, taking the chain of documents, a great deal of impropriety arising out of any one of them in connection with others. Let me refer him to a consideration of the matter as a business man. As I understand we are dealing with the original tenders and leases relating to three separate timber berths. My hon. friend knows as well as anybody that there is not any court of justice in any civilized country which would for one moment take cognizance of anything but the original documents unless it were proved that the originals had been lost or destroyed. If there is going to be any inconvenience caused by producing these documents or if the documents are of a precious character, such as registered deeds, they are produced in the custody of the registrar or one of his clerks. The cases are precisely analogous. The clerk of the department hands these documents over to the clerk of the House for the information of the House, and if the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) desires to have them back after

this House is through with them, it is his duty to bring the matter to the attention of the House and obtain an order of the House to have these documents returned.

Now, imagine any business being conducted on such a basis as that. Surely, the responsibility of the minister does not end when he sends documents to this House. The officer of the House, of course, is in charge of these documents ; but the duty of the minister is surely to look after his own documents and to see that he gets them back within a reasonable time. Or, still more, I submit that the minister should see to it that, when an order is made for the production before this House of an original document, that that order shall contain such provision as protects his department. And, as the hon. member for St. Antoine said, if the document is produced for ten or fifteen minutes or in the case of the Public Accounts Committee if it is produced for three or four hours and left in the custody of a clerk, it can be sent back and there is no inconvenience and no possibility of keeping the document out of the custody of the minister for two years. If this discussion does nothing else, surely it will lead to there being no more cases of documents being kept in this House for two years, and then only coming to light because an energetic clerk wants to give the minister something to say against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Coming back to the matter before us, the point is not whether a member has or has not a right to go into the Department of the Interior. I have not heard anybody claim that right, and I should be surprised to hear anybody claim it. Of course, the minister is supreme in his department. If, as a matter of courtesy, he shows an original file, to save the country expense, or to promote the public convenience, that is a matter of business discretion. He has a right to grant it or refuse it. As a good business man, no doubt he will do as he has done in the past. It seems to me that we are simply wasting time over something which should never have been disputed for a moment. I think the Prime Minister, when he reads the rest of the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine, which he did not hear, will say that the hon. gentleman did give good reasons upon which a reasonable man could be asked to act. Under the circumstances, it seems to me, the Prime Minister should be the first to ask that this resolution be passed, the order made and this whole question got out of the way. It is idle to suppose that hon. members on this side would take up time with arguments to secure documents merely out of curiosity. That is an insult to the members of this House and a reflection upon the intelligence of the electors who sent us here. The first minister could not say that no reason was given for the production of the documents, but that he had not observed, as a matter of fact, that reasons were given. Possibly the hon. member for St. Antoine did not give reasons until just at the close of his argument. But no case could be more plainly stated or more clearly within the lines of the Prime Minister's own argument. Because the member for St. Antoine says that the question of handwriting in the originals and other matters might be of value. And he says :

> Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle that when we on this side have what we consider good and sufficient reason we may have the right to see an additional document.

And so on. That is exactly in line with the concession of the first minister this evening. Are we to have another seventy pages of ' Hansard ' devoted to this matter ? Are we to allege improprieties which nobody is in a position to allege at the present time ? Or. is the absence of such allegations to be made the ground of refusal ? I submit that the whole matter amounts to this, if such argument is to be presented, if such sophistry is to be used in regard to the argument of the hon. member for St. Antoine, there will be no case in which a member can get production of documents because there will never be a reason alleged that the government will be ready to regard as justifying the production of original documents in this House when the government does nothing to have them produced.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I do not rise to prolong this discussion, but to comment for the moment upon the extraordinary attitude of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to night, as contrasted with the attitude he took on January 13, when the motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) was made. He stated and reiterated here to-night that, if the hon. member for St. Antoine had stated his reasons, the documents would have been brought down without hesitation. But contrast that position with the position that the right hon. gentleman took on the motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine on January 13 last. The hon. member for St. Antoine moved that the original documents be produced and laid on the table. And how was he met ? Granting for the moment, and for the sake of argument that, up to the time when the right hon. gentleman replied, no sufficient reason had been given for the production of the documents. Did the Minister of the Interior say that the right hon. gentleman as leader of the House, took any such ground ? No, Sir. Reference to the records of this House will show that the Minister of the Interior first, and then the right hon. Prime Minister, did not base their refusals of this motion upon any such reason. If I may be pardoned for reading a very short extract, I will refer to what the hon. Minister of the Interior said in his speech following that of the hon. member

for St. Antoine. As has been shown, he says that he has submitted this matter to his deputy and he reads a letter from the deputy which is duly on our records on page 1179 of 'Hansard'. I would refer to the fact that that letter is dated December 6, 1907. And, in a debate which came up on January 13 this is made use of by the minister as an absolute denial of the right of the hon. member for St. Antoine to the production of the papers for which he moved. And what position does the Prime Minister take upon that motion ? At the close of the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto, he uses these words, quoting the Minister of the Interior :

My deputy will be somewhat inconvenienced if these papers are brought down in the original form, and he asked me to refuse and I say to the House that I do refuse, and that the members shall not have these papers. Surely the Prime Minister will never subscribe to such a doctrine.

The Prime Minister says, at page 1183 :

I am sorry to have to say that not only have I no hesitation in endorsing the doctrine laid down by my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), but if the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) permits me to say so, I am very much scandalized by the argument he has just put forward.

And he says, at page 1184 :

If the hon. gentleman were to allege that he has reason to believe, as a member of this House, and alleges that a certain document has been tampered with that would be a very different proposition.

Did he make any remarks or inquiry such as, I submit with the utmost respect, is due to the hon. member for St. Antoine as to whether there were special reasons for the production of the documents if the reason for moving the motion were not sufficient ? He did not. He simply said to this House, as endorsing the speech of the Minister of the Interior, that the reasons for refusing access to these documents and the non-production of these documents in this House were decided before any hon. member in this House had an opportunity to speak and were decided by the Deputy Minister of the Interior on December 6th, 1906. That is in marked contrast with the words of the right hon. gentleman now, when he says that if the member for St. Antoine had stated his reasons the documents would have been produced without any hesitation. I merely drew this matter to the attention of the House to show that the right hon. gentleman has somewhat changed the position he took when this matter was under consideration on the 13th of this month. At that time he was prepared to back up his Minister of the Interior at all costs and at all hazards, and to refuse access to and production of those documents, in conformity with the letter of the Deputy Minister of the Interior dated on the 6th day of December, six weeks before the motion was made. He said in so many words that he endorsed the attitude of the Minister of the Interior in carrying out the advice of his deputy minister. Therefore the concluding words of the letter of the deputy minister are of great importance.

In regard to these papers, therefore, I would strongly urge that any attempt——

Any attempt, coupled with a reason or without a reason——

—to compel the department to produce the same should be resisted.

I ask, Sir, whether that is consonant with the right hon. gentleman's words here to-night thrice repeated, that if the hon. member for St. Antoine had stated any reasons the document would have been produced at once. I think, Sir, these two opposite positions of the Prime Minister present a very remarkable anomaly.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House went into Committee of Supply forthwith.

Progress reported.

On motion Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 22, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 78) to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting offensive weapons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. This Bill proposes to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting offensive weapons, in reference particularly to the discrepancies in, and the inadequacy of the punishment for offences against persons using or carrying same. It is proposed to amend section 120 of the Criminal Code by inserting therein next after the word 'air gun' in the third line, the words 'or any sheath knife, bowie knife, dagger, metal knuckles, revolver, razor, skull cracker, or other offensive weapons.' In section 2, subsection 24 of the Code 'offensive weapon' is defined but it does not cover the word razor. My contention is that any person who is discovered by a police officer with a razor in his possession without any justifiable cause has it with the intention of

commiting some indictable offence. He should carry a razor in his trunk or with his shaving brush, or in some such way as that, and not carry it around in his pocket.

The Bill proposes also to amend chapter 146, section 121, Revised Statutes of Canada, by adding at the end of the section the following :—

Or, on indictment, to a like fine or to imprisonment for any term not less than one year or more than five years, with or without hard labour.

Under the present law the imprisonment is six months. My intention is to leave it to the Justice, where a person is found guilty under this section, to impose a minimum penalty of one year or a maximum penalty of five years, with or without hard labour. Then this Bill proposes to amend section 123 of the Criminal Code by adding the words 'revolver or pistol' after the word 'shot' in the third line thereof ; and by adding at the end of said clause the words :

A revolver or pistol shall not be sold to any person unless the purchaser of same produces to and leaves with the vendor a permit in writing from the police magistrate, justice of the peace, or chief of police, allowing him to purchase such weapon.

The original section prohibits second hand shops or pawn shops, &c., from exhibiting certain weapons for sale, but, revolvers or pistols are not covered by that. I therefore propose to add a clause to cover 'revolvers or pistols.' It has been very truly said by some newspapers recently that a foreigner coming to Canada, seems to be under the impression that he is coming to a wild western country and that he needs a revolver ; he sees on all sides revolvers displayed for sale and thinks it the proper thing to buy one. The intention of my amendment is to prohibit the indiscriminate display and consequent purchase of revolvers.

The Bill also proposes to amend section 274 of the Criminal Code by adding the following subsection thereto :—

(2) Every one is guilty of an indictable offence who unlawfully wounds or attempts to wound or inflicts or attempts to inflict grievous bodily harm upon any other persons with any revolver, knife, stiletto, razor, or other offensive weapon; and upon conviction shall be punished with not less than two years or more than five years imprisonment, and in addition to such punishment shall also be sentenced to be whipped.

My proposal is to add to this section in the present code the words 'revolver, knife, stiletto, razor, or other offensive weapons.' The present code imposes a penalty of three years for an offence under this clause and this Bill proposes to make it five years. I would ask the hon. gentlemen who are concerned in the administration of the law in this parliament to pay some attention to these amendments, and if the Bill should go to Committee of the Whole other amendments which are necessary to the different sections might be added, or, I have no objections that my proposals may be changed if necessary in the direction of making the law more efficacious. I have no doubt in my mind that some legislation is necessary on the lines proposed by this Bill and is looked for and desired by the people.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 79) to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting assaults on women and children.

He said : The Bill proposes to amend section 292 of the Criminal Code by striking out the words 'two years' in the second line thereof and inserting after the word 'and' in the second line the words : 'in addition thereto shall be sentenced to be whipped.' That makes it obligatory to sentence the convicted person to be whipped, whereas under the code as at present it is not obligatory. Then, the Bill proposes to amend section 301 of the Criminal Code.

Section 301 of the said code is amended by inserting therein after the word 'and' in the second line, the following words, 'in addition thereto shall be sentenced.'

That is making in addition to the sentence already imposed a whipping obligatory.

Section 302 of the said code is amended by inserting therein next after the word 'and' in the last line thereof the following words: 'in addition thereto shall be sentenced.'

Section 302 applies to an offence of this nature against a girl under the age of 14 years, and the penalty imposed by the present clause is two years' imprisonment.

Section 291 of the Criminal Code is hereby amended by adding the words 'where the said offence is committed by a male upon a female, the penalty shall be a fine not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not to exceed one year, with or without hard labour'.

The purpose of this amendment is that by adding these words :

Where the offence is committed by a male upon a female, the penalty shall be a fine not exceeding $100 and imprisonment not exceeding two years.

Is to make a difference between a common assault upon a woman by another woman, or a man upon another man, and an assault by a man upon a woman or girl. Where the assault is by a man upon a female the sentence is increased.

Section 299 of the said code is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

2. Every one who commits rape on a girl under the age of fourten years is guilty of an indictable offence and shall, on conviction thereof, be sentenced to death.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 80) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. ALCORN. Hon. gentlemen will be aware that at the beginning of this session, as at the commencement of the last two sessions by the speech from the Throne, legislation was promised with regard to the election law of this country. Notwithstanding that fact no such measure has been brought down by the government, and it is therefore considered proper that a Bill should be presented with reference to that subject. The Bill which I have now the honour to present is one which deals with a large number of matters provided for by the Election Act.

The opening section is with reference to the matter of personal expenses of the candidates at an election. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the definition of personal expenses in the Act is extremely meagre. Having recourse to the Ontario statutes of 1898, 61 Vic., chap. 5, it has been sought to introduce into this Bill such further definition of the term 'personal expenses' as is afforded by that Act, and, therefore, it is here provided that personal expenses should include:

The reasonable and actual travelling expenses of such candidate, and the reasonable and actual expenses of his living at hotels or elsewhere for the purposes of and in relation to such election (not including expenses for treating);

2. A reasonable and bona fide rent or hire of halls or other places used by the candidate personally in which to address public meetings of electors; the like rent of committee rooms actually used; and the expenses incurred in heating, lighting or cleaning same when necessary;

3. Tolls on toll roads;

4. The reasonable, ordinary and actual hotel expenses of one speaker for each meeting (not including expenses for treating) who accompanies the candidate and speaks at a public meeting addressed by the candidate;

5. Reasonable charge for the hire and keep of horses and hire of conveyances (including boats) for the use of the candidate in travelling to and from public meetings, and in canvassing in the constituency; and reasonable and ordinary charges for the services and maintenance of a driver when one is employed or used by the candidate;

6. Reasonable charges for the use by the candidate personally of not more than one conveyance at the same time and the services of a person as driver on the day of the poll. The carriage of voters to the poll in such conveyance personally by the candidate shall not be a violation of this Act;

7. Reasonable expenditure by the candidate for postal, telephone, telegraph, express, cartage and public messenger service; for stationery, printing, bill posting and advertising; and for actual professional services performed;

8. And all other expenses which by this Act he may lawfully incur and pay.

Provision is added that the onus of showing that the personal expenses of the candidate are fair and reasonable rests on the candidate.

By the Act as it now stands any person who performs services or who has sold supplies for the purpose of the election or has done anything for which he has received payment with reference to the election is disqualified. Having recourse to the Ontario statute, it has been thought well to modify that to some extent and therefore this Bill provides that:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained the receipt of the ordinary and reasonable charges

(a) by the owner, possessor or caretaker of a hall or other place in which bona fide public or committee meetings are held, for the hire, heating, lighting, care or cleaning of the same;

(b) by toll-keeper for tolls on toll roads;

(c) by an inn-keeper for the lawful accommodation of a candidate, a public speaker lawfully accompanying a candidate, or of a driver of the vehicle in which they travel, or for the keep of their horses;

(d) by a printer for lawful printing or advertising in relation to an election;

(e) by a bill-poster for bill-posting done in relation to an election;

(f) by a regularly established livery-keeper for the hire of horses and vehicles lawfully used for the proper purposes of the election;

(g) by persons otherwise entitled to vote who perform services or supply to a returning officer in the ordinary course anything necessary for the purpose of enabling the returning officer to carry out the requirements of the Dominion Elections Act;

(h) by persons otherwise entitled to vote whose halls, rooms or places have been taken for use for a nomination meeting or for a polling booth;

(i) by an official agent of a candidate for his services as such official agent;

(j) by one clerk and one caretaker only, if actually and bona fide employed for the necessary and lawful purposes of an election, at each committee room actually used during an election, shall not disqualify the persons so receiving the same from voting, and shall not be held to be within the meaning of the disqualifying words of any oath which may lawfully be put to any voter at the polls.

None of these things shall disqualify the person receiving them from voting.

A further section proposes to amend section 67 with regard to the hiring any paying for teams and horses and carriages.

The change sought to be made is to introduce a provision with regard to bringing within the scope of the Act the providing of transportation by railway, tramway, boat, or vessel, free of charge, or at a diminished rate, by passes or the like, making these all unlawful acts. The candidate so offending is to forfeit $100.

A new feature is:

Every person by himself or by any one on his behalf demanding or receiving from any candidate or his agent or any person payment for the use of any horse, team, carriage, cab or other vehicle, or any boat, steamboat or other vessel for conveying voters as aforesaid, shall forfeit the sum of one hundred dollars to any person who sues therefor with costs.

The following section relates to writs of election and deals with the persons to whom the writs shall be addressed. It is sought to reintroduce the former practice of addressing the writs to certain provincial officials as returning officers. The provision is that the writs shall be addresed in Ontario to the sheriff or the registrar of deeds; in Quebec, to the registrar of any registration district or the sheriff of prothonotary of any judicial district in that province.

In the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, to any sheriff whose shrievalty includes the whole or any part of the electoral district for which such writ is issued; in the province of Manitoba to any sheriff; in the province of British Columbia to any sheriff; in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and in the Yukon territory to any sheriff, to a registrar or deputy registrar of titles or to a superintendent of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police.

Then if through lack of sufficient number of these officers, or their disqualification, inability or refusal to act, the writ cannot be addressed as provided by subsection 2 of this section, the Governor in Council (or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, where such officer may be nominated by him), may direct to whom the writ is to be issued.

If any person to whom the writ has been issued refuses or is disqualified or unable to act, the Governor in Council (or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery where such person has been nominated by him) may appoint another person to act as returning officer.

It is further provided that not more than one writ of election shall be addresed to the same returning officer at one time. This is to prevent what was done in the Nipissing case, which was discussed in this House a few years ago. It appeared that in that case two writs of election were issued and addressed to the same returning officer at the same time.

Then where any person other than a sheriff or other official mentioned above is appointed returning officer, he shall be a person who would be a voter in the electoral district for which he is appointed, if he were not so appointed.

Taking a provision from the Ontario Act I have provided that in case a writ has been issued to a person whose appointment is subsequently superseded, a new writ may be issued, or the new returning officer may act under the writ already issued as if the same had been addressed to him; and if valid proceedings have been had under the first appointment, the validity of such proceedings shall not be affected by the new appointment.

In the list of penalties, I have thought it desirable to propose this provision :

Every person who at a time when by this or any other act he is disqualified from acting as returning officer, deputy returning officer, election clerk or poll clerk, nevertheless so acts, he shall be disqualified from voting at any Dominion election during the period of seven years from the date of his first official act as such election officer and be also liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year nor less than six months with or without hard labour.

Hon. gentlemen must be aware that a great deal of difficulty arises frequently at the polls in knowing precisely what form of oath should be administered to a voter, and also with regard to the instructions which are issued by His Excellency to the election officer. I have introduced a group of sections with the view of meeting this difficulty under which the returning officer must provide a sufficient number of copies of the Act, having affixed to them copies of the instructions containing all the forms of oaths both provincial and federal which may be put in each province to an elector, such returning officer will send three copies to each deputy returning officer, namely, one for himself as at present, and two which will be hung up in prominent positions in the polling booth. He shall also furnish a sufficient number of detached copies of the instructions with accompanying forms of oaths so as to provide four of such copies to be given by the returning officer on the day of nomination to each candidate or his official agent, and four for use in each polling place. The effect of these provisions will be to remove all the present difficulty regarding the forms of oath by having a sufficient number of copies of the Act, instructions and oaths available for all persons and for all purposes at each poll.

I have introduced a provision to the effect that the instructions together with the forms of oaths therein referred to and the orders in council approving the same made conformable to the requirements of the Act shall be published in the 'Canada Gazette' within one month next after the coming into force of this Act, and thereafter when and so often as any change shall be made in the issue of such 'Gazette' next following the making of any order effecting such change. And within the first twenty

days of every session of parliament a copy of the instructions and accompanying forms of oaths then in force and of the orders in council relating thereto shall be laid before parliament.

Very much inconvenience is frequently felt owing to the want of knowledge as to who the election officers are to be—i.e. the deputy returning officers and poll clerks. The present Act requires notice to be given by the returning officer on application to him. I propose to compel the returning officer to send by registered post to each candidate and to his agent a list of all the deputy returning officers and poll clerks who will act in such election, six days before the election except in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon territory where a shorter time shall suffice.

It is also provided that except in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon territory, no person shall be appointed a deputy returning officer or poll clerk who is not a resident of and a voter in the municipality, parish or other local territorial division wherein the polling subdivision in which he is to act is situate or in the case of unorganized territory who is not a resident of and a voter in the electoral district.

And no person shall be appointed a deputy returning officer or poll clerk who has at any time been convicted of crime.

As the law at present stands, there are five constituencies, namely: Chicoutimi, Saguenay and Gaspé in the province of Quebec, and Comox-Atlin, Kootenay and Yale-Cariboo in the province of British Columbia, in which the deputy returning officers themselves fix the day of nomination and polling, and in which ordinarily the polling day is fixed at a date somewhat later than in the other electoral districts.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It is absolutely——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call hon. gentlemen to order. There is too much conversation going on to enable the House to hear what the hon. gentleman is saying.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It is absolutely impossible to hear the hon. gentleman on this side and I would ask him to speak a little louder. I heard him make some reference to my own constituency which I did not quite accurately catch.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is no reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should not permit hon. gentlemen on this side from hearing what is said.

Mr. ALCORN. Evidently the hon. member from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) did hear his own constituency alluded to. A group of sections has been introduced in this Bill for the purpose of making the polling day the one day throughout Canada, and that is to be effected in this way. I provide that in the cases of the five electoral districts I have mentioned, the writs of election shall be despatched to the returning officer in time to allow the lapse of 22 clear days between the day of their receipt by such returning officers and the day thereby fixed for the nomination of candidates. And the day so appointed in those five constituencies, shall be one week earlier than the nomination day in the other electoral districts. The effect would be that the returning officer will have fourteen days in which to perform his duties, i.e. to issue and post his proclamation and make other necessary arrangements. There will then intervene the eight clear days during which that proclamation must remain posted up in all electoral districts. He will also have fourteen days between the day of nomination and polling in which to distribute the ballot-boxes and other requisites for holding the poll and complete his other duties. If it be a fact, which I believe it is not, that in these five constituencies, owing to their area, the returning officer is to a large extent precluded from performing his duties within the time assigned in the case of other electoral districts, that difficulty will be removed by the scheme I have mentioned, namely, by giving him fourteen days both before and after nomination within which to do his work instead of the number he has at present. The governor shall name the nomination day and the polling day, and the polling day shall be the same day in those as in all the other electoral districts.

A clause is introduced with regard to printing ballots, namely, that the printer shall, upon delivery of the ballot papers to the returning officer, file an affidavit setting forth a description of the ballot papers so printed, the total number so printed, the number supplied to the returning officer and stating the fact that no other ballot paper was printed or remains in his possession or control. It is also provided that this affidavit will form part of the return and will go with the return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

In view of what has been known as the Lott-Sibley trick ballot boxes, a further section is inserted dealing with the opening of the poll; it provides that the deputy is to ascertain that the box to be used at the polling station is a lawful ballot box and contains no device by which a ballot paper might be secretly stored therein, or having been deposited therein during the polling might be secretly diverted; and he is to ascertain that the box is absolutely empty before it is locked and the public permitted to vote.

It has been much discussed whether a witness who has voted ought to be allowed to state for whom he voted. A clause has been introduced here, because of the difficulty experienced in getting at the bottom of election frauds on many occasions, allowing a witness to state how he voted, but not compelling him to do so. If he does so, the statement may be received in evidence.

Amongst the sections with reference to penalties it is sought to introduce one to the effect that any person being concerned in the printing of ballots who supplies a ballot paper or what purports to be a ballot paper, to any person other than the returning officer, shall be made subject to the penalty prescribed in section 25, and that there shall also be a penalty for any one who manufactures, imports into Canada, has in his possession, supplies to an election officer, or uses for the purposes of an election, any ballot box, containing mechanism by which ballots may be secretly stored therein or secretly diverted.

With reference to the secrecy of the ballot, it is sought in the case of any election officer, returning officer, deputy returning officer, poll clerk or constable to increase the penalty to imprisonment for 12 months and in the case of any other person who violates that section, a fine of not less than $200 or more than $300. It is also sought to disqualify every person who so offends.

We are accustomed to hear and particularly to read in the public press, assertions to the effect that certain great corporations own governments in this country and are able to affect the course of legislation in this House and in other legislative bodies. With a view to deal with that a clause is introduced providing that any corporation which shall give, pay, lend, contribute or expend any money to or for a candidate—

Mr. TALBOT. What about the corporations who own the opposition ?

Mr. ALCORN. Who own them ?

Mr. TALBOT. You spoke about the corporations who own the governments ?

Mr. ALCORN. My hon. friend will no doubt introduce a Bill to deal with that. Perhaps I cannot do better than read that clause to give hon. gentlemen an accurate idea of its scope.

No corporation shall directly or indirectly by itself or by any officer, director, or employee, or by any other corporation agency or person on its behalf pay, give, lend, advance, deposit, receive, transmit, forward, deliver or pay over or by any device contribute or expend or offer or promise or aid or facilitate the contribution, application, delivery, payment or expenditure of any money, property, security, or valuable consideration, or offer or promise to procure or to endeavour to procure any money, property, security, or valuable consideration to or for a candidate or to or for any person on behalf of any candidate or to or for any person in order to aid or influence the election or defeat of any candidates or in order to promote the success or defeat of the candidates or prospective candidates of any political party in Canada or in any electoral district in Canada, or in order to aid or defeat the objects of any organization, association or party maintained for political purposes in Canada.

2. Every corporation, which violates any of the provisions of this section shall forfeit the sum of $5,000 to any person who sues therefor with costs.

3. Every officer, director, or shareholder of any corporation which violates any of the provisions of this section, or who participates in, aids, abets, advises, consents to or acquiesces in any such violation, and any person who solicits or knowingly receives any payment, gift, loan, advance, deposit or contribution, prohibited by this section is guilty of the indictable offence of bribery and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, and shall also forfeit the sum of $1,000 to any person who sues therefor with costs.

4. Every person who directly, or indirectly, by himself, or by any person on his behalf, pays, gives, lends, advances, deposits, or by any device contributes, or expends, or offers or promises any money, property, security or valuable consideration, or offers or promises to procure or to endeavour to procure any money, property, security, or valuable consideration, to or for any candidate or to or for any person on behalf of any candidate, or to or for any person, in order to aid or influence the election or defeat of any candidate, or in order to promote the success or defeat of the candidates or prospective candidates, of any political party in Canada or in any electoral district in Canada; or in order to aid or defeat the objects of any organization, association, or party, maintained for political purposes in Canada, which or some part of which money, property, security, or valuable consideration, such person expects or intends shall be reimbursed, repaid, or replaced to him or any person on whose behalf or in respect to which or any part of which he expects or intends to be indemnified by or on behalf of any such corporation, or in respect of which or some part of which money, property, security, or valuable consideration, such person accepts reimbursement, repayment or indemnity from or by such corporation, is guilty of the indictable offence of bribery and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, and shall also forfeit the sum of $1,000 to any person who sues therefor with costs.

5. Every officer and every employee of the government of Canada or of any department thereof, every contractor with such government or with any department thereof (including the officers of a corporation contractor) to whom or whose assigns public money may as incident to such contract become payable, and every officer or employee of the government of any province of Canada or any department thereof who directly or indirectly pays, gives, lends, advances, deposits or by any device contributes, or offers or promises any money, property, security or valuable consideration, or who procures or solicits or endeavours or offers or promises to procure or solicits any money, property, security or valuable consideration to or for a candidate, or to or for any person on behalf of any candidate, or to or for any person in order to aid or influence the election or defeat of any candidate or in order to procure the success or defeat of the candidates or prospective candidates of any political party in Canada, or in any electoral district in Canada, or in

order to aid or defeat the objects of any organization, association or party maintained for political purposes, or who becomes the trustee or custodian of any money or property for any of the purposes aforesaid, is guilty of the indictable offence of bribery, are liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, and shall also forfeit the sum of $200 to any person who sues therefor with costs.

A further clause is introduced to this effect:

Every officer and every employee of the government of Canada or of any department thereof and every officer or employee of the government of any province of Canada, and every person who is ordinarily resident without Canada who acts before or during an election as the agent of a candidate in the management or control of his election, or as canvasser, locator, organizer, agent at a poling place, or in any capacity for on behalf of or in the interest of such candidate, at such election or in respect thereto, shall be guilty of an offence and liable upon indictment or summarily to a penalty not exceeding $100, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or to both in the discretion of the court.

By way of re-introduction of a Bill presented to the House in 1906, clauses are introduced dealing with the publishing of pamphlets during an election, intended to affect prejudicially the election of candidates. The clause then introduced is now re-introduced, together with one providing that every bill, circular, placard or poster having reference to an election should bear upon the face of it the name and address of the printer and publisher. Then with reference to attempts to bribe constituencies by promise of public works there is this clause:

Every person who, during an election, in order to induce or in such manner as might induce any voter or class of voters to vote for or against any candidate, or to refrain from voting, by public speaking, by any writing, or printed publication, or otherwise offers or promises to procure, or to endeavour to procure. the expenditure of the public moneys of Canada, within an electoral district or districts, on condition that electors procure the return of a particular candidate, is guilty of bribery.

This, it will be observed also deals with publications in the press. It has also occurred to me that the provision with regard to counting ballots at the close of the poll is extremely indefinite in the present Act, and it has therefore been thought well to introduce in place of section 172 the Ontario provision with regard to counting ballots. One effect of that will be to avoid the catastrophe which occurred in the South Wentworth election, Seeley vs. Smith, by which the returning officer having numbered the ballots got the whole of those ballots thrown out. The section sought to be introduced would contain this provision, inter alia:

No word or mark written or made or omitted to be written or made by the deputy returning officer on a ballot paper shall void the same, provided the number of ballots in the box agrees with the number of voters who voted, as shown by the poll book.

A series of clauses are introduced for the purpose of bringing into effect almost verbatim in this country the provisions of the English Act as regards returns of election expenses. Hon. gentlemen will be more or less familiar with the English practice in that regard. The sections are very lengthy, and I will merely say that a return the correctness of which is sworn to both by the candidate and by his official agent, is sent to the returning officer by the official agent of every candidate within a prescribed time. These returns will show in minute detail not only all moneys expended, but all moneys received, including the particular persons from whom, and time when all such moneys were received As to the expenditure the utmost particularity is required showing to whom, when and upon what account every dollar is expended. As in the English Act provision is made for the case where a man may be out of Canada at the time when the election return is due. Fourteen days are allowed after his return to Canada within which to make his declaration. Also if from any inadvertence or cause over which he has no control, the return is not filed within the prescribed period, he may make application to a judge who has jurisdiction to make an order excusing him and directing that such returns be filed within a time limited by his order. The remainder of the Bill contains the schedule, consisting of the form of returns of election expenses, and also of the statutory declaration to be made by the candidate and his agent.

Another subject dealt with by the Bill is the case of a member who has been returned for two or more electoral districts. In that case if there are in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery returns showing that that has been the case.

The member shall within thirty days next after the day on which a poll was last held in any such electoral districts, elect by a writing with certain attendant formalities for which of such several electoral districts he will sit.

Such writing shall be transmitted to the Speaker, but if there is no speaker, or if the member be himself the Speaker, then and in either of such cases transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Upon receipt by the Speaker of this writing a vacancy shall ipso facto exist in the representation of the electoral district for which such member was elected and for which he shall not so elect to sit.

In case the member shall refuse to elect and shall have consented to his nomination in one only of the electoral districts for which he

has been so returned, a vacancy shall ipso facto, arise on the expiration of the above period of thirty days, in the representation of the electoral district, and in each of the electoral districts for which such member shall have been so elected, but to his nomination in which he did not so consent. If the member consented to his nomination in all or in none of the several electoral districts from which he has been returned, a vacancy shall *ipso facto* arise in all the electoral districts from which he has been returned other than in that the return from which first reached the clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Provision is then made preserving the rights of all persons who may have title to petition against the return of the member for any of the divisions for which he has been so returned, and a clause is added to the effect that upon the receipt of every return the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall endorse in handwriting upon that return its proper consecutive number of the day, hour and minute that it is received.

I have the honour to move the first reading.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I know it is not the custom to discuss a Bill when it is introduced. But I have heard all that my hon. friend has read of his Bill, and I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is in elections that we find how an election Act works out. Now in an election that is going on to-day, and where I had the honour of addressing the electors, I had occasion to observe the fact that there is not a clause in our present Election Act which shows what should be the qualifications of a voter, whether he should be twenty-one years of age, or a British subject. This leads to a great deal of confusion. The only thing I find which relates to that subject, is in form P, defining the qualification of electors. Hon. gentlemen will find that there are included in that form the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the Yukon Territory. It may be that we here understand what the clause means ; but the deputy returning officers, whether willingly or unwillingly, refuse to administer that form of oath to any voter, because they pretend that it only relates to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory. Under the circumstances, there remains nothing at all in the whole Act which shows what should be the qualifications of a voter.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is in the Franchise Act.

Mr. BERGERON. So I have told the deputy returning officers, but they will not use any thing else but this form ; and it is very hard, between nine o'clock in the morning and five in the afternoon to call in a justice of the peace to interpret the law. The deputy returning officers, whether through ignorance or ill-will, will not use any thing but this. If you remind them that there is a clause in the Franchise Act covering that point, they will answer that they have nothing to do with the Franchise Act. I now suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) that he should have a clause in his Act making it quite clear what are the qualifications of a voter in elections. Another thing which has been discussed very often in this House—I do not know whether my hon. friend has included it in his Bill—is the oath. There is no oath at all in the Act. A sheet is given to the deputy returning officer and until lately that sheet was the oath administered according to the law of the local legislature, but, as a matter of fact, it was an oath that meant nothing at all. As the law implies the oath we want is one to prevent the elector from polling his vote illegally. There is nothing in the oath to state whether or not a man is a British subject or twenty-one years of age. There is one clause in it which is supposed to have the effect of preventing corruption but which is very incomplete. I do not see why there should not be a complete oath printed in one of the forms which would make it necessary for the deputy returning officer to administer a proper oath. I do not know whether my hon. friend has thought of putting in a clause which would prevent a minister of the Crown from promising a county that if it elects a ministerial candidate it will get all it needs, while if it elects the other candidate it will be in the cold shades of opposition and it will not get any thing. I believe that this is high corruption and that there should be a clause that will prevent a minister of the Crown from acting in that manner. These are some of the suggestions I want to make to my hon. friend who has introduced this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRESENTATION OF PETITION.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Speaker, I would like, with the consent of the House, to introduce a petition. I may say that this is the last day and that the lawyer who had this petition in charge forgot that the House met at two o'clock to-day. This petition is also being introduced into the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is irregular and it cannot be introduced unless the House consents.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried.

Motion agreed to,

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ENGINE-HOUSE AT PICTOU.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. Who is the contractor for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway engine-house at Pictou, and what is the bulk sum of the contract therefor?
2. How much has been paid to the contractor to date?
3. What will be the probable total cost of the completed work, including site?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. E. A. Wallberg, bulk sum for work above rail base and foundation walls, $13,950.
2. At schedule contract rates for foundation, retaining walls, filling cribwork, sewers, piling, &c. $86,271.09. Total paid contractor, $100,221.99.
3. Expenditure for labour and material by the department outside of Wallberg's contract, $10,069.80 ; final estimate on account of contract, not yet paid, $10,719.71 ; site, $8,000 ; total cost of the above works completed, $129,111.50.

FISH HATCHERY ON LAKE WINNIPEG.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked :

1. Is the government aware that the large hatchery on Lake Winnipeg is idle this year on account of the failure to secure spawn?
2. Why was spawn not secured?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.
2. The matter is being investigated.

EXPENDITURES ON ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND MONTREAL HARBOUR.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked :

1. What has been the expenditure directly and indirectly for dredging in the St. Lawrence river and Montreal harbour from 1896 to 1907?
2. What has been the expenditure by the government from 1896 to 1907 in building docks at the harbour of Montreal?
2. What has been the expenditure by the govgovernment in building elevators at the harbour of Montreal from 1896 to 1907?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). As the answer to this question involves information to be obtained from more than one department I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) to put it in the form of a motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion.

FISHING LEASES BETWEEN LAKE SUPERIOR AND ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. To whom have fishing leases been granted since July, 1896, to January, 1908, between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, including James bay, Hudson bay and all northern waters?
2. How long do those leases run in each instance, and amount charged, specifying waters leased?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Coffey & Merritt, Winnipegosis, Manitoba : Sturgeon pound-net fishing in Cumberland and Namew lakes, including Whitney's Narrows. Term, 5 years from 26th of November, 1903. Fee, $200 per year.

Coffey & Merritt, Winnipegosis, Manitoba. Privileges in Cedar, Moose, Cormorant and Atikaneg lakes. Term, 5 years from 1st of April, 1905. Fee, $100 per annum.

F. H. Markey, Montreal (British American Fish Corporation, Limited). Privileges in Nelson river and tributaries, from west river to its mouth. Estuary of Nelson from Cape Tatnam to Owl river, extending three miles from shore ; also Hayes and Pigeon rivers in Keewatin. Also Great Slave lake. Term, 21 years from 19th of April, 1904. Fee, $10, per annum.

J. K. McKenzie, Selkirk, Manitoba, (Athabaska Fish Company, Limited). Privileges in Lake Athabaska and Lesser Slave lake. Term, 9 years from 1st of May, 1904. Fee $10 per annum.

Archibald McNee, Windsor, Ontario. From North Bluff, James bay, around James bay, to northern point of Moer's island, opposite the island known as Solomon's Temple, extending three miles from shore, and shoreward in tidal waters of all rivers. Term, 21 years from 1st of January, 1903. Fee, $10 per annum.

2. Answered by No. 1.

LAND REGISTERS AND STATE PAPERS OF LORD SELKIRK.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. In whose custody and control, and where are the original land registers and state papers of Lord Selkirk, for the period 1812 to 1835?
2. Are there copies or extracts from any portions of such land registers and state papers in the Dominion lands office at Winnipeg, known as land register 'B'?
3. Is there a copy of land register 'B' in the Department of the Interior at Ottawa?
4. Are such copies authenticated in any, and what manner, so as to be available as legal and historical evidence of their contents in the absence of the original Selkirk papers?
5. Is there any portion of the original papers alluded to of which the government has no copy?
6. If the original papers and registers are not in the custody and control of the government, is there any sufficient reason why they have not been obtained and placed in safe keeping on behalf of the Dominion? What is the reason, if any?
7. Is it the intention of the government to obtain the original papers?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The government does not know in whose custody, or under whose control, the papers in question are.
2. No.
3. Yes.
4. A formal declaration that the copy is authentic is attached, but the government is not aware of the legal effect of the declaration.
5. Yes.
6 and 7. As the papers in question are not the property of the government, the government has no authority over them.

COLD STORAGE PLANTS IN ALBERTA.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. How many cold storage plants are being constructed in the province of Alberta by government aid?
2. At what places are they being constructed?
3. What are the names of the persons receiving such aid?
4. In case such aid is being granted to any incorporated company, who are the persons constituting such company?

Hon W. S. FIELDING (for the Minister of Agriculture):

1. The government is not granting aid to any cold storage plants under construction in the province of Alberta. Some time ago an application for the bonus given under the Cold Storage Act, was made by the Edmonton Produce Company, of Edmonton, through Mr. T. S. Williamson, the principal member of the company. While the application was pending Mr. Williamson died and the department has not been advised whether or not the application will be further prosecuted by his representatives or associates.

2, 3, and 4. Are answered by No. 1.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—SOURIS BREAKWATER.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. Who is the contractor for the repairs to Souris breakwater, Prince Edward Island?
2. Has the work been completed according to specification, and passed by the inspector?
3. What was the total expenditure during 1907, and to date?

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

1. F. S. Macdonald.
2. Yes.
3. Total expenditure from 1st January, 1907 to date:

Contractor	$3,295 00
Inspector, advertising, &c.	178 30
Total.	$3,473 30

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. What has been the total cost of the construction of the Hillsborough bridge, Prince Edward Island, to date?
2. Have all claims for construction for said bridge been paid? If not, (a) what claims are outstanding, (b) for what work, (c) and what is the total amount of such claims?
3. Is it true that the government is arbitrating a claim for extras of M. J. Haney in construction of said bridge, and that Mr. Collingwood Schreiber has been appointed sole arbitrator?
4. What is the amount of said claim, and for what extras?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. $1,363,085.57, which includes substructure and superstructure of the bridge, also the approaches and completion of roads and floor for highway purposes.
2. No. (a) Claim outstanding from M. J. Haney for work on substructure and approaches thereto; Hugh MacDonald's claim for work on superstructure. (b) Answered in (a). (c) M. J. Haney, $393,821.04; Hugh MacDonald, $16,081.39.
3. Yes.
4. Answered above in No. 2.

EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. What was the total expenditure by the Department of Public Works in Prince Edward Island over the following periods 1873 to 1878; 1878 to 1896; 1896 to 1907?
2. What was the total expenditure by the Public Works Department in Prince county over periods 1873 to 1876; 1878 to 1882; 1882 to 1887; 1887 to 1891; 1891 to 1896; 1896 to 1900; 1900 to 1907, respectively?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The information extends over quite a long period and I would ask my hon. friend to put the question in the form of a motion for a return.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I call attention to an error in the question as printed. The first period should read from 1873 to 1878 and not to 1876 as printed. I do not think it is very difficult to answer the question in the form in which it is put.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It stands as a notice of motion for a return.

ST. PETER'S BAY MAILS.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked:

1. Was a contract entered into between the Post Office Department and H. Boswell Finlay for carrying the mails daily for four years from the railway station to the post office at St. Peter's bay? If so, what was the amount paid yearly under this contract?

2. Was a second contract entered into for carrying the same mails a second time each day? If so, who is the contractor and what is his remuneration?

3. Is he carrying out his contract now?

4. Are the mails now carried a second time daily?

5. Is it the intention to cancel the contract with Mr. Finlay? If so, on what grounds?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes. $120 per annum.

2. No, but on the advice of the inspector that the rate of payment to Finlay was too high the department decided to cancel the contract and invite tenders for a new contract to include a second service each day, which the department has been asked to provide.

The new contract was awarded to Barnaby O'Hanly at $100.16 per annum—$19.84 cheaper for the semi-daily service than was paid to Finlay for once a day service.

3. Yes, since 1st January instant.

4. Yes.

5. Answered by No. 2.

ST. PETER'S BAY POST OFFICE.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked:

1. Has the appointment of Mrs. Mary Finlay as postmistress at the head of St. Peter's bay been cancelled?

2. If so, for what reason and on whose recommendation?

3. Was an investigation demanded by a numerously signed petition?

4. Was the investigation granted? If not, why not?

5. When was Mrs. Mary Finlay appointed?

6. Was a petition forwarded to the Department or Mr. Hughes, M.P., asking that Mrs. Mary Finlay be retained in her position as postmistress?

7. If so, what was the number of signatures thereto?

8. Why was not the prayer of petitioners granted?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1 and 2. Representation having been made to the department that the head of St. Peter's bay post office was inconveniently located and should be removed to a more convenient site, near the bridge which crosses the bay and where it would serve the people living on both sides of the bay, it was decided to make the proposed change. The change in site involved a change in the postmastership and on the recommendation of Mr. J. J. Hughes, M.P., Mr. Barnaby O'Hanly was appointed as postmaster.

3 and 4. No petition for such an investigation was received at the department and no investigation was made.

5. On the 14th December, 1905.

6, 7 and 8. No such petition was received at the department.

Mr. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.).

I.C.R. COLD STORAGE CARS.

Mr. PAQUET asked:

How many cold storage cars, for the transportation of dairy produce, has the Intercolonial Railway got?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Railways). 112 refrigerator cars available for dairy and perishable produce.

TIGNISH POST OFFICE.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Was a petition received from the people of Tignish, Prince Edward Island, and surrounding district, for the placing of a fireproof safe in the post office there for protection of mail matter?

2. Will the government state the heading of said petition and the number of persons signing same?

3. What report was made to the department by the post office inspector?

4. Is it the intention of the department to grant the request of the petition?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. That in view of the large amount of postal business done through the Tignish post office the office in question should be supplied with a fire and burglar proof safe. There were 212 signatures to the petition.

3 and 4. The department having made full inquiry into all the facts came to the conclusion that there was no reason for deviating from its regulations requiring that postmasters in all but government buildings shall provide their own means of safe guarding the mail matter and other valuable matter passing through their hands.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. MONK moved for:

A return showing: 1. The present indebtedness to the Dominion government of the Montreal Turnpike Trust (a) on capital account, (b) for arrears of interest.

2. The amounts collected at each toll gate belonging to the said Turnpike Trust during the three years ending 31st December, 1905, 1906, 1907, respectively.

3. The names of all parties who have commuted their tolls during each of the abovementioned years, 1905, 1906, 1907, and the amount of the commutation money paid to the Trust in each case.

4. The amounts expended on each section or road division, under the control of the said Trust, during each of the said years, ending 31st December, 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively, and the contracts given out during each of the said years, with the name of the contractor and the date and amount involved in each case; and a statement in each case also as to whether the contract was awarded after tender called through the newspapers.

5. The amount paid out during each of the said three years, 1905, 1906, 1907, at each toll

gate for salaries of day and night guardians, and any other expenditure at each of the toll gates maintained.

6. The names of all parties holding passes for free use of the roads under control of said Trust, during each of the said three years above referred to, 1905, 1906, 1907, with a statement in each case of the reason why the pass was so granted.

7. The expense of the said Trust during each of the said years, for rent, salaries of the office, inside or outside service, giving name and remuneration of each official.

8. The actual present indebtedness in detail of the said Trust outside of its bonds due to the government of Canada.

9. The amounts collected by said Trust, year by year, since the 1st February, 1905, from municipalities under special agreements made as to their share pro rata of the bonded indebtedness of the Turnpike Trust.

10. The names of all those members of the Trust appointed or elected to represent the bondholders since the 1st July, 1896, with the date of the election in each case.

11. The amounts paid by the Trust to any of its members or officials during each of the said three years, 1905, 1906, 1907, whether as travelling or personal expenses, or indemnity for attendance or for any other reason whatever.

12. The name of the auditor of the Trust, and the date of the audit made of the company's affairs, in each of the said three years, 1905, 1906, 1907, respectively.

13. A copy of the agreements between the Trust and any municipalities on the Island of Montreal, by which the Trust ceded to said municipalities any portion of its roads, said copy to be certified by the president and secretary of said Trust.

He said: As the information must be obtained from the turnpike trust in Montreal, I would ask the Minister of Finance to press them for a return as soon as possible.

Mr. FIELDING. I will endeavour to do so.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of all correspondence, documents, resolutions and other papers, which have passed between the government of Canada, or any member of the government, and any railway company or any individual relating to the building of a railroad from any point in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta or British Columbia, to Fort Churchill or any point on Hudson bay.—Mr. Schaffner.

Return showing the advances made each year since July 1, 1904, to December 31, 1907, on account of travelling expenses to Hon. L. P. Brodeur and his private secretary and messengers, the date and amount of each advance, and the appropriation to which it was charged, the dates at which each advance was finally accounted for, and the dates on which any repayments were made to the Treasury, and the amount of such repayments, and all correspondence with the Auditor General's Department in connection therewith.—Mr. Foster.

Copy of all correspondence between the Department of the Interior and Jas. S. Waugh, Immigration Distribution Agent, subsequent to December 1, 1907.—Mr. Gordon.

Return showing on what dates since June 30, 1906, advances were made on account of travelling expenses to Hon. L. P. Brodeur, to Mr. Wiallard, his private secretary, and to Nap. Potvin, his messenger, respectively, for what amounts, and to what accounts they were severally charged; also, what refunds, if any, have been made on any of these several advances, and on what dates.—Mr. Foster.

Copy of all letters, correspondence, plans, surveys, estimates, &c., in connection with the proposal to open a waterway in St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, in the county of Huntingdon, from Lake St. Francis to the St. Louis river.—Mr. R. N. Walsh.

Copy of all orders in council, correspondence, memoranda, claims, accounts, agreements and other documents and papers of every nature and description from December 31, 1904, up to the present time, touching or relating to the claim of M. J. Haney, or any person or corporations, corporation or corporations in connection with the construction of the Hillsborough bridge in Prince Edward Island.—Mr. Barker.

Copy of all orders in council, reports, memoranda, correspondence, documents, plans, tenders and advertisements of every kind, nature and description relating to the proposed acquisition under lease of certain car work shops with railway sidings at Moncton, N.B.—Mr. Barker.

Copy of all orders in council, correspondence, evidence, memoranda and other documents and papers of every description relating to or touching the conduct of all persons who have acted as public administrator in the Yukon Territory, or who have had charge or control by reason of their official position, of the estate of deceased persons in the Yukon Territory. And a copy of all such documents and papers aforesaid as set forth and describe the action, if any, of the government in respect of any claims, charges or proposed proceedings against any such official in respect of his duties, acts or dealings as public administrator.—Mr. Lennox—by Mr. J. D. Reid.

Return showing the names and number of establishments being operated under the law and regulations of the 'Meat and Food Inspection Act'; when they were individually put under the operation of the Act; and the names and number of inspectors for each establishment.—Mr. Sproule—by Mr. Sam. Hughes.

Return showing how many fire extinguishers were purchased by the government for the different departments of the public service since the 30th of June, 1906, to January 1, 1908; from whom they were purchased, and at what price; and the total amount paid for the same.—Mr. Taylor.

Return showing what amount has been paid by the Dominion government for all purposes,

from 1st January, 1904, to 1st January, 1908, to the following papers: 'Alberta Star,' Cardston; Lethbridge 'Herald,' Macleod 'Advance,' Nanton 'News,' 'The Frank Paper.'—Mr. Herron.

WILEY CLAIMS AGAINST YUKON GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, reports, memoranda, evidence and other documents and papers of every description relating to the estate of the late Orrin Leonard Wiley or to the claim of Louise F. Wiley, or of her infant daughter, against the government or against Frederick T. Congdon as public administrator of the Yukon territory or otherwise as an official of this government, or to any charges against the said Frederick T. Congdon as public administrator or otherwise as an official or employee of this government.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that some time ago he moved a resolution covering a considerable part of the same matter. That return is now in course of preparation and in order to save duplication of work I would be very glad if he would add to this order:

Excluding therefrom any papers on the subject that may be included in the return ordered on the 13th instant.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be glad to accept the amendment to my motion.

Motion as amended agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF FISHERIES COMMITTEE.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved :

That in the opinion of this House it is advisable to appoint a select standing committee on fisheries.

He said : The purpose of this resolution is to secure the approval of the House for the appointment of a select standing committee on fisheries. We have now in this House Committees on Agriculture and Colonization, Banking and Commerce, Railways and Canals, Public Accounts, and a variety of other subjects, all I presume doing useful work ; but we have no committee to-day to which we can refer questions that arise from time to time regarding our fisheries. In the House of Commons in England there is a committee on trade, which under the rules of that House, includes fisheries. In the province of Nova Scotia, for 50 years, prior to confederation, there was a select standing committee of the legislature on fisheries. I suppose that the same was true of the other maritime provinces. But when the jurisdiction in regard to this question was handed over to this parliament in 1867, those committees were dropped and it is rather an extraordinary circumstance that we should have allowed forty years of confederation to pass without the appointment of a standing committee to deal with this question.

If the House will bear with me for a few minutes, I would like to refer to the great importance of our fishing industry and to the work that such a committee might be expected to do. My reason for detaining the House is that I desire to awaken in the country and among the members of the House a greater interest in this important question. In my opinion the people of Canada do not realize what an asset they have in their fisheries. Without doubt the Canadian fisheries are to-day the greatest and most extensive fisheries in the world. To begin with, we have an enormous coast line. On the Atlantic stretching from the Bay of Fundy to the Straits of Belle Isle, we have a coast line of some 5,600 miles. We have also an important coast line on the Pacific, not quite so important as on the Atlantic but still of vast importance, and if we consider that our country is washed by three oceans and that the coast line is greatly indented, we will not be surprised to find that we have a coast line in all of 12,000 miles. We have bays and inlets of the sea covering an area of 15,000 square miles; whereas in that part of the great lakes, under Canadian jurisdiction there is contained about 72,000 square miles. In addition to this we have lakes and rivers in all parts of this vast country and all these waters are more or less prolific of good food fish.

If it were necessary to remind the House of the great importance of this industry, I might refer to the growing volume of the halibut and salmon fisheries on the Pacific coast. The output of this industry in British Columbia grew in value in one year from $5,219,107 to $9,850,216.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Where is the market for that fish, mainly ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Boston is the great market for the halibut fishery. Enormous quantities of British Columbia fish go fresh to Boston and are distributed by the Fish Trust of the United States to the different cities of the United States. I question if there is any industry in Canada that shows such a growth as that in any one year.

I might also refer you to the great lobster industry of eastern Canada. We have on the eastern coast of Canada a practical monopoly of the lobster industry of the world. Lobsters, I understand, are confined almost exclusively to the Atlantic ocean. They were found a generation ago in considerable quantities on the coast of Norway, Scotland and other European countries, but I am told that they are scarcely to be found at all in those waters to-day. They were also found on the coast of the United States as far south

as Cape Hatteras, but there are very few lobsters found on the coast of New York state at present, or in fact on the coast of any of the New England states, except Maine. A certain quantity are still caught on the coast of Maine, but outside of a limited number caught in that state we have on the eastern shore of Canada a practical monopoly of the whole lobster business of the world. To give you some idea of the importance of this one branch of the fishing industry, I may say that it realized for the people of Canada during the last fiscal year the sum of over $3,500,000. I might also point out that the growth of the Canadian fishing industry since confederation has kept pace with the advance of the country in other respects. The output of the fishing industry of Canada at the end of each ten year term, has been as follows :—

Year.	Output.
1870	$ 6,577,391
1880	14,499,979
1890	17,714,902
1900	21,557,639
1906	26,272,485

1906 is the last year for which we have the statistics. From 1870 up to the present it has increased from $6,000,000 to $26,000,000 in value.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Could the hon. gentleman say whether there is a corresponding increase in the weight of the fish caught ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think so.

Mr. W. F MACLEAN. It was rather a diminution.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I will not say a diminution excepting in the case of lobsters.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is a discouraging feature.

Mr. SINCLAIR. A much larger price is obtained for the output at present than was obtained a number of years ago. I have not got the quantities before me. The output for the past year is credited to the various provinces in the following proportions.

Nova Scotia	$ 7,799,160
British Columbia	7,003,347
New Brunswick	4,905,225
Quebec	2,175,035
Ontario	1,734,856
Prince Edward Island	1,168,939
Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, which are grouped together	1,492,933
	$26,279,485

It is clear that the people of Canada have faith in this industry for, without very much encouragement from the government or any other source, they have continued from year to year to invest an increasing portion of their capital in the prosecution of our fisheries. The capital invested by our people in fishing vessels, boats and gear has increased every ten years in the following proportion:

1880	$ 3,936,582
1890	7,372,641
1900	10,990,125
1906	14,555,565

Showing that in twenty-five years the Canadian people have increased their investments in this important industry by over 350 per cent. This industry gives employment to a large population. It does not take much capital to start a fisherman. A boat and a supply of nets is about all that is required to begin with. It is the most democratic business in the world, as the ocean is free to all who are willing to get up early and work hard. In Nova Scotia alone this industry gives employment to over 25,000 men. Multiply that number of men by five, the average number of each family, and we have a population of 125,000 in that province alone depending on this industry. The total number employed in it in all the provinces for the year ending June 30, 1906, was 67,646 men, and including those employed in the lobster industry, largely on land, the total is 88,421.

It is also to be observed that the number of men employed shows a steady increase. While the farming population of the eastern provinces are steadily going west, the fishermen are much more apt to remain at home. In 1880 the total number of men employed in the Canadian fisheries was 60,657 while in 1906 the total number reached 76,100 ; and if we add those employed in the lobster industry, it amounts to 88,421.

In the prosecution of this industry in Canada we have a fleet employed, consisting of 1,439 fishing vessels, manned by 8,458 sailors. Our inshore fisheries, however, are prosecuted to a much greater extent than our deep sea fisheries. The former employ 39,634 boats manned by 67,646 men. The number of persons employed in the fisheries in the New England states, which is our chief rival, is about 23,000. They are equipped with 11,021 boats and 1,479 vessels, and the capital invested in these, including vessels, boats, nets and gear, is valued at 19,963,031. In the case of the United States, the capital invested per man is $868 as compared with $191 in Canada. According to the official reports, the average earnings of our fishing populations per man in our various provinces during the past year were as follows :—

Nova Scotia	$322
New Brunswick	338
Prince Edward Island	327
Quebec	183
Ontario	594
Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta	379

The average earnings of Canadian fishermen, taking all the provinces together, is $388, and the average earnings of the fishermen in the New England states is $519.

I have not included in this comparison the province of British Columbia, as the fishing is done in such a different way in that province that a comparison would not be a fair one.

The fisherman purchases more goods per capita than the farmer, and in that way contributes more to the revenue of the country. Our Canadian fisherman is a virile type of man, adventurous and hardy. His very calling requires courage and endurance. Having to fight the storms of the north Atlantic, having to win livelihood from the rough seas, he has necessarily to be both active and courageous and vigorous. And if the time should come ever when the British race will again have to fight for the supremacy of the seas, as they have had to do so often in the past, and if Canada is to do her share in maintaining that supremacy, it is from this class that we must draw the men for our future Canadian navy. We often hear it stated that Canada has a great destiny, that it is to be our task, under the British flag and in partnership with the other great divisions of the empire, to build up on the northern half of this continent a great Canadian state. Well, if we are ever to achieve this destiny, we must not confine ourselves to settling our broad prairies, tilling our soil, building transcontinental railways and working mines and factories, but we must hold our grip on the sea as well as the land. A generation ago it was the proud boast of Nova Scotia that her people owned more shipping, in proportion to the population of that province, than any other country in the world. We cannot make that boast to-day. Our ships are fast disappearing from the sea. Let us then not neglect our fishing industry lest it also should disappear like our coasting trade. It will be asked, can the state judiciously assist in developing our fisheries ? My reply is that it has been done successfully in Great Britain. The Scotch fishery board, under the direction and control of the Secretary of State for Scotland, has done a great deal to develop the fisheries of that country. Separate these classes and number them, first by encouraging the application of modern methods; second by disseminating scientic information and carrying on an educational campaign. As much as £10,000 has been voted in one year to defray the expenses of technical instruction on the fisheries.

(3) By insisting on inspection and proper packing and branding.

(4) By dividing the coast up into districts and providing the appointment of Local Fishery Boards from among the men who have an intimate knowledge of the requirements of the business.

(5) By reporting on and investigating injuries done by steamers to fishermen's nets and gear, and by assessing damages in such cases and compelling payment by the guilty parties.

(6) By ascertaining and reporting on the requirements of foreign markets and doing the work usually done by commercial agents.

(7) By experiments to ascertain the best model of fishing boat and the best kind of twine or fibre to be used in the manufacture of nets.

(8) By placing a public barometer at each fishing station, so that the fishermen may have warning of an approaching storm.

(9) By capturing fish alive and marking or tagging them, showing date and place, and then setting them free, so that, when they are recaptured, the fishermen may ascertain the frequency of their visits and the regularity of their return to the same waters and other useful information.

(10) The Scotch Fishery Board has even gone so far as to lend money from the public funds to assist fishermen to equip themselves with boats and fishing gear.

These are among the things that have been done during recent years by the Scotch Fishery Board. It is well known that the work done by this board has been eminently successful. One of the results is that capital has flowed in for investment in this industry. By reference to the public reports, it will be found that 38,000 men employed in the prosecution of this industry in Scotland have an equipment of boats, nets and gear of a value of $20,000,000 ; while for 76,000 Canadian fishermen there is an equipment valued at only $14,555,565. In other words, the equipment of the Scotch fishermen per capita is $527 while that of the Canadian fishermen represents a capital expenditure per man of only $191.

It is also pointed out that, the strict attention to inspection and packing, insisted on by the Scotch Fishery Board, has shown good results in a steady increase in prices and growth in sales of Scotch herring in the foreign market. It is a fact well known to the dealers that a barrel of herring packed under the inspection of the Scotch Fishery Board and branded by their officers will sell in the market of St. Petersburg or New York at from $10 to $12, while a barrel of Canadian herring, which is as good in every way, but packed without inspection and branding, will only bring, in the same markets, $6 or $7. I would like to commend this fact to the consideration of our hon. friends opposite who are now trying to raise an agitation in the province of Ontario against the inspection of Canadian canned meat. It is also interesting to note the expansion of the Scotch fisheries under the direction of the fishery board. By reference to the public report it will be seen that the advance in production of the herring cured and branded has been as follows:—

	Barrels.
In 1811	9,034
1831	414,574
1867	804,090
1902	1,803,159
1906	2,111,006

This is exclusive of a large quantity used fresh and smoked. The improvement in this system of inspection and branding has been so marked that the Scotch cured herring for many years has held first place in the great fish markets of the world. This one result is worth millions to the people of Scotland every year. A similar work has been done, under the direction of fishery boards in Norway and Holland and other European countries. Our fellow countrymen in Cape Colony are doing the same kind of work through their local government. They are paying special attention to the business phases of the fishing industry. For example, they are showing to the fishermen by actual experiment, the places where the fish are likely to be at certain seasons of the year. They are making maps of the bottom of the different bays along the coast of South Africa, and giving useful information of this kind and many other kinds to assist the fishermen in conducting their business.

The question for us in Canada is—Can we profit by the experience of these countries ? I submit that the matter is worthy of our very best consideration. Fishery boards, after the model of the Scotch board, may not be practicable in Canada. In my opinion, we should not commit ourselves to this proposal hastily. Our coast, as I have said is very extensive and sparsely settled, and the difficulty of finding a class of men who would properly represent the fishing interests and would give their time without remuneration to this work, as they do in Scotland, would have to be encountered. These circumstances, however, make the appointment of the committee that I am proposing all the more necessary. In my view, the work done by the Scotch Fishery Board might be done, here to some extent, by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I would also like to say that in any arrangement of this kind that is possible to be made in Canada, the ultimate control should be in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, just as the control of the Scotch board is in the Secretary of State for Scotland. The present administration has done a great deal to develop this important industry, but much remains to be done. I believe that no branch of the public service offers a greater field for special effort at the present time than our fisheries. The importance of our fisheries is bound to grow with the increase of our population. When we have twenty millions of people in this country, as we should have before many years, we should have a splendid home market for our fish. If we can improve the transportation facilities and reduce the express and freight rates, we can put this wholesome food within the reach of every Canadian family. Give us branch lines of the Intercolonial Railway touching at the principal fishing ports along the Atlantic sea-board in Nova Scotia, fair freight and express rates, and an up-to-date system of cold storage, and, instead of an output valued at about $6,000,000 or $8,000,000, within twenty years we should have an output of $20,000,000. There is practically no limit to the possible expansion of this industry unless it is the market, and in a rapidly-growing country like ours, the market will always be improving. There is no call to be despondent in regard to the fishing industry, and I may say that our people are not despondent. On the contrary, the most hopeful feeling prevails among them. Permit me to read an extract from a recent article by Mr. C. H. Whitman, of Canso, Nova Scotia, in a Halifax paper, which is a good illustration of the way our people regard this industry. Mr. Whitman says :

> The fisheries of these provinces are not a failure, they are but in their infancy. Let the same intelligence and courage that have given to Nova Scotians a world-wide reputation on sea and land be applied to the solution of our fisheries and we need not fear for the result. We are ready to predict that the time is not far distant when the descendants of the men who carried the British flag on Nova Scotia ships into every port in the world will demonstrate their ability to make their conduct of our North Atlantic fisheries the envy of our neighbours and a source of pride and satisfaction to every patriotic Canadian—when Canadian ship-yards will be called upon to build and Canadian fishermen to man a fleet of fishing steamers and fishing schooners and fishing boats far and away in advance of anything we have now afloat, and the fishing fleet of Great Britain shall find itself reproduced and improved upon in the ports of Nova Scotia.

Among the expenditures of the present administration for the development of our fisheries that have brought, and are now bringing, good results, I might mention the following :

(1). The assistance given towards providing cold storage for bait. The results in this respect have been most important. Bait this season on certain parts of the coast was a complete failure, but the fishermen in many localities were in a position to continue their work by using last year's supply kept over in the cold storage warehouses assisted by the government.

(2). The propagation of lobsters which already is giving good results and in a few years will return to our people a hundred fold for every dollar expended.

(3). The improved transportation facilities, refrigerator cars and fast freight trains provided by the Intercolonial Railway, which has enormously stimulated the trade on the

Atlantic sea-board wherever it is within reach of the railway, and enabled our dealers to compete with the Gloucester fish merchants in the Montreal market.

(4). The subsidies granted by the Department of Trade and Commerce to coasting steamers employed in collecting fresh fish and delivering them to the Intercolonial at Mulgrave and Halifax, thus making it possible to carry on a fresh fish business at the points reached by these boats, and at the same time furnishing profitable business for the Intercolonial Railway.

Permit me to give an illustration. Prior to 1896 the merchants and fishermen of Canso, Port Hood and Petit de Gras and some other points on that coast were unable to carry on successfully a fresh fish business at those places for lack of communication with the Intercolonial at Mulgrave. The matter was brought to the attention of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and a subsidy was brought to the attention of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and a subsidy was voted to establish a daily steamship service with Mulgrave. The business at once began to expand and has made steady growth ever since, until last year it reached the value of over $220,000, and paid to the Intercolonial Railway, on the one article of fresh fish alone, over $29,000 in freight. The following table shows the growth made in this business, at this one point alone, from 1896 up to the present time.

Year.	Tons of Fresh Fish Shipped from Mulgrave.	Value.	Freight and Express Rates Paid.
	Tons.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1896	900	73,000 00	6,460 00
1897	997	77,600 00	9,596 00
1898	1,415	99,050 00	11,312 83
1899	1,353	94,710 00	14,493 00
1900	1,450	100,000 00	16,500 00
1901	1,900	133,000 00	19,760 00
1902	1,800	126,000 00	18,720 00
1903	1,600	112,000 00	16,840 00
1904	1,700	127,500 00	17,680 00
1905	2,201	164,070 00	23,032 06
1906	3,154	220,780 00	29,063 01
1907	3,156	220,920 00	27,417 70

Showing a growth in quantity, owing to the facilities given, from 900 tons to 3,154 tons, and in value from $73,000 to $220,000. Now, Sir, what has been done at Canso, and Petit de Gras and Port Hood can be done at other points on the coast if the same facilities are afforded.

(5). The construction of wharfs and breakwaters along the coast where many thriving villages have been built up and business developed and our young men induced to remain at home instead of seeking employment as formerly in the fishing vessels of the New England states. If my hon. friend from North Toronto will do me the honour to visit my constituency I will show him the splendid results that have come from those breakwaters that he so vigorously condemned. If he could only see those prosperous villages for himself and note how the trade of these places has expanded and how much sounder these fishermen sleep knowing that their boats are safe behind the breakwater and that there is no danger of them being found in splinters on the shore in the morning. I am sure that his better nature would prevail and that this year he would make no more opposition to these improvements than he did last year to the large sum that we voted for improving the harbour of Toronto.

If I might be permitted to venture any criticism on the Department of Marine and Fisheries in so far as the fisheries are concerned, it would be that it has to some extent got into a rut. There is too much red tape—too much tendency to multiply regulations and not enough attention paid to the practical phases of the business. The Canadian fishery officer has developed into a kind of detective. It is not the fault of the officer, but of the system. He is not asked or expected to concern himself with any plans for assisting the fishing industry. I have pointed out some of the numerous ways in which the Scotch fishery officer is expected to direct his energies. It would seem that the principal duty imposed upon the Canadian fishery officer, apart from the routine of his office, is to watch the fisherman and fine him for infractions of the law. Detective work is useful in its place but there are other things.

I will venture to say that it is a very unusual thing for a fisherman on any part of the Canadian coast to consult a fishery officer or seek information from him about his

business. The officer of the Agricultural Department who runs the travelling dairy or inspects the fruit, is always welcome when he makes his tour through the country. I recollect well when the Department of Agriculture had the benefit of the services of Prof. Robertson, and when the visit of that gentleman through my province was a source of inspiration and assistance to the farmers. The same relations should exist between the fishery officer and that class of our population that he is paid to serve.

I do not wish to be understood as reflecting in any way upon the present minister. I am sure that every man in this House on both sides has the most implicit confidence in him. During the short time that he has occupied the position he has done splendid work, especially in the marine branch of the service. The defects in the fisheries branch were handed down to him by his predecessors and are as old as the department itself. I have every confidence that the minister will find some way of lifting it out of the rut and placing it on a higher level.

The usefulness of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is to some extent handicapped by the fact that the seat of government is 1,000 miles distant from the fishing grounds on the eastern coast and 2,000 from the west. There is accordingly little opportunity for the officers of the department here to become acquainted with the views and needs of the men engaged in prosecuting the industry, and I submit that a standing committee of the House could do much to bring them closer together and create a better understanding. It is also clear that a committee composed of members of this House from the various provinces meeting here year after year would be a sort of centre for the collection and dissemination of useful information in regard to this important industry. This kind of work has been done for some years with considerable success by the Committee on Agriculture and there is no reason why the same kind of useful work could not be done for this other industry by a committee on fisheries. In my motion I have asked for a committee on fisheries alone. Permit me to suggest to the minister the advisability of including marine as well. We have now before this House a number of Bills—we have at least three that I recollect that might very well be referred to such a committee. There is the Bill now before the House of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) relating to the nationality of master mariners, second, the Bill of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) relating to coasting voyages, and third the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) relating to marine engineers. Such questions as these are arising in the House every year and in a maritime country like ours they will continue to arise and there is no more convenient way in which they can be dealt with than by referring them to a committee such as I am proposing. I therefore beg leave to move that this resolution be adopted.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Mr. Speaker, I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has not any very serious objection to the passing of this motion and on that account I feel that I ought to preface my remarks by apologizing for taking up the time of this House. We all recognize the fact that too much of the valuable time of the House is spent in discussing academic questions and in treating of matters about which there should be no controversy or contention whatsoever, but the importance of this subject is my excuse for asking to be permitted to offer a few remarks this afternoon. The subject is of such importance that I consider no words of apology or excuse are necessary for the few moments I intend to take up the time of the House. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without placing myself on record as being in hearty sympathy with that great, very important and very deserving class of our population, the fisherman of Canada. The time that will be taken in the consideration of anything that will tend to the conservation of our fisheries and the improvement and betterment of our fishermen, is time well spent by this government and by the House. As to the necessity of this committee, my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. Every one who has served on that committee knows the good work that is there done. It is the means of bringing together agricultural and other experts and of getting their views on the subjects that interest and concern the farmer, who is, after all, the backbone of the country and it is the means of causing a great deal of useful knowledge and information to be disseminated throughout the country. These men meet, exchange views, ascertain local conditions and are in a position to improve the conditions of farmers throughout the country generally. Their efforts are not limited to the betterment of local conditions. That committee in short is one that has done an immense amount of good for the vast farming interests of our country and has also very materially assisted in shaping and directing and even checking if you will, the policy of immigration. I need not enter into any argument to justify the establishment and continuance of that committee. Its work speaks for itself. What has been done by that committee for the farmers, I submit, can be done by a similar committee for the fishermen of the country. The fisheries

are of the very greatest importance, as has been remarked by my hon. friend from Guysborough, and the fishermen are well deserving of anything that this government or any other government can do for them. They are an industrious, energetic, hard-working, honest class of people where brawn and muscle, intelligence and endurance are required in the exercise of their calling. The fishermen, as has been remarked by my hon. friend from Guysborough are large contributors to the revenues and the wealth of the country and they are deserving of any assistance and encouragement that the government can give them. I am pleased to observe that this government has not been unmindful of that class and that it has done considerable to help it. The matter of cold storage or bait freezers has been referred to by my hon. friend from Guysborough. The assistance given in that direction has been of incalculable benefit to the fishermen, who are enabled thereby to obtain bait at all seasons of the year to catch fish when fish are going and thus make profitable an industry that would otherwise be a very precarious one. Reference has also been made to the boat harbours, breakwaters and wharfs that have been constructed and maintained by the government for the purpose of enabling the fishermen to prosecute their industry with greater facility and convenience. I endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough as to what should be the attitude of the opposition when they come to consider the votes and appropriations submitted for the improvement of the condition of the fishermen, for the building of breakwaters and wharfs along our coasts. Too many hon. gentlemen in this House think that this money is wasted, that this money is frittered away; but if they would reflect for a moment who are they that are benefited by these boat-harbours, wharfs and breakwaters, if they would consider how important an asset the fisheries of the country are to the people of Canada, and if they would only bear in mind the fact that it is impossible to prosecute the fishing industry on the shores of the Atlantic without these breakwaters and wharfs, they would be less caustic in their remarks in criticising these appropriations. Honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House would do well to consider and take to heart the arduous labours and hazardous occupation of the toilers of the sea who furnish food for the rich man and poor man alike; and if they do, we shall hear less of government effort to corrupt and debauch the electorate by useless expenditures of public moneys in building these public works.

I might also refer to the fact that the improvement of the system of transportation that we have in this country has been of incalculable benefit to the fishermen. It enables him to place his product on the markets of the world in a better condition and in a shorter time and, therefore, to obtain more remunerative prices for his fish. I might also refer to the fishing bounty that it is only comparatively trifling, but it is a matter that the fishermen appreciate and are thankful for. Further, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that last year the fishermen were well remembered when it came to the revision of the tariff. Twine and other articles entering into the business of the fisherman were placed on the free list, or the duty was materially reduced and in that way the fisherman was recognized and favoured.

But, I submit that a great deal more can be done for our fishermen than already has been done. I had occasion to remark a moment ago that the fishing industry in Canada is one of our leading industries. In 1905 the value of our fisheries was $26,250,000, including fishing products. In our Statistical Year-book for 1904 I find that the value of fisheries that year was $23,500,000. Nova Scotia led that year among the provinces in the value of the fisheries, the value being $7,250,000, or about one-third of the total fisheries of Canada. British Columbia in that year came next with $5,250,000. My hon. friend from Guysborough has grown very optimistic in view of the fact that to-day the value of our fisheries has increased, but I am afraid that the facts will not altogether bear out the bright picture he has painted. As I look over the statistics I find that while the value of the fisheries has increased the quantity has decreased, and it seems to me that there is a decrease going on that will ultimately, unless something is done by this government or otherwise to change the conditions that now exist, result in the depletion of our waters and the extinction of our fisheries. But, mark you, whilst the quantities have decreased, the value has increased, the prices that have been obtained in the last number of years by our fishermen have largely increased, and in that way the business is more profitable than ever it was. I have tabulated some figures from the Statistical Year-book of 1904 just for the purpose of comparison. The Year-book for 1905 was not at hand at the time I collated these figures. But as the figures are only for the purpose of comparison, the later figures are not of very material importance.

These figures show the catch of the various kinds of fish in the years 1900 and 1904 in round numbers as follows :—

	1900.	1904.
Dried cod..	571,000 cwt.	516,000 cwt.
Fresh haddock ..	7,750,000 lbs.	5,250,000 lbs.
Dried haddock ..	103,000 cwt.	80,000 cwt.
Fresh haddock ..	1,500,000 lbs.	1,000,000 lbs.
Fresh herring ..	9,750,000 lbs.	5,000,000 lbs.
Salted herring..	82,500 brls.	59,500 brls.
Fresh mackerel.	3,750,000 lbs.	2,500,000 lbs.
Salted mackerel.	58,500 brls.	21,500 brls.
Fresh salmon ..	750,000 lbs.	500,000 lbs.
Lobsters	202,000 cwt.	146,000 cwt.

Comparing the figures for 1900 with the figures for 1904, there would seem to have been a most lamentable falling off in the quantities of fish taken. I would warn the House, however, that these figures may be to some extent misleading ; they are a good deal like the figures that hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes present to this House when they undertake to show that the present administration has increased the taxation of the country that the people of this country pay more per capita to-day than they did during the Conservative régime. The figures are all right but the conclusions sought to be drawn from them are not justified. So it is with the statistics I have just given. The inference to be drawn from them at first blush is illogical and inaccurate. For instance, in 1901 the catch of fresh haddock was 4,700,000 pounds and in 1905, 10,250,000 pounds ; in 1901 there were 68,000 barrels of salted herring and in 1905, 78,000 barrels, while in 1903 there were 5,000,000 pounds of fresh mackerel as against 2,500,000 pounds in 1905. Therefore, from a glance at these figures and comparing 1900 with 1904, you cannot arrive at the certain conclusion that the quantity of fish is declining or that the decrease has been as great as the figures would suggest. However that may be these figures do disclose a condition that may well cause alarm to those whose livelihood depends on the fishing industry as well as to every Canadian no matter what his avocation may be who has the welfare of his country at heart. In the United States they have had to deal with the depletion and threatened extinction of the fisheries, particularly the lobster fisheries, and they adopted certain regulations which were regarded by the fishermen at the time as very drastic. In the state of Massachusetts the catch of lobsters fell from 1,612,000 in 1890 to 426,000 pounds in 1905, a decrease in the latter year of about one-quarter what it was in the former year. And mark you, this decrease occurred notwithstanding the use of improved apparatus for catching fish and the greater incentive to pursue the industry because of the increased demand and the enhanced price. What is true of the lobster fishery is true of other fisheries except, as to the extent of the decline. In looking over the Massachusetts public document for 1905, volume 12, document 25, I find the following with regard to the lobster fisheries :—

Reports, official and from the press, from the Straits of Belle Isle to the Delaware capes, the entire lobster producing coast, are well nigh unanimous, both that the number of lobsters is decreasing and that the average size of the lobster is gradually diminishing.

Then, again, Professor Prince, our Canadian commissioner of fisheries, who has given the lobster fishery a good deal of attention, wrote as follows in 1896 :—

In the Dominion of Canada there remains the last great lobster fishery of the world, and it is not too much to say that this fishery has reached a critical stage. . . . Ten years ago the average size of lobsters was 10 inches (2 pounds weight) while 30 years ago an old fisherman testified that 13 inches (3½ pounds weight) was the average.

If Professor Prince had an opportunity of knowing the size of the lobsters that have been taken in recent years, in violation of the law, I regret to say, I wonder what picture he would draw of the present condition of our lobster fishery. In 1903 the government of Massachusetts appointed a committee to investigate the question of the fisheries not only on the eastern coast of the United States, but on the entire Atlantic coast. On that committee were appointed men of eminent ability for the work, and among them were the most noted scientists connected with the United States fishery bureau. On page 181 the result of their investigation is summed up in the following conclusions :—

As a result of our investigations we are of the opinion that there has been a decided decrease (1) in the number of lobsters living today as compared with ten years or even one year ago; (2) in the average size; (3) in the number caught per pot; (4) in the number of lobsters of breeding age; (5) in the aggregate number of eggs laid upon which the future of the lobster depends, there is (6) marked evidence of the absence of lobsters from extensive areas where they were formerly numerous.

In a work entitled 'The Potential riches of British Columbia," Mr. J. B. Clearihue treats at length of the condition of the salmon fisheries in that province, and says :

About a year ago a commission was appointed by the Dominion government to report on the fisheries of British Columbia, and the evidence taken by them goes to show that the very important industry of salmon canning is decreasing, notwithstanding the greatly improved fishing methods of to-day; and that this decrease is due to the failure of the salmon to reach their spawning grounds in the upper rivers. This industry can yet be saved and even increased if radical changes are wrought in the Fisheries Act, limiting the number of fishing licenses, the size and use of nets, the fishing limits and by increasing the hatcheries and the close season by a few hours each week. Large quantities of fish enter the small streams on the west coast of Vancouver island and along the mainland, where little or no fishing takes place. If hatcheries were placed here the increase would be at once felt.

It would seem that not only the lobster fishery is threatened with extinction, but that our salmon fishery is also in jeopardy. It is generally admitted that the quantity of lobsters is decreasing, that the size of the lobster is diminishing, that the increase in price is constantly advancing, and this being

universally admitted it might be asked why I should labour the question. Well, to those who are not so blessed by Providence as to live on the sea coast, to those who belong to the great inland provinces it may be that this alarming state of affairs has not impressed itself upon their attention with sufficient force to enable them to realize its consequences. I have therefore at the risk of wearying the House, drawn attention to the conditions of affairs as they exist. As Canadians, those who belong to the inland provinces are interested in the question because as I understand it the fisheries in the great lakes are in a very dangerous position, although perhaps not in so perilous a condition as the fisheries on the Atlantic coast. That being so the magnitude of the danger must be pointed out so that a remedy may be devised commensurate with the case. If we had this committee on fisheries such as is proposed, what would be the result? I submit, Sir, that it would be the means of disseminating a great deal of useful information in relation to our fisheries; it would be the means of starting a propaganda of education among the fishermen so that when regulations are passed these regulations would be observed, and not only observed by the fishermen but that the fisheries would be jealously guarded by the fishermen themselves. At present the regulations are not by any means properly observed; the fishermen do not see the necessity of these regulations, they do not realize that their enforcement is to their interest, to the interest of the country, to the interest of their children and to the interest of the people of Canada as a whole. It is sometimes said that our fishermen are improvident, that they are a class of men who will take the last fish out of the water to-day irrespective of what may happen to-morrow, that they go on the principle of 'let posterity look after itself, posterity never did anything for us.' I deny that. The fishermen of the maritime provinces, and I think of Canada as a whole, are as public-spirited, as patriotic, and have as due regard to the duty they owe themselves, to their children and to their country, as in any other class in the land.

I say that what is needed is mainly education. Let the fishermen understand the situation. Let it be pointed out to them that it is to their interest to have these regulations which are made from year to year by the government observed, and they will be only too glad to join hand in hand with any one desirous of enforcing the regulations.

If we had such a committee as is proposed by my hon. friend, we would derive greater benefit from the work of the expert officials of the departments. We have to-day these fishery experts in the fishery department, no doubt men who thoroughly understand the work to which they are assigned, men who have made a life study of the duties which they are called upon to perform, but it seems to me that we do not get the best out of them. They are looked upon by some people in this House and certainly by many outside of this House as a sort of fish autocracy. I read in a paper recently a reference to this fish autocracy, and the officials of the department who have to do especially with the fisheries of Canada were spoken of as martinets, &c., I do not believe that is right, I believe these officials are anxious to do their duty; they are desirous of helping out the fishermen in their precarious occupation, desirous of preserving the fish. They are honest, sincere and faithful in the discharge of their duty, as they see it. The great trouble is that with our system we cannot bring out the best that is in these officials. If we had this committee on fisheries, it would be the means of keeping these men up to the mark, it would enable them to better realize local conditions and to understand just the condition under which the fisherman is operating and the hardships to which he is exposed. With such a committee, composed among others of men representing constituencies where fishing is an important industry, these experts could be made more useful to the fishermen generally and the country at large. As I said, what is needed is education on the subject of fisheries. How many people outside of this House, who have not made a special study of the subject, know that a lobster grows rather slowly, and is at least four or five years old before reproduction begins, that the natural rate of reproduction is slow, one litter of eggs being produced under favourable conditions every two years instead of annually, that lobsters are not migratory as the mackerel are, the only migration being from deeper to shallow water during the period when eggs are hatching, in June and July. Give the fishermen the benefit of the knowledge of the character and habits of the different fish, educate him on the subject, satisfy him, convince him that this, that or the othe regulation which to him at first seems an injustice, is really for the welfare of the industry in which he is engaged, is in the interest of himself and his children, and he will cheerfully comply with any law or regulation that may be passed or imposed. At present we have laws and regulations regarding the fisheries which seem more honoured in the breach than in the observance. You must proceed in this matter as you would in the case of any sumptuary law—lay the foundation by first educating those to be affected by such law or regulation as to the necessity of it.

While this government has done a great deal for the fishermen, when we contrast the condition of the miners and farmers with that of the fishermen, we see that a

great deal more could be done for them. In Nova Scotia, thanks to the work of the local government there, the condition of the miner is really enviable. Mining schools have been established, technical schools, wherein the miner can receive an education in the higher branches of his work ; regulations respecting the ventilation of the mines and the hours of work have been passed ; in fact the intellectual advancement and the physical comfort of the miner have been particularly looked after by the province of Nova Scotia and, as I said, the mining conditions down there are really among the best in the world.

Then look at the condition of the farmer. Too much cannot be done for the farmer ; no one can say that the farmer is not entitled to all the assistance that can be given. We have travelling dairy schools, a school of agriculture, where the farmers' sons can receive an education and learn to thoroughly understand that noble calling ; we have also model orchards and model farms established through the country. In addition to all this we have experimental farms and a generous encouragement to agricultural societies and farmers' associations throughout the land. Now, when you come to consider the position of the miner and farmer on the one hand and the fisherman on the other, you will see that, comparatively, very little has been done for the fisherman and I think that a great deal more could be done. Such a committee as has been suggested, will evolve the means of solving the difficulties that present themselves and will enable the best means to be devised to assist the fishermen. I do not believe in too much paternalism, but there are conditions where paternalism becomes almost a necessity. I venture to think that incalculable good would be done by the creation of such a committee as has been proposed by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and I cheerfully support his motion, believing as I do that it will meet with the hearty approval of the fishermen throughout Canada and that it should receive the approval of every man in Canada.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.) I wish to say a few words in support of the resolution. I very strongly approve of a committee of this kind being appointed. Officials of the fisheries branch of the department will themselves admit that they have not all the information on this subject that might be obtained. The members from the fishing districts of the maritime provinces have occasion to frequently go to that department to present their views and requests, and I have been informed and I believe it to be true that these opinions and requests are found to contain a great variety of ideas. If we had a committee of this kind before which the members interested in this subject could go and discuss all these matters, have them threshed out so that they could go to the officials of the department of fisheries with concrete views, I believe that these views would then have very much greater importance and would in all probability receive a better hearing and would produce better results.

One thing would be of great importance to the fishing interests of this country if it could be brought about. It has been touched upon by the mover of this resolution and the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. William Chisholm). That is more education among the fishing population in regard to their own calling. The fishermen of the maritime provinces as a class I think look upon the overseers, the men who are appointed to enforce the regulations in regard to the fisheries, as unsympathetic, as their enemies in fact. It would be an important thing if that condition of affairs could be changed and I know of no better way of doing that than for the department to have the services of some man who had a scientific and practical knowledge of the business who would go among the fishermen, hold meetings and explain to them the reasons of the regulations which are made, explain that these regulations were not against the fishermen or their calling, but the very reserve ; that these regulations were made to preserve and perpetuate the industry and were more important to them than to any other class of the community. If the department could obtain the services of such a man as Prof. Robertson was to the Agricultural Department, to go among the fishermen, to get their sympathy, and to get what is more important still, their co-operation in the carrying out of the regulations made especially in their interests, great and lasting good would result.

Another thing that is very important to the fisherman, particularly to the fisherman of Prince Edward Island, is the improvement of transportation facilities. In that province, we simply cannot carry on our trade in the fresh fish business, unless this question is taken up and a great improvement made. Really, I think, the province of Prince Edward Island, according to its size, is perhaps the most important fishery province in the Dominion. It is right on the fishing ground, surrounded by water, but we are greatly handicapped, in consequence of our being an island, by lack of transportation facilities. I have personal knowledge in this matter. Last year I undertook to put up a quantity of fresh fish for shipment to Montreal and Toronto. We sent out a shipment of frozen cod fish some time in January, and I think it took between three and four weeks before it reached Toronto. I have not the exact dates but am writing for them because I intend to bring up this matter as soon as I have the opportunity in connection with a resolution which I propose to move. The consignee naturally refused to take delivery thinking that the

consignment was injured if not destroyed. Fortunately, however, the weather happened to be cold all the time, we wired him to take delivery at all events, and the consignment happened to turn out all right. But the risk is too great, and we are not doing anything in the business this winter, very fortunately for ourselves because the weather has been changeable and mild. I have not been able to this day to find out exactly where the delay occurred. It may have occurred in the crossing from Prince Edward Island to the mainland or some of the delay may have occurred on the Intercolonial Railway and perhaps also on the Grand Trunk Railway because we sent the shipment by the Grand Trunk Railway from Montreal to Toronto. But I have not yet been able to locate exactly where the delay did occur. That is a condition of things which is not at all satisfactory and which will have to be met.

Again I wish to put in a word on behalf of improved harbour facilities for the fishermen, particularly in Prince Edward Island. That is the sine qua non of the fishing business. Fishermen cannot prosecute their calling unless they have safe harbourage for their fishing craft. During the last few years Nova Scotia fared pretty well in having breakwaters and wharfs built by the government in that province but Prince Edward Island has been partially neglected. I would ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to remember the fishermen of Prince Edward Island this year and make some attempt to provide suitable harbourage in which they can shelter their fishing boats. The character of the fishing business has changed. A few years ago our fishermen could prosecute their calling in small flat-bottomed boats called dorys. The fish were caught in-shore, but now, for some reason or other, which I do not understand, the fish frequent the deeper waters, and our fishermen have to follow them in large boats or small schooners. So long as the business could be conducted with small boats, these boats could be hauled up on shore safe from the danger of storms, but that is impossible with the larger boats. On that account proper harbourage has become a primary necessity.

As regards the statistics given by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I must say that they are rather favourable to the province of Nova Scotia and unfavourable to the province of Prince Edward Island. That is not a matter of very much importance, but it is just as well to have these things accurate. They are unfavourable for this reason. Many of the vessels which fish around the waters of Prince Edward Island belong to Nova Scotia and their catch is consequently credited to the province in which the vessels are registered. That of course is only natural and there is no harm in it, but it shows that in making up the statistics the officials of the department have not credited Prince Edward Island with its fair proportion of the catch. In the eastern part of Prince Edward Island at all events, at least one-third of the vessels engaged in the fishing business belong to Nova Scotia, and I am informed that the best fishing ground which these vessels frequent are around Prince Edward Island and that it is there they make their largest catches. There is therefore this much to be said in favour of fishing harbours for that province, that they would be interprovincial because they would benefit not the fishermen of the island alone, but the fishermen of Nova Scotia as well. This whole matter is one of such importance and it is so essential that we should have better information regarding it, that I know of no better way of procuring this information than by the appointing of the committee asked for. In consequence I have much pleasure indeed in supporting the resolution before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the debate closes, I would like to say one or two words on the subject. I agree entirely with what has been said by the gentlemen who have spoken with respect to the very great importance of the fishing industry, not only on the Atlantic but the Pacific as well, and also on the inland waters of Canada, becuse these must not be forgotten. So far as the fishery industry of the maritime provinces is concerned, it cannot be regarded as being in a very satisfactory condition at present. It is at any rate not in a satisfactory condition compared with that in which it might be if the same effort were made in this country as have been made in Scotland, Sweden, Iceland and other countries where a board, such as has been suggested by the mover of the resolution, has been formed, and where the results of the formation of that board have been not only to increase very greatly the catch, but greatly to improve the character of the fish after it has been put up. Around the shores of the province of Nova Scotia alone, with which I am most familiar, there are opportunities for the supply of all the fish that could be required in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. So far as Quebec is concerned, I understand that it could supply its own needs to a very considerable extent, but I imagine that it would still take a very considerable portion of fresh fish, at least from the maritime provinces. I remember well talking with a gentleman largely engaged in the fish industry in the maritime provinces some two years ago. At that time he was supplying one-third of the needs of a large dealer in Toronto, and he said the reason why he could not get a contract for a larger proportion was the uncertainty of his being able to send from day to day a sufficient quantity to meet a greater proportion than I have mentioned.

The fisheman, in the autumn or winter

season, where the fishing is carried on in the winter, has to encounter very rough weather. In one particular locality it may be impossible to venture out on a particular day. Therefore, the dealer must supply himself from somewhere else. Thus, a man undertaking to supply a dealer in a western city like Montreal or Toronto, must be able to draw his supply from more than one source.

The methods of catching have been alluded to by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). I understand that something has been attempted in the way of improving these methods, but I have communications, even within the last two or three days, and have had communications every year, in which it is demonstrated that the lack of proper care of the fish, after they are caught, results in a very great yearly loss to the province of Nova Scotia, and I suppose that the same is true of the other maritime provinces. The Halifax Board of Trade has issued a memo. in which it declares that the lack of care in putting up fish in that province alone results in a yearly loss of $100,000, and points out the results that have been obtained in other countries where these methods have been improved, and improved under government supervision. The question of transportation has been referred to also by the hon. member for Guysborough. I do not doubt that, although some progress has been made in that regard, still further progress could be made, and that better transportation facilities would result in securing very much more of the Ontario and Montreal market than has been secured by the fishermen of the maritime provinces hitherto.

Some reference was made to the appointment of fishery officers. I do not think that the appointment of fishery officers, in Nova Scotia at least, is in a very satisfactory condition. I do not speak of the methods of the present government as against those of a former government. I do not know very much about what the methods of governments of the past have been in this matter. But I know that there continually come to me representations, especially from the south shore of Nova Scotia, in which reputable men declare, over their own signatures, that the authority of the fishery officers is largely used for political purposes—that men who are Conservatives are proceeded against very strictly, while men who are strong Liberal partisans are not dealt with harshly by some of these men, at least.

Mr. FIELDING. My information is the very reverse.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That being the hon. gentleman's information, it would be a very good thing indeed to have this fishery committee and to have some of these matters investigated. It is not right that these officers should be under a certain suspicion by a portion of the community at least, when it may be that they are entirely guiltless or that there are faults on both sides. One officer has been referred to in the communications sent to me, whose name has been mentioned in this House, Captain Bain, of Liverpool. I have had various complaints with regard to the conduct of that officer.

Mr. FIELDING. Lately ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, within the last two or three months. The way in which most of these officers are remunerated is not very businesslike. If my memory serves me well, they are appointed at very small salaries, but they are supposed to drive about the country using their own horses and rigs for which they make a charge. Thus men whose nominal salary is $250, may really draw from the public treasury, $1,200 to $1,600. That is an absurdity in itself. These men ought to be appointed so that they would have the confidence of the community in which they are to administer the law. They should be selected for the purpose of enforcing the law, and in enforcing it they should have the government behind them. The conditions should be such that these men will not have to fear the resentment of political supporters of either party.

Something has been said about the improvement of conditions. I have a memo. recently issued by the Halifax Board of Trade. It is not a political document. The Halifax Board of Trade is constituted of men of both political parties. I have not the slightest idea as to which political party has the greatest number of supporters on that board at this moment, but I know that representative members of both political parties are members of that board. One heading in this memo. recently sent to me is 'The Canadian Atlantic Fisheries.—Wanted a new policy.' On this branch of the subject the Halifax Board of Trade says :

> The administration of the Canadian fisheries is in the hands of the Marine and Fisheries Department and is carried out through inspectors and overseers appointed by the government. These inspectors and overseers, in addition to their duties, supply the figures which appear as the fisheries statistics in the annual fisheries blue book. They do not, in our opinion, give the accurate and desirable information which the importance of the fishing industry demands. At various times the government has appointed special commissions to investigate conditions in certain localities relating to various branches of the fishing industry. As far, however, as the maritime provinces are concerned, matters have been allowed to drift along without much attempt to improve the conditions or conserve the various branches of the industry for our fishermen and merchants, and it is felt, by every one interested in the welfare of the fisheries, that it is time something was

done to remedy the present most unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Then, under the heading 'Seriousness of the situation,' the pamphlet proceeds :

The government's establishment of fish hatcheries, bait freezers, dog-fish reduction works, demonstration of the Scotch method of curing herring, &c., are certainly to be commended. They have, however, been more or less abortive owing to lack of system, the only partial carrying out of the various things attempted, and the seeming impossibility of eliminating politics.

I would call the special attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to that serious statement made by this important non-political body, representative of the commerce of the largest city of the province of Nova Scotia. The pamphlet continues :

Twenty-five years ago lobsters were so plentiful on our shores that fishermen were making good wages by catching them at fifty cents per hundred count. During the early part of the present season they were so scarce that the fishermen were unable to make living wages with the price at $40 per crate in Boston.

I direct the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the sentence which follows :

This condition has been brought about by the illegal, wholesale destruction of the small-sized and seeded lobsters by the fishermen and packers, in consequence of the law not being enforced by the officers of the department.

That is the statement made by this non-political and representative body, and it is in exact accordance with the private communications which have come to me from all parts of the country interested, within the last four or five years. The pamphlet proceeds :

The conditions in regard to the oyster industry, are, if anything, worse than those under which the lobsters are being exterminated. Practically nothing is being done to prevent the depletion of the oyster beds, to say nothing of any effective steps to increase the supply of these valuable shell fish.

Just before the general election of 1900, short-date licenses were granted by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries in respect of valuable oyster beds, which had been planted by the government, I think, at a certain locality on the coast of New Brunswick; and according to information which came to me, in about three weeks the whole of that bed was cleaned out and was rendered absolutely valueless. So there is small wonder that this representative institution should make some protest against the continuance of a condition that must inevitably result in the permanent loss of great wealth which otherwise would accrue to the fishermen and people of the maritime provinces. This pamphlet continues as follows :—

The clam beds in various parts of the maritime provinces are being depleted, in many cases to supply bait for foreign fishermen, whereas, under efficient laws properly carried out, a continuous supply could be maintained to the advantage of all concerned. Unless in the near future therefore some radical change is made, these valuable branches of the fishing industry will practically cease to exist. New and stricter regulations are required, as well as effective means of carrying them out.

The pamphlet is not very long, but it is too long to quote in full. Statistics are given which indicate the urgent need of some such step as that which has been advocated by the hon. gentleman who proposed this motion. I may, however, quote a few words from the concluding portion of the pamphlet in order to show that the Halifax Board of Trade supports the proposal of the establishment of a board upon some such lines as the Scotch Fisheries Board. 'The scheme for us' is the heading of this portion of the pamphlet.

It is now desired by concerted action on the part of those interested to bring the Dominion government to see that their present progressive policy for the encouragement of the fisheries could be worked out to better advantage to all concerned, by the appointment of a Canadian Atlantic Fisheries Board, on the same lines as the Scotch Fisheries Board, which has control of the Scotch fishing industry. Said board to work in conjunction with the Fisheries Department in all matters affecting the betterment of the conditions of the Atlantic fisheries. A fisheries board representing all interests would thoroughly investigate and advise the department in regard to such matters as the depletion of the lobster and oyster fisheries, the destruction of dog-fish, the proper distribution of the output of the fish hatcheries, the supply of bait, &c. The board must necessarily be a non-political body. It would be under the control of the Fisheries Department in the same way as the Scotch board is under the control of the Secretary for Scotland, in that it would have the appointment of the chairman, which chairman and the vice-chairman are in Scotland the only two paid officials. The Scotch board consists of nine members—the chairman, three members to represent the fishermen, three for the merchants, a scientist and a legal adviser.

Then it goes on to declare that at a meeting held in the board of trade rooms, Halifax, on the 5th of April, 1907, the fisheries committee of the Halifax Board of Trade initiated the movement outlined above by unanimously adopting the following resolution :

That a fisheries board should be appointed along the lines of the Fishery Board of Scotland, to act under the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the regulation and control of the Canadian Atlantic fisheries.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Halifax Board of Trade. At a similar meeting held on the 9th of April last they spoke of a proposed endorsement by the Maritime Boards of Trade. I have not at present information as to whether this resolution has been endorsed by the Maritime Boards of Trade, but I have no doubt it has been if an opportunity has been afforded to bring it to the consideration of that body.

Now, there is another subject about which a word might be said in connection with this question. I have alluded to the fisheries of the Pacific coast, which are also of the greatest possible importance to the people of this country. From them should come the supply of fish for the great future population which we expect to see in the two great provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Besides that, we have the great inland fisheries, and I have observed with regret that the policy of this administration seems to be to farm out leases of large areas of the inland waters of Canada to gentlemen who, so far as I am aware, are not specially engaged in the fishing industry, and that at merely nominal rentals and for a long term of years. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to declare to us this afternoon what the policy of the government is in that regard. I do not desire to minimize the effect of any answer which he may be able to give on that particular subject. But in the absence of any such answer I would regard it as absolutely prejudicial to the interests of this country to hand over, by means of franchises of that character, the control of a large part of our inland fisheries to men who, so far as I am aware, can only be regarded as speculators, in many cases at least. Why should this be done? Why should such a policy be embarked upon? Why should leases be granted at only a nominal rental and for so long a term of years? I venture to think this is a subject which should receive the most serious and earnest consideration, not only of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the government, but of this House as well. These franchises ought not to be lightly granted by any country which has any regard for the conservation of its public domain.

Now there is one other observation I would like to make. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has alluded to the importance of the fisheries. I have also expressed, and I desire again to express, my hearty concurrence in all he has said with regard to the importance of that great national industry. But there are other industries in this country which are not very well represented by any committee of this House, so far as such committee would afford an opportunity for inquiry and consideration in a more effective way than can be given on the floors of this House. We have great forests in this country. About two years ago we had a great forestry convention in the city of Ottawa, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was present. Many men were there who might be regarded as experts with respect to the value of the forest industry of this country, with regard to the great importance of conserving those forests, and the great importance of dealing with them so that they should not be destroyed, but that an annual crop, or a decennial crop, should be taken from them in order that the value of our forests might be retained for future generations. All of these men spoke at that great convention, and I think that in whatever respect there was any difference of opinion, there was absolute unanimity as to the extreme importance to the future of this country of preserving the forests. Examples were given of what has been done in European countries, in Saxony, for example, where a small area of rocky forest country has been made, by judicious methods of governmental conservation, to yield an enormous revenue to that state for the last hundred years. We in Canada are intensely interested in this great question, not only so far as the conservation of the forests is concerned, not only so far as the annual yield from those forests is concerned, but also for the very reason that if we do not preserve our forest we will not preserve those great water-powers which are of equally enormous importance to this country as the forests themselves. So I would suggest to the hon. member for Guysborough that it would be well to amend this motion in some such way as to give this committee jurisdiction to deal with the question of forests as well as with that of fisheries.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Would not that question more properly come within the jurisdiction of the provinces?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I do not think so; because we have in the northwest of Canada at the present time large areas of timber lands; we have in the Rocky Mountains under the control of this government large areas of timber lands, and the preservation of those lands is of the greatest possible importance to this country. Further than that, a committee of this House, if constituted with jurisdiction to deal with this subject, could perhaps give better opportunities for entering into negotiations with the provincial governments along the same lines than would be possible without the services of such a committee. At least I would be prepared to make that suggestion. Then, the mining industry of this country, of course, is very largely under the jurisdiction of the provinces themselves, but so long as we can retain control of the public domain in the great provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, we will have important questions coming up in this country in regard to mines and minerals. Indeed we have the

geological survey which investigates the extent of our mining resources all over Canada without regard to the fact that the ownership and administration of these resources had been confided under the constitution, to seven of the nine existing provinces of Canada. So, I would think that the mines might as well be brought under the jurisdiction of some such committee and I would suggest to my hon. friend, the proposer of this motion, and I would suggest to the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that we should either add to the words of the resolution the further words 'forests and mines' or that we should change the words somewhat and form a committee which should be charged with jurisdiction over trade and natural resources, or, if you like, over natural resources alone. I do not care so much about the form of the amendment so long as it is competent for the committee to deal not only with the great fishing industry but to keep an eye upon, to deal with and to have a certain jurisdiction over the great industries of the forests and the mines as well. Apart from this consideration I agree heartily with the proposal which has been made by my hon. friend from Guysborough, and I think the formation of such a committee would be a very important step for the purpose of improving the outlook of the industries to which I allude.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my support and my approbation to the resolution which has been proposed and not to go over the subject at any length in regard to statistics or information, as I think a sufficient outline has been given by the mover and others who have addressed the House to give a definite idea of the benefits that can be derived from the adoption of this proposal. But, there was one observation relating to the details of the fishing industry that I thought was omitted by those who have spoken on this subject and I would like briefly to refer to it in this connection. Some of the hon. gentlemen who supported the resolution alluded to the necessity of wharfs and breakwaters which have been erected on various parts of the maritime coast for the protection and advantage of the fishermen. One of the purposes which these wharfs serve in that country is this: The method of collecting the fish from the fishing boats and schooners is very different from what it was formerly. Now, both the local and Dominion governments have supported and subsidized lines of steamers which ply to the various harbours on the coast and collect, by means of these wharfs, the fish which are brought in by the boats and small schooners, they transport them with rapidity and certainty to railway centres whence they are carried to their places of destination over the railway and thus obtain a great advantage in price,

which fresh fish obtains over salt fish. That is the necessity for the wharfs at the various harbours along the maritime coast. Complaints have been made that money has been expended by the government for that purpose, and hints have been given that the money so expended on these harbours has been spent with a political object and that that the tendency should be rather to spend this money in large cities like Montreal. If these gentlemen were better acquainted with the conditions of trade and if they knew the hardships of the lives of the fishermen, as they have been pictured very clearly this afternoon, they would forego that kind of criticism altogether and they would believe that no amount of money spent to help the fishermen and to protect their industry in misspent. In regard to the subject of the utility and indispensability of these wharfs I will say no more at present. In regard to the observations of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) with reference to the depletion of the lobsters, the conditions which prevailed at one time do not prevail at the present time. The fish have naturally decreased in number and the means for taking them have been much improved and more fishermen have devoted their attention to the capture of lobsters than at any previous period. Their appliances are also improved and by means of steamers, gasolene smacks and small tug boats they are able to collect the fresh lobsters and to forward them to the United States cities in a condition to obtain a far higher price; as has been demonstrated by the statistics submitted to the House this afternoon. Therefore while the fish are pursued with as much ardour as they are at the present time, and while the appliances for taking them are improved they will not increase in numbers as they did during the old dispensation when the only effort to fish for lobsters was by means of spears or and old fashioned torch and pot. In connection with this, Mr Speaker, I think a question will arise before long in the Dominion of Canada as to whether American merchants and factory owners should be allowed to monopolize the business upon the coast of Canada. There is no return for this privilege given by the Americans. There is no privilege given the Canadians along their coast, we are not allowed to interfere in any way with their harbours, and yet they are the collectors of a large amount of our fishing property and derive a considerable emolument therefrom. Before long the question will become a very important one as to whether American factory owners and others should be allowed to pursue their vocation along the coast of Nova Scotia and the other provinces.

In regard also to the resolution of the Halifax Board of Trade, I might remark that they are not all experts. They are merchants and sometimes gentlemen interested

in various processes, come before the board of trade, dilate upon their processes and give reasons why a particular process should be employed assuring the board that it will result in great benefit to the country. I am not so well satisfied that the Scotch method of curing the fish is superior to that in vogue provided facilities exist such as are now being introduced of promptly obtaining and employing the best native methods of curing fish so as to exploit them to the best advantage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do they not bring much higher prices in some lines ?

Mr. W. ROCHE. I believe they do, but that may be only due to the name or the brand. I have heard people who are experts in the quality of fish declare that the old Nova Scotian or native process of curing fish, if properly undertaken or if enough work were put upon them to prepare the fish in the best possible manner, was preferable to the Scotch process, but there is a repetition of the Scotch method amongst those who are of Scotch taste or Scotch extraction and they think that there is nothing in the world but what comes from Auld Scotia.

Now, Sir, with regard to the allegation that the fishery inspectors of Nova Scotia visit their wrath upon the Conservative and smile with approval upon those of the other political persuasion, I might mention that three of the inspectors on the coast of Nova Scotia are to my certain knowledge Tories of the old school, and I do not think they would indulge in any such heresy as that the Grits should go free and the Tories be punished. In fact, complaints have been made the other way to me. I do not know how my hon. friend obtained his information, but I have constant complaints that the fishery inspectors are most severe, arbitry and tyrannical on the unfortunate Grits, and that they let the Conservatives go scot-free. However that may be, there is a very marked difference of opinion between the factory people and the fishermen as to regulations, and there is also a difference of opinion among experts as to the size of the lobster that should be taken. Some contend that the large fish alone should be taken, while others contend that the better lobster is the smaller one. I believe that the establishment of the hatcheries and the other efforts that are being made to preserve the breeding lobsters will result in certainly retaining the supply we at present have and probably of increasing that supply. I can certainly testify to the very great advantage conferred upon the fishermen by the establishment at Halifax of a bait preserve which has enabled the fishermen to obtain their supplies in the spring so as to pursue their industry and catch large quantities of fish. The whole fishing industry of the maritime provinces commends the Fishery Department for having established that service, and the only drawback is that a sufficient number of them are not erected so that greater good might be disseminated by this very useful and very praiseworthy system of bait preserving. There has always been a difference of opinion among fishermen as to what are the most beneficent regulations, and I suppose that the experts themselves have great difficulty in coming to a satisfactory conclusion on the matter. However, I believe that the officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department are doing their utmost to harmonize all interests and to obtain the very best results, so that this very valuable industry may be retained at its full value, and so that the Dominion of Canada may reap a full measure of prosperity from the prosecution of our very wealthy fisheries on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I wish to make one or two remarks in support of the resolution proposed by the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) with which I quite agree. Although the gentleman who have so far spoken on the question come from the maritime provinces, the question of the preservation of the fisheries of Canada is one which deeply concerns the people of the whole country. In fact, the largest fishing business in the whole Dominion is done by the province of British Columbia as I find from statistics, which show that in 1905 the value of the British Columbia fisheries was $9,850,216, while the next largest was the province of Nova Scotia with a total of $8,259,085. The hon. member (Mr. Chisholm) pointed out that although the value of the fisheries had increased, he wondered whether the total quantity of the fish taken had increased or decreased. It may be as the hon. member for Antigonish has said, that the total quantity may be somewhat less, but when we look at the returns we find that while some kind of fish have decreased others have increased. In 1905 the quantity of fresh cod taken was greater than ever before ; in 1901 the catch of fresh haddock was 5,420,056 pounds, while in 1905 it was 11,520,134 pounds. The catch of fresh halibut has also increased, but the catch of mackerel seems to have decreased very greatly. These results may be due to changes in the habits of the various kinds of fish, and the fact that we do not know as much as we ought to about this matter is one reason why some particular body specially constituted should be appointed to look after that interest. I attended the meeting of the Maritime Boards of Trade held at St. John in August last, and the matter was discussed of appointing a fisheries board—somewhat, I presume on the lines of the Scotch Fishery Board—under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The following resolution was passed at that meeting of the Maritime Provinces Boards of Trade :

That this meeting of the maritime provinces boards of trade endorses the movement for the appointment of a fishery board to act under the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the regulation and control of the Canadian Atlantic fisheries, and that steps be taken to have this important matter acted upon at the next session of the Dominion parliament.

I may say that the arguments advanced in support of that resolution seemed to me to be very cogent. The political side of the question was dealt with. I could not say that the members of that board of trade are politicians in any way, but judging by the expressions that were casually made I should judge that the majority of those present were rather the friends of the government. They undoubtedly complained that the control or superintendence of the fisheries was not free from political influence, and that in order to have a proper control over that great industry the political element would have to be entirely eliminated and that was one of the chief reasons why they advocated the appointment of this fishery board which would be free from political influence, but which would of course be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before my hon. friend takes up the subject of the appointment of a board, might I say that I have read a great deal with regard to this question of a fisheries board, but so far I have not been able to see what its duties would be. Would they have the framing of the regulations and the administration of the fisheries and what part would the department or the representatives of the country have in the administration of the fisheries ?

Mr. DANIEL. I should think that they would have the administering of everything in connection with those things what might be thought to increase the value of the fisheries and to give directions as to how they should be preserved. Take for instance matters of control of the enemies of the fish and of course there are enemies of the fish that sometimes travel on the water—the improvement of the numbers of the fish, reducing the number of the enemies of the fish, the curing of fish and everything of that kind would come under the control of this board. Of course they would be under government control and the Department of Marine would have the last say about everything placed in the hands of the board, but I think that if they had the carrying out of matters of that kind and also probably the overseeing and carrying out of the duties of fishery overseers, it would be an advantage. These appointments would be made through them and the duties of the overseers prescribed by them so that there would be no suspicion of any political influence in the matter at all. That is the view that I think would probably appeal to them as being a portion of the duties of that board. The checking of the enemies of the fish is certainly a very important matter. Summer before last I had an opportunity of personally witnessing the great destructive influence of the dogfish in the Bay of Fundy. I was on a yachting cruise for a week or two on the bay and we went over to the Nova Scotia coast and one afternoon we provided ourselves with fishing materials and went out on the fishing grounds. Some four or five of us were fishing at the same time. We put over our lines, we caught fish, but for every rock cod or eatable food fish that we caught we caught at least six or seven or eight dogfish. In the evening when we returned to shore at St. Mary's I happened to meet a young fisherman and entered into conversation with him. He told me he had been out that day on the fishing grounds trawling. I understand that these trawls have attached to them a great number of hooks, something over 2,000. He told me that when they hauled in their troll, they had 1,700 dogfish on and what was left of edible fish was for the most part nothing but heads and fragments of the whole fish. In other words they had caught 1,700 dogfish and the good fish that they had caught on their hooks had been destroyed by the schools of dogfish infesting the fishing grounds, before they could be taken off the lines. That gave me a better idea of what a pest the dogfish is to the fishing industry at least in that portion of the eastern waters than any amount of reading could do.

Then Sir, a committee such as proposed by the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) would deal with the fishery matters in the same way as the agricultural committee deals with agricultural matters. There is no doubt that the method adopted by the agricultural committee does a great deal to spread information through this country among farmers and those interested in agricultural pursuits, and is of great advantage not only to the members of this House but, by the distribution of this evidence and of these lectures to the farming industry generally. A fisheries committee conducted in the same way would produce equally good results for that industry, and that I presume is one of the objects of the mover of the resolution in asking for the appointment of such a standing committee.

The other aspect of the case which has been brought up by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. William Roche) the right of foreigners given under treaty, is rather too large a question to discuss at this time. I certainly would have much pleasure in supporting the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and as the minister has stated that he is satisfied to let it pass, I presume that the result of this motion will be that we shall have in the near future a standing committee on fisheries, perhaps with the addition

of these subjects mentioned by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, if I had known that this matter was coming up to-day I might have fortified myself with some facts and figures to show the importance of the fishing industry in my constituency. It may perhaps be a blessing to the House that I did not know, for statistics are not generally very acceptable unless they can be made interesting and that is sometimes a difficult matter. I am glad that this matter has been brought forward. I hope the committee will be granted by the House, for there certainly is a great deal in this industry which requires looking into and which would be in the interest of the country at large, were it better understood by the members of the House.

As we heard from the first speaker, there is considerable red tape in connection with the carrying on of the work of the department here, as there is in all the departments. I know I have found it very difficult to get some things looked after, which I considered were urgently needed in my district; and I think if we had a committee of this kind some of these matters could be brought before it and by it sent to the department in such a way that they would not be ignored.

The members of the House generally are not aware of the extent of the fishing industry in the province of British Columbia. In the year 1905 the value of the fisheries of British Columbia exceeded the value of those of any other province, exceeded those of Nova Scotia, which had been the banner province in that respect for a great many years. The last two years we dropped off as they have been what we call short years. Of course I am referring largely to the salmon industry when I speak of their being short years. This year and next year we hope to again pass Nova Scotia.

I would like to draw the attention of the House and particularly to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to the account of revenue and expenditure as set down opposite each province on page 360 of the last report of the Marine Department. From that and similar reports given for some years past you may notice that British Columbia has returned more revenue from fisheries than all the rest of the provinces put together.

That may look a big statement but the figures are there to prove it, and the expenditure by the government in that province has been less than in either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. I think therefore we are entitled to more consideration than we have been able to secure from the department in that respect. So far as my own district is concerned, we do not ask for very heavy expenditure. The heavy expenditure there for some years past has been in the way of hatcheries, and of course they should be revenue producing in a manner. But there is one thing I would like to impress on the House, and that is the necessity for some different arrangement in connection with the carrying on of the work of the Marine and Fisheries Department in that province, which is so far distant from the fountain head. There should be some expert placed over all of those departments out there who would have the control of his department, and who could buy a small steamer, if he required it, without having to refer to headquarters, and who would be at liberty to expend a certain amount and order certain work to be done without having first to report to the department at Ottawa. Here is where the delay occurs. No matter how small the expenditure, everything has to be referred to Ottawa for sanction and very often that leads to serious delay and loss. Some have recommended that the inspectors out there should be given larger powers. That might work also, but each inspector has his own district, and sometimes there might be some conflicting interest and the matter would have to be referred to Ottawa in the long run, even though it were not a very serious one. Therefore I think that an expert having authority over the whole sea-board there, would meet the case to a great extent. I do not wish to weary the House by saying very much on this question, but I hope that the House will grant this committee and that it will appoint the committee of men having the interest of the country at heart and who will attend the meetings of that committee and give it the benefit of their experience and knowledge.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). I was not aware that this subject was coming up to-day and shall consequently not take up much of the time of the House in going into details. Nor is it necessary that I should do so as the matter has been very well threshed out by the previous speakers. The statistics which were given by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) show beyond doubt that the fishing industry of Canada is second to none other in importance. With the immense coast line which we possess some 5,600 miles in the eastern waters, more than double that of England and Ireland, besides the Pacific coast and the immense area of our inland waters, amounting to some 1,500 square miles, it is clear that the development of these waters, the wealth that can be taken out of them is surely an immense asset to the people of this country. The men engaged in our fishing industry, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, have increased in number from some 60,000 in 1880 to some 88,000 in the last year, and each year the number of men employed and the amount of

capital invested are increasing. But a great deal of dissatisfaction exists in the maritime provinces at least regarding the administration of our fisheries and on account of the immense falling off in some lines which years ago produced a much larger output than at present. Therefore I think it is in the general interests of this Dominion that the motion of my hon. friend to appoint a select committee to deal with this fishery question should be granted. It certainly has my most cordial support. What we need in the fishery business particularly is more government aid and more government attention than has been given it in the past. Just as we have a select standing committee on agriculture, I think some such step forward should be taken for the advantage of this great fishing industry which is, in its way, as important as the agricultural industry. In my own province there is, for instance, the oyster fishery which, if properly cultivated and extended, would produce much larger returns in proportion to the capital invested than could be possibly obtained out of any agricultural pursuit. There are various methods by which our fishing industry might be benefited. It might be benefited by the dissemination of literature pointing out the best means of handling and caring for the fish, by the establishment of government fish hatcheries, and the sending out of competent men to inquire into the reasons why certain fish industries have been falling off as they have been during the past few years. In this country some 12 or 15 years ago a great impetus was given to the dairy industry. This was mainly affected by the government sending competent men to all parts of the country to educate the people into better methods of handling the products of the dairy, and to this action is due the immense strides and progress which that industry has made these last years. If the same interest and vigour were given to our fisheries, we would in all probability overcome some of the evils which are apparent now and obtain much better results. The capital invested in the fishing industry has rapidly increased. It has increased from some $4,000,000 in 1880 to $14,550,000 in 1906.

There is one question which I should like to allude to more particularly and that is the question of bounties. The government sets a certain amount aside each year from proceeds of fishing award or based on that award, for bounties to the fishermen, but I notice that Prince Edward Island, whose share in the fishery award amounts to a very large sum, gets very small encouragement indeed from the moneys reserved for the payment of fishing bounties. In that province I believe that last year only between $8,000 or $9,000 out of the whole bounties were paid to her fishermen, whereas, if we had our just share of the fishery award, we would be receiving some $50,000 or $60,000 at lowest possible calculation this last year instead of this $8,000 or $9,000. A few years ago I advocated that the bounty should be paid also to the lobster fisheries and encouragement of other fisheries. In Prince Edward Island the fishing industry is carried on not to so large an extent in larger boats and vessels as in Nova Scotia, but in small boats. Our waters, being land-locked, boats of a smaller size are necessarily employed and consequently are not so much engaged in deep-sea fishing. For that reason I should suppose that since we have a large claim on the moneys from which the bounties are paid, we should at least get some compensation for our fishermen by the government giving the smaller boats the benefit of the payments.

The lobster fishing industry is the second largest fishing industry on the island. Last year, lobsters were caught to the value of $575,402. I have been, for a number of years, endeavouring to secure the establishment in the western part of Prince Edward Island of a fish hatchery, and the late predecessor of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when in office, practically told me he would have such an establishment provided in Prince county. I have brought the matter to the attention of the government since the accession to office of the present minister, and as this industry is such an important factor in the fishing business of Prince Edward Island, I would ask that hon. gentleman to give it his attention. As it has been stated by a number of the speakers here to-day that the establishment of lobster hatcheries has led to an increase in the catch, I would urge that a hatchery be established in western Prince Edward Island. Certainly, something must be done to protect and promote the lobster fishery. Within the last thirteen years, the catch of lobsters has decreased sixty-six per cent. While the total values in catch have been quite large in recent years, this is because the value of the product has gone up, and not because of an increase in the quantity caught.

Another industry to which I would ask the attention of the government is the oyster fishery. The oyster fishery of Prince Edward Island last year, 1906, yielded 14,988 barrels, of a total value of $89,928—that is, they are estimated at $6 a barrel. Last year, when the fishery inspector from Ottawa was down and the local fishery inspector was present in Summerside, I took occasion to go out with them to the oyster beds in Malpeque, the greatest natural oyster beds of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada. We inquired of the men there, some of whom had been in the business of shipping oysters for fifteen or thirty years, as to the results of the catch. They told us that the men were coming in with less than a quarter of a barrel a-piece for a day's catch. The price of oysters ranged from $8 to $11 a barrel on the shore. Turning

up the books of the last ten or twenty years, we found that when from 80 cents to $1 a barrel was paid for oysters in this bay, the fishermen were catching five or six barrels a day. Manifestly, something is radically wrong with the fostering of this important industry—and it is an important industry not only to the people of Prince Edward Island but to the whole Dominion.

The oysters of Prince Edward Island are sought for almost from coast to coast, and in all the principal American cities there is always a great demand for them. But when the catch is down to less than fifteen thousand barrels as compared with what could be caught in the olden days, it is evidently time for the Department of Marine and Fisheries to secure the advice of the best experts with a view to taking action for the protection of this industry. With the falling off in the catch, as the report points out, there was a little shortening up of the season. But the report also shows that the catch is not likely to be one-half what it was in the previous year. One of the greatest bugbears of this industry in Prince Edward Island and in the maritime provinces is the dispute between the federal and local authorities as to the right to control these beds and the fisheries of other inland waters. I have brought this matter up in the House on several occasions. The sooner this dispute is settled the better it will be for the protection of the oyster industry. The local government have been trying to deal with the oyster industry. A year ago, they passed a Bill authorizing the leasing of these beds to private holders, and I believe that surveyors were sent out on certain of the beds. But I understand that there was a protest from the federal authorities and the matter has been allowed to drop, though there are cases where leases have been given by the local government to fishermen for the propagation and taking of oysters in certain localities. One authority or the other must have full control of these beds, and a reasonable amount of money must be spent for the protection of this fishery. In other countries the culture of oysters as a private business has proved most remunerative and productive. The quantity of oysters produced in Chesapeake bay, in New York and other places where this is carried on as a private business has been enormous. This form of industry has resulted not only in cheapening the oysters to the people, but in causing a production equal to the demand in the United States, while allowing of large shipments beyond their borders.

A matter of great importance to Prince Edward Island is that of transportation. We have had a great deal of difficulty in past winters in sending away our fish. In several cases, the government has had to pay damages for the poor handling of fish in the winter steamers, and the lack of proper facilities for the transport from the places on the mainland at which these steamers land. This is a matter which should be looked into. The question of harbours is another important matter with the fishing industry in Prince Edward Island. I believe it will be found that the condition of our harbours is one reason why larger and more numerous boats are not engaged in the fishing industry of my own province. In the county of Prince, I have heard complaints for a number of years. Take, for instance, the harbour of Tignish. This harbour is not able to accommodate half the fishing fleet that would wish to take shelter there, and when the Caraquet fleet comes over from New Brunswick and seeks shelter there the whole run is absolutely blocked up, and, whichever party is inside cannot get out until the other fleet moves out into the offing. I believe the department has received a request from the people of Tignish and surrounding territory and from the people of New Brunswick that some relief be given to them in this respect, and I trust the department will take up the subject this session. There are also requirements at Kildare where there are forty or fifty boats that are absolutely without protection when they are out fishing. The people of Kildare and along the coast, in order to carry on the fishing industry successfully, must have some protection in the shape of a harbour. I think the question of harbours and protection for our fishing fleets along the coast of the maritime provinces—I have only instanced some of the places I know about—should be taken up by the government and every facility afforded the fishermen for carrying on this important business. The question of mines and forests is a very important one and might well be taken up along with this. I have much pleasure in supporting the proposed resolution of the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). I desire to express my sincere thanks to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), for the remarks he has made to the House this afternoon. Certainly the figures he has given and the arguments he has presented are sufficient to convince every member of this House of the necessity of carefully looking after the interests of the fisheries of Canada, more particularly those of the maritime provinces. No doubt the appointment of such a committee as he proposes might become the means of rendering great services to the fisheries of Canada. I desire also to express my concurrence in the remarks of the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm), who gave important figures and statements relative to the fisheries of Canada. Much has been said of the importance of the construction of wharfs and breakwaters for fishermen carrying on the business of deep-sea fishing in the maritime provinces. No doubt a great deal has been done by this

government within the last ten years in behalf of this industry. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lefurgey) has spoken of the necessity of further improvement in the harbour of Tignish, which is frequented by fishermen of my constituency from Caraquet and Shippegan. The fishermen of my constituency who frequent that harbour recently presented a petition to the Minister of Public Works asking for better protection on the shores of Prince Edward Island, and I have no doubt the hon. minister will give heed to their request, because it is not only a necessity for the fishermen of Gloucester county, but also for the fishermen of Prince Edward Island. It has also been remarked by my hon. friend that the amount of the fishing bounty paid to the fishermen of Prince Edward island has been decreasing recently instead of increasing. I think that is due to the inactivity of the population of Prince Edward Island in reference to the deep-sea fishing. The fishing bounties can only be distributed to fishermen carrying on deep-sea fishing, not to those who are engaged in shore fisheries. I find to my sorrow that for a number of years past the population of Prince Edward Island have, to a certain extent, withdrawn from deep-sea fishing, and are giving themselves more particularly to fishing for lobsters along the shore. The lobster fishery is not supposed to receive fishing bounties, because that is a fishery which we have to protect, and which we have to limit to a certain extent, in order to preserve it for the future. Therefore we can hardly expect that the government should distribute any portion of the bounty to lobster fishermen.

PRESENTATION OF PETITION.

Mr. HALL. I beg the permission of the House to present a petition, which was handed to me this afternoon, on behalf of the Dominion Lumbering and Power Development Company.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is quite irregular, unless the House is willing.

Mr. HALL. Then I move that the debate be now adjourned. I beg to present the petition for incorporation of the Dominion Lumbering and Power Developing Company.

Motion agreed to.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Insurance Bill, and the estimates of the Public Works Department.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

Mr. TURGEON.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 23, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company. —Mr. Adamson.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—Mr. Telford.

QUESTIONS.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING AND LITHOGRAPHING.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. During the last ten years how much money has been expended by years by this government for printing and lithographing done outside Canada?
2. For what reason was such work done out of Canada?

Rt. Hon Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Information will have to be obtained from several departments to answer this question, and I would ask my hon. friend to move for a return.

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

WASHINGTON FISHERIES CONFERENCE —EXPENSES.

Mr. FINLAYSON asked :

1. Who were the ministers who represented Canada at the Fisheries Conference at Washington in 1887, and who accompanied them?
2. What was the amount paid in connection with travelling, living and other expenses in connection with this conference?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Sir Charles Tupper, Hon. J. S. D. Thompson, Hon. Geo. E. Foster, J. M. Courtney, Deputy Minister of Finance, Maj. Gen. D. R. Cameron, secretary ; Wallace Graham, Q.C., C. C. Chipman, private secretary to Sir Chas. Tupper ; Douglas Stewart, private secretary to J. S. D. Thompson; S. J. Jenkins, private secretary to Hon. Geo. E. Foster ; Geo. Johnston, statistical officer ; Dr. Geo. M. Dawson, Hon. Judge Gray.

2.

Hon. Sir Charles Tupper	$5,378 85
Hon. J. S. D. Thompson	1,691 53
Hon. Geo. E. Foster	800 00
J. M. Courtney	158 22
Maj. Gen. D. R. Cameron	2,769 60
Wallace Graham, Q.C.	1,298 48
C. C. Chipman, private secretary, Sir Chas. Tupper	512 55
Douglas Stewart, private secretary, J. S. D. Thompson	655 70
S. J. Jenkins, private secretary, Hon. Geo. E. Foster	338 55
Geo. Johnston	329 33
Dr. Geo. M. Dawson	147 40
Hon. Judge Gray	250 00
	$14,330 21

BEHRING SEA COMMISSION—EXPENSES.

Mr. FINLAYSON asked :

1. Who were the Canadian ministers who represented Canada in Paris at the Behring Sea Commission in 1891-92?
2. Who were the secretaries of these ministers, respectively, and what persons accompanied them?
3. What amounts were paid for the travelling and other expenses of these ministers, secretaries and other officials?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1 The Behring Sea Commission appears to have been in 1892-93, not in 1891-92. The ministers were Sir John Thompson, Hon. C. Hibbert Tupper.

2. Douglas Stewart, private secretary to Sir John Thompson ; Peter Connolly, messenger ; Joseph Pope, private secretary to Hon. C. Hibbert Tupper ; Dr. Geo. M. Dawson, J. M. Macoun.

3.

Sir John Thompson	$7,830 02
*Hon. C. Hibbert Tupper	4,428 95
Douglas Stewart	2,059 20
Peter Connolly	731 60
Joseph Pope	2,387 59
Dr. G. M. Dawson	2,562 04
J. M. Macoun, salary	899 50
" living allowance and expenses	1,456 14
	$22,355 04

*Hon. C. Hibbert Tupper was also agent of the British government at the Behring Sea Commission in Paris in 1892-93 and any expenses incurred by him as such agent were paid by the British government in addition to the amount paid by Canadian government.

DOMINION REVENUE.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

What was the total revenue of the Dominion of Canada during the following periods: 1873 to 1878; 1878 to 1882; 1882 to 1887; 1887 to 1891; 1891 to 1900; 1900 to 1907?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would refer my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) to page 20 of the Public Accounts now before the House where he will find this information in detail.

POINTE-AUX-TREMBLES WHARF.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Up to the date of June 14, 1907, how many tenders did the Department of Public Works receive for the completion of the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, county of Portneuf?
2. What is the name of each tenderer and the amount asked by each of them?
3. Has the contract been awarded? If so, to whom?
4. If not, why not?

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

1. Three.
2. Lemay and Poliquin, $23,000 ; Heney and Smith, $23,900 ; John Burns, $25,700.
3. Owing to a change in the plans new tenders were called for December 6, 1907.

ICE-BREAKER FOR NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings) asked :

1. What progress has been made regarding the construction of the new ice-breaking steamer for the winter navigation of the Northumberland straits?
2. Has the contract for her construction been let?
3. If not, when will it be let, and when will she be ready for service?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The specifications and plans which have been submitted to and approved by Sir Philip Watt, chief constructor of the British Admiralty, are now in the possession of the department.
2. No.
3. Tenders will be invited immediately, and if contract is placed at the end of this month delivery can be gained by December 1, 1908.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—CONTRACTS.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Have any contracts been let for the construction work in the Trent Valley canal? If so, to whom, what sections, when let, at what price, and when is the work to be begun and finished in each section now under contract?
2. Was a deposit required from contractors? If so, what amount for each section under contract, and in what form was such deposit made?
3. Is the government still in possession of all deposits so made? If not, what has become of such deposits, and why?
4. Have any contractors who were awarded contracts for this work abandoned their contracts or expressed a desire to do so? If so, which contractors, for what section or sections, and what reason is given?

5. Has the government given its consent to the abandonment of any such contract by any contractors? If so, which, and for what reason?

6. Is it the intention of the government to again call for tenders for any portions of work heretofore contracted for and abandoned? If so, when and how?

7. Will any contractor abandoning his contract or defaulting therein forfeit his deposit?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. (a) Yes, Messrs. Brown and Aylmer, for section No. 5, Ontario, Rice Lake division, August 9, 1907, at schedule prices, work to begin on the 1st October, 1907, and to be completed 30th November, 1908.

(b) John Reilly's tender being the lowest was accepted for section No. 2, Holland river division, June 1, 1907, at schedule rates ; but he has not yet executed contract.

(c) Lewis P. Nott's tender being the lowest, was accepted for section No. 1, Ontario, Rice Lake division, at schedule rates on October 18, 1907, but he declined to enter into a contract, on account of the Fair Wages' schedule, the figures of which he states are too high.

(d) Randolph MacDonald Company's tender being the lowest was accepted for the Rosedale section of the Trent Canal, on the 18th January, 1908, and was notified to that effect, on January 21, 1908, and was called upon to execute a contract for the above work, at schedule rates.

2. Yes. Brown and Aylmer, 2 cheques, one for $10,000, and one for $17,584, respectively, on the Canadian Bank of Commerce. John O'Reilly, a cheque for $10,000, on the Canadian Bank of Commerce, which accompanied his tender. Lewis P. Nott, two cheques, one for $20,000, and one for $23,333, respectively, on the Bank of Montreal. Randolph MacDonald Company, a cheque for $10,000, on the Sovereign Bank of Canada.

3. Yes.

4. Yes. Answered in (b) and (c) No. One.

5. No.

6. No decision arrived at.

7. Each case will be dealt with as it arises.

MEDICAL PORT OFFICER AT CANSO.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has a successor been appointed to the late Dr. Brine as medical port officer at Canso? If not, why not?

2. What salary was paid to the late Dr. Brine?

3. What amount has been paid for medical services at the port of Canso, since the death of Dr. Brine?

4. What scale of fees is allowed, or does the department allow the medical man doing the work to make his own charge?

Mr. PORTER.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. $280 per annum.

3. $288.65.

4. 1 mile each way $1 a visit. Over a mile not exceeding 2 miles each way $1.50 a visit. 2 miles not exceeding 3 miles $2 a visit. 3 miles not exceeding 5 miles $3 a visit.

DEPUTY MINISTERS—PAYMENTS FOR SPECIAL SERVICES.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. During the fiscal years 1904-5, 1905-6, 1906-7, how much money was paid to the deputy ministers of (a) Public Works, and (b) Marine and Fisheries, in addition to their salaries for services performed by them for the government?

2. (a) What were the special services for which such extra remuneration was granted, and (b) how was the same authorized?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

No amount was paid to the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries for services performed by him for the government in addition to his salary for the fiscal years mentioned.

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

1. To Deputy Minister of Public Works, the following sums were paid :

In 1904-05	$500 00
1905-06	900 00
1906-07	750 00

2. (a) Special services as chairman of Departmental Board of Arbitration.

(b) Authority of special vote of parliament as follows : 'Arbitration and awards, including payments authorized, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act,' with approval of account by minister thereunder, also order in council of 10th March, 1906.

PAYMENTS ON DREDGING CONTRACTS.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Between the years 1896 and 1902, both inclusive, how much money was paid on dredging contracts, (a) to James Whalen, (b) A. F. Bowman, (c) C. M. Bowman, (d) Conmee and Bowman, and (e) Whalen and Bowman, and in respect of what work?

2. From 1902 to 1907, both inclusive, how much money has been paid on dredging contracts to (a) A. F. Bowman, (b) The Great Lakes Dredging Company, and (c) Whalen and Bowman, and in respect of what work ?

3. Was any dredging work which was let since 1896 to any of the persons or firms mentioned in clause 1, taken over with the consent of the department, by the Great Lakes Dredging Company or any other person, firm or corporation ?

4. If so, what was the work, and the reason assigned for the transfer of the contract, or performance of work let by other or others than the original contractors ?

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

1. From 1st July, 1896 to 30th June, 1902,

(a) Nothing.
(b) Kaministiquia river, Ont ..$ 1,709 87
Port Arthur, Ont 921 00
(c) Nothing.
(d) Nothing.
(e) Nothing.

2. From 1st July, 1902, to 31st December, 1907 :

(a)	Port Elgin, Ont .. .. ..$	1,456 48
	Kaministiquia river	155,456 78
	Owen Sound	108,003 19
	Port Arthur	211,363 35
	Fort William	21,094 15
	Wiarton	17,775 33
	Neebing	15,065 21
	Saugeen	40,566 60
	Penetanguishene	25,492 00
	Waubaushene	14,804 40
	Sault Ste. Marie	37,594 02
	Wiarton	7,120 00
(b)	Port Arthur	165,250 43
	Kaministiquia river	227,703 59
	Fort William	221,984 11
	Mission river	27,993 78
(c)	Kaministiquia river	810 00

3 and 4. No.

I.C.R., BEAR RIVER, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—DWELLING FOR STATION MASTER.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

Who were the tenderers for the dwelling house for the station master at Bear River, Prince Edward Island, and what was the amount of each tender ?

2. Whose tender was accepted ?

3. What is the total expenditure to date ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1.

F. S. MacDonald, Souris .. .. ..$	1,295 00
James G. McLellan, Hermanville	1,373 00
McLean Brothers, North Wiltshire	1,440 00

2. F. S. MacDonald.

3. $1,507.99. The difference between the amount expended for dwelling for station master, and the amount of contract, is for land purchased, legal expenses, advertising and miscellaneous expenses.

BELLEVILLE DRILL HALL—MR. JEREMIAH HURLEY.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What authority or connection had Jeremiah Hurley in regard to the purchase of the lands for the drill hall and parade grounds at Belleville ?

2. What was the said Jeremiah Hurley paid for his services ?

3. What amount was paid for passing the title to these lands, to whom, and when ?

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

1. None.

2. Nothing.

3. $391.01, to E. J. Butler, the agent of the Minister of Justice for the purposes of this purchase ; paid 23rd January, 1906.

MONEY-LENDERS OPERATING IN PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. DELISLE asked :

1. Has the government, or any member thereof, received complaints from members of the civil service or others, to the effect that money-lenders of the city of Ottawa pursue their business in the offices or corridors of the departmental buildings ?

2. If so, has the government reason to believe that these representations are correct ?

3. If such representations should be ascertained to be correct, is it the intention of the government to take any action in the matter ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Complaints have been made in some departments that money-lenders are pursuing their business in the offices of the departments, and we have no reason to doubt that the complaints are correct. Instructions have been given that such persons, when known, should not be admitted to the offices while the officials there are engaged in public business.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DUNSMUIR.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Before the orders of the day are called I wish to ask the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a question regarding a special despatch from Victoria which reads as follows :

Up to Dominion.

Victoria, British Columbia, January 22.—Replying to the accusation of Mr. J. A. MacDonald, leader of the opposition, stating that the government was responsible for Lieutenant Governor Dunsmuir withholding his assent to the Natal Act, passed unanimously last session, Premier McBride said yesterday in the House that, in withholding his assent, His Honour acted as the official of the Dominion government, and that the case was not one in which the local government could be held responsible.

Had this government anything to do in any way with the lieutenant governor withholding his assent ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was absent in England at the time, but I know that no advice was given to Lieutenant Governor Dunsmuir on that question. I shall inquire what correspondence there is in the office and bring it down to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the first part of the answer does not hold ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, because I know there has been no advice given Lieutenant Governor Dunsmuir.

MR. M. J. HANEY.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals to an item published in the press which reads as follows :

Mr. Collingwood Schreiber has been appointed sole arbitrator in the claim for extras of Mr. M. J. Haney, of Toronto, who was the contractor for the bridge across the Hillsborough river, P.E.I., and which cost the government $1,500,000. Mr. Haney is claiming $300,000 as still due him. The investigation will last all this week.

Is it true that $300,000 are still due and that a claim for that amount has been made, and that Mr. Schreiber has been appointed arbitrator.

Mr. GRAHAM. The item may be correct. I am not sure as to the details. It is true that Mr. Schreiber has been appointed arbitrator to settle a claim made by Mr. Haney against the Department of Railways and Canals.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if the documents referred to in the resolution moved by my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), respecting which there was a discussion in the House some time ago, will be produced so that we may have an opportunity of examining them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. member for St. Antoine moved his motion and the House pronounced upon it. If he will move for the papers he requires and give sufficient reasons, certainly they will be brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What would the right hon. gentleman regard as sufficient reasons ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall judge them when brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should like to ask further when the report respecting the Quebec Bridge inquiry will be distributed.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is somewhat difficult to answer that question definitely. We are urging it as rapidly as possible and are assured that no time will be lost and that the report will be handed in as soon as possible.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There are two returns which I moved for on December 11 and four on the 13th. I would be obliged if they would be brought down as soon as possible.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. HAGGART. When will the surveys with reference to the Georgian bay canal be brought down ? They were promised last session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the engineers have completed the field work and are now engaged in completing the plans and the date necessary in order to determine with accuracy what the cost of the work will be. The survey and plans of the portion known as the French river section are practically completed. The remainder will be ready in the course of from four to six weeks, the engineer in charge of the work tells me.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. minister bring down the portion with reference to the French river section, as we shall have a debate on the subject on Monday next ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) any further information as to the time when the Civil Service report will be brought down ?

Mr. FIELDING. When the question was last before the House, I made inquiry of the chairman and was told it was being expedited. I shall make further inquiry.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would also inquire with reference to some returns called for on December 11 regarding the cold storage business in St. Johns, N.B. I think the hon. minister said they were nearly completed some days ago.

Mr. FISHER. I shall inquire about it.

Mr. FOSTER. When may we expect the report of the expert accountants who were appointed to start a new system of bookkeeping in the department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are several reports, and there are three persons who are looking after them. The work is quite arduous.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask also when we may have a return of the advertising done in certain papers in St. John and Halifax I do now know who fathered the motion but I do not want it to fall to the ground still-born.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to an order given the other day, for a copy of the lease of the Beauharnois canal to some private company. Has my hon. friend given an order to have that brought down as soon as possible ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be brought down in a very few hours.

SEED WHEAT.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that two members of the Northwest government are

here regarding seed wheat for the people of that country in the coming spring. Has the government any information to give regarding what has been done or what is to be done in that connection ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have nothing to communicate to the House to-day.

GOVERNMENT GROUNDS.

Mr. TALBOT. I would like to draw the attention of the government to the disgraceful condition in what is called the government highway is kept.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman desires to ask a question, he is in order, but it is not proper for him to discuss any matter not on the Order Paper unless it be of very urgent importance.

Mr. TALBOT. This is a matter of public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only way for the hon. gentleman to bring it before the House is to prepare a notice of motion.

MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the government when they propose to bring down the Bill respecting the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot tell my hon. friend to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May we expect some information to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say now. I would not like to bind myself as to the date.

INSURANCE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 42) respecting insurance. He said: In making this motion I desire to act upon the suggestion which I offered to the House at the introduction of the Bill. I then ventured to suggest that, having regard to the very technical character of the greater part of this measure, the House might find it convenient to pass the Bill to a second reading without anybody committing himself to it, and reserve judgment until after the measure could have been examined by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, before which body, of course, representations could be made by any persons who desired to be heard. I am aware that representations will be made, both for and against the provisions of the Bill. I desire to adhere to that suggestion now in moving the second reading. I only wish to add a few words upon a special feature of the Bill. The Bill proposes to deal with the question of insurance generally, and a number of clauses in it have reference to what is commonly known as assessment or fraternal insurance. With regard to that, very urgent representations have been made to the government by a large and influential deputation representing the greatest of our fraternal orders, that of the Independent Order of Foresters, and although that body only was represented on the deputation, I have no doubt that the views they expressed would be endorsed by the fraternal organizations generally. I may say that the leaders of that very influential deputation frankly acknowledged that their system probably would need some further consideration. While they have unquestionably ample resources for all their present obligations, and for the early future, they felt that the time was at hand when some further steps should be taken by these organizations themselves with a view to strengthening themselves and making them permanent. They have represented to the government that

> The Supreme Court of the Order has been convened to meet in June next (one year earlier than usual) to consider and adopt such measures as may be deemed necessary to strengthen and perpetuate its fraternal system of insurance; and that the representative bodies of other Canadian fraternal institutions will likewise meet during the year, that the managing officers of the societies should have the opportunity of consulting and advising with their membership; and that such a delay will probably enable the societies to co-operate with the government in preparing an adequate measure which will be acceptable to all.

Those representations seemed to us to be fair and reasonable, and we have pleasure in acceding to them. Therefore, when the Bill goes before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, if the House will pass the second reading now, I will propose to strike out from the measure all the clauses which deal with assessment and fraternal insurance. These will become the subject of a separate measure, if necessary, at another session of parliament. Therefore, in asking the House now to assent to the second reading of the Bill I do so with the understanding that when the measure comes before the Committee on Banking and Commerce the particular provisions to which I refer will not be pressed, but we shall then ask to omit them.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned I think the course the Fininace Minister proposes is the most businesslike course to get at the Bill, and in the end to get at the best results from an examination of it, it being expressly understood of course that the second reading is simply pro forma and that it does not bind any person to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I entirely concur in that.

Mr. HAGGART. There are two Bills brought down; is there any difference between them?

Mr. FIELDING. Not this session. I think there is a private Bill relating to one of the orders; there is but one government measure.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to dissent from the course proposed by the Minister of Finance and supported by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but it did seem to me that the more appropriate course would be to discuss the salient features of the Bill, as we usually do on the second reading of principles of the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. We did that on the first reading.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it was gone into very extensively on the first reading. A discussion now would go through the press and we might get a reflection of public opinion, especially from the insurance side, with regard to it before it reaches the committee stage. The committee stage of course is one of inquiry, and the great bulk of the members of this House do not take part in its consideration at that stage. I think it would give a great deal more enlightenment to the country if a debate took place now on the principle of the Bill, and especially if the intentions of the government with regard to its prominent features were now disclosed.

Mr. FIELDING. I may remind my hon. friend that on the introduction of the Bill I did give a somewhat lengthy explanation calling attention to what were regarded as the chief features. With regard to the companies feature in it I think I am correct in stating that every insurance company doing business, and affected by this Bill, has received a copy of it, and is well aware of its contents.

Mr. SPROULE. The epitome which I saw in the press gave very little information of what took place in the House. I know that the companies differ very much in their opinion with regard to the merits of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the said Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion passes I think we should understand, that the report of this committee should not necessarily have the binding character which has sometimes been attributed to a report of that committee on a private or a public Bill. It is very desirable, indeed, that the Bill should be sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce in order that any person interested may have an opportunity of placing his views before that committee. I presume that is the principal object. But that object could be served nevertheless if it were understood that when the Bill comes back and is considered in the Committee of the Whole House, it should not be taken as a matter that has been determined by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, so as to bind this House, but it should be regarded as having been sent to that committee simply to afford an opportunity to private individuals to make their views heard, and that the discussion in the Committee of the Whole should be as unrestricted and have the same effect as if the Bill were now before it.

Mr. FIELDING. I entirely agree with what the hon. gentleman has said; I take no objection whatever.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—BRITISH COLUMBIA LEGISLATION RESTRICTING ASIATIC IMMIGRATION.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer given by the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) in reference to the lieutenant governor of the province of British Columbia having refused his assent to the Act popularly known as the Natal Act passed by that legislature during the last session, in view of the fact that a similar Act has been introduced by the Hon. Mr. Bowser, Attorney General for the province of British Columbia in the legislature a few days ago, and in view of the fact that if this Act becomes law it may seriously complicate the diplomatic relations and interfere with the diplomatic understanding which has been successfully entered into as a result of the mission of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) with the government of Japan, I think the time opportune to lay before the House and the people of this country certain facts in connection with all the British Columbia legislation of this character. For a number of years our Conservative friends in the province of British Columbia have endeavoured to make political capital out of this question—a question which tends to arouse the passions and the prejudices of the people, and, up to the present time, I do not think that the members representing the province of British Columbia have said very much in this House to explain their position and to explain the record of the Liberal party in connection with this question. I want to deal briefly, Sir, with the Natal Act which was introduced by Mr. Bowser, then a private member of the British Columbia legislature representing the city of Vancouver. Before I do so I want to relate some inci-

dents and give the House some facts a few of which were brought out by Mr. Mackenzie King, the commissioner appointed by this government to investigate certain matters in connection with Chinese and Japanese immigration into the province of British Columbia. In his very excellent report he points out that the origin of the Japanese difficulty dated from the advent of Mr. Saori Gotoh into the province of British Columbia. This gentleman had a large experience in connection with furnishing Japanese labour to American railways, notably the Oregon Short Line, the Union Pacific, the Southern Pacific and the Northern Pacific. In 1901 he came from Tacoma to Vancouver and established a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Mr. Mackenzie King proceeds to say :

He succeeded in effecting an agreement with that company similar to the agreements between the railway companies and Japanese contractors across the line. He opened an employment agency in Vancouver, and in addition to his railway contract, obtained contracts to supply other industries with men, in particular some of the sawmills and logging camps in British Columbia.

Now Sir, this agreement, entered into between Mr. Gotoh and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was drawn up by Mr. W. J. Bowser, member for the city of Vancouver and now Attorney General in the McBride government in the province of British Columbia. Mr. W. J. Bowser was solicitor for Mr. Gotoh and every agreement entered into afterwards between Mr. Gotoh and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Wellington Collieries Company was based on the original agreement prepared by Mr. W. J. Bowser as solicitor for Mr. Gotoh. I have here a copy of this agreement and as it has an important bearing upon the Natal Act introduced by Mr. Bowser into the provincial legislature, I intend to place it on 'Hansard.' It is as follows :

This agreement made this first day of 1907, between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, hereinafter called 'the company,' of the first part, and Saori Gotoh, of the city of Vancouver, in the province of British Columbia, hereinafter called 'the contractor,' of the second part, witnesseth that in consideration of the covenants and agreements on the part of the company hereinafter contained, and the payment by the company to the contractor as hereinafter provided, the contractor hereby covenants and agrees to and with the company to furnish promptly upon demand to the company at such points on the company's line of railway in the province of British Columbia (and, in this agreement, wherever the words 'lines of railway' are mentioned, the same shall be held and construed to be all lines of railway owned or operated or under construction by the company or any other railway company with which the company has a working agreement) as may be designated by the company by its general superintendent for the Pacific division, or other duly authorized officers or agents, as many competent Japanese labourers and workmen as may be demanded by the company, from time to time, such men to be able to perform such work and labour as may be required by the company upon and about its line of railway tracks, roadbed, right of way, depots, and other property, either upon construction or maintenance, the said men and work and labour performed by them to be satisfactory to the company, upon the following terms and conditions:

1. The contractor shall not be liable to the company for any loss or damage sustained by the company through failure on the part of the contractor to furnish as many labourers as may be required by the company, when conditions render it impossible, by the exercise of all due diligence by the contractor, to furnish all such labourers.

2. The company agrees to pay to the contractor for all labourers furnished by the contractor and who are employed by the company in the province of British Columbia as follows: at the rate of one dollar and fifty cents per day of ten hours for each man while working on an extra gang, and one dollar and twenty-five cents to one dollar and forty-five cents on section gangs, the men on section gangs to be graded and the rates of wages between one dollar and twenty-five cents and one dollar and forty-five cents to be paid in respect of them to be fixed by the roadmaster and section foreman of the company under whom they work.

3. The contractor further agrees to keep proper books of account and complete pay-rolls; and, from time to time and at such times as may be demanded by the company, to exhibit said pay-rolls to the company; and, if requested, leave the same with an acknowledgement endorsed thereon by each person whose name appears thereon, of the receipt of the wages shown by such pay-roll to be due him; and should the contractor at any time when so demanded by the company be unable to produce such pay-rolls with acknowledgement endorsed thereon as aforesaid, he shall then furnish a statement showing what wages are not receipted for, and giving reasons why no receipts have been obtained, or otherwise satisfactorily accounting for the disposal of the moneys not receipted for. In the event of the failure of the contractor to carry out this term of the agreement the company may withhold payment of any sums due the contractor until satisfactory evidence is produced showing that all labourers furnished hereunder have, up to that time, been paid their wages in full by the contractor; and, in addition the company may terminate this agreement forthwith, without being in any way responsible to the contractor for any damages he may sustain by reason of such termination.

4. The company agrees to furnish to the contractor free transportation over its lines of railway, of the Pacific division only, for the manager and three other men engaged in looking after such labourers, and will also provide free trip transportation for the purpose of moving any of the men furnished by the contractor under this agreement from points on the line of railway of the company to points elsewhere where their services may be required by the company, and the company

agrees that its freight rates on supplies for Japanese as with any other labourers on the company's railway.

5. It is understood and agreed between the parties hereto that the company by its officers shall have full direction and control of the men so furnished while engaged upon work upon its line of railway, and the contractor will at any and all times remove any of such men that the company may think incompetent or unfit for the purposes of the work or for any other good cause.

6. The contractor shall take care of all the men, so furnished under this agreement, who shall become sick or injured, and the company shall in no way be responsible for their care or be liable for any charges therefor; and if the company reasonably incurs any pecuniary liability therefor, by placing any of the men injured in a hospital, employing necessary medical attendance or otherwise, the contractor shall re-imburse the company therefor, and the company may retain any sum for which it may so become liable out of moneys which become due the contractor hereunder.

7. The company will furnish, free of cost for all men furnished by the contractor while working on the lines of railway of the company under this agreement, water and fuel for all domestic uses, but the carrying of the said water and fuel must be done by the men so furnished.

8. The contractor convenants and agrees, once in each month, to pay all the men so furnished their wages in full, and to indemnify and save harmless the company from the payment of the same and from any costs and expenses they may be put to in connection with any action brought against the company for payment.

9. This agreement shall be in force and effect from the first day of April, 1907, until the first day of April, 1912; but should the company consider that the labourers or workmen supplied by the contractor are unsatisfactory then the company shall be at liberty to terminate this agreement upon giving the contractor thirty days notice in writing to that effect. And should the contractor be unable to supply labourers or workmen to the company according to the terms of this agreement, then, in like manner, the contractor shall be at liberty to terminate this agreement upon giving the company thirty days notice in writing to that effect.

10. The contractor covenants and agrees with the company to furnish on or before the execution of this agreement a bond in the sum of five thousand dollars ($5,000) with a surety approved by the company for the faithful performance of section eight of this agreement.

11. It is understood and agreed that this agreement shall not be held or construed as being a contract by the company with the men so furnished, but it is distinctly understood that the men so furnished shall be employees of the contractor and not of the company.

12. It is further understood and agreed between the parties hereto that none of the men furnished under this agreement shall be imported from any place in contravention of chapter 11 of the Statutes of Canada 1897, and any amendment or amendments thereof, commonly known as the Alien Labour Act.

13. And it is further agreed between the parties hereto that the contractor will in case of accident or injury of any kind whatsoever happening to any employees or workmen furnished by the contractor, unless such accident or injury shall be due solely to negligence of the company indemnify and save harmless the company against any claim whatsoever which may be brought against the company on account thereof.

As witness the hand and seal of the general superintendant for the Pacific division of the railway company and the hand and seal of the contractor.

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:—

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:—

Now, Mr. Speaker, that agreement was prepared by Mr. W. J. Bowser, the Attorney General of the province of British Columbia, acting as sollicitor for Mr. Gotoh. It was prepared first in the year 1902. Keeping in mind that Mr. Bowser prepared this agreement, keeping in mind that he was solicitor for Mr. Gotoh, the contractor, under whom all the Japanese who created the difficulty in British Columbia came into British Columbia, it gives us a cue to what afterwards developed in that province. And in order to show what happened in connection with these Gotoh contracts, I call the attention of the House to a very interesting table prepared by Mr. Mackenzie King in reference to this Japanese immigration, which appears on page 11 of his report. This table shows that during the ten months ending October, 1907, 8,501 Japanese arrived in the province of British Columbia. It also shows that if we deduct the number of Japanese who came in under the Gotoh contracts prepared by Mr. W. J. Bowser, we find that the number of Japanese immigrants was limited to 299, a less number than was allowed under the arrangement between this government and the government of Japan. Or, in other words, if the Gotoh contracts had not been put into force we would never have had any Japanese difficulty in the province of British Columbia.

Now, Sir, we will go a little further—the general elections for the province were held in British Columbia on the second day of February, 1907; on the evening of the first day of February, 1907, Mr. Bowser who was one of the Conservative members for the city of Vancouver and who was running for re-election, delivered a speech in the city of Vancouver which is reported in the Victoria Daily 'Colonist' on the morning of February the 2nd, the morning of the election, as follows:

Labour on Grand Trunk Pacific.

Then, as regards the Grand Trunk Pacific. The railway was a creature of and created by the government at Ottawa. Infinite trouble had arisen from the employment of oriental

labour on the Canadian Pacific Railway and yet, blind to the interests of this province, the authorities at Ottawa had refused to put any clause in the contract with the railway forbidding the employment of Japanese or Chinese labourers. What was more, the province was actually booked for a repetition of the old trouble. Mr. Bowser stated upon absolutely authoritative grounds, that a company, the United Construction and Supply Company, had already been organized and had let a contract to a Japanese labour agent, Gotoh, of Vancouver, for the bringing of 50,000 Japanese labourers to the country, to work on the Grand Trunk Pacific. Already the contract had been let and Gotoh was even now in Japan, arranging for the shipment of the 50,000 coolies.

As to the membership of this company, Mr. Bowser read the names, James Carruthers of Montreal, E. G. Russell, local manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific, Robert Kelly of Vancouver, whose name was greeted with scornful laughter and hisses of execration from the audience: F. Bennett and D. Hays.

This is the 'Colonist's' report of Mr. Bowser's speech. On the evening of February the 1st, the evening before the elections, an editorial appeared in the Vancouver 'Province,' a newspaper which is the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway and supports the McBride government, and in this editorial Mr. W. J. Bowser who is now Attorney General in the McBride government, was commended for his work in drawing the attention of the public to the efforts of the McBride government to prevent the influx of cheap Japanese labour into this country; he was also commended for forewarning the public regarding the contract entered into by the Grand Trunk Pacific for the supply of Japanese labour. And the 'Province' newspaper intimated that this contract would be made effective if the McBride government were defeated and the Liberal government returned to power. The editorial of the 'Province' concludes:

> Mr. Bowser's warning, therefore, to the people of British Columbia who do not want the province swamped with cheap labour from Japan, is worthy of the most serious attention.

But how did they report Mr. Bowser's speech? They did not report it at all, but instead of reporting the speech, on the front page of the Vancouver 'Province' on the evening before the election was a long article with flaming headliness, giving with a wealth of detail the contract entered into between the United Construction and Supply Company, and Gotoh for the supply of 50,000 Japanese labourers for the Grand Trunk Railway. I say they gave this contract with a wealth of detail the evening before the elections. I want to put this article on record. With its flaming headliness it reads as follows:

> 50,000 Japanese for British Columbia.
> Grand Trunk Pacific and the machine Liberals want to flood this country with the little brown men.
> Hard and fast bargain is made.
> No chance for white men on new railroad.
> Japanese contractor now arranging to bring over horde of coolies.

The article reads:

> Arrangements have been virtually completed for the bringing into British Columbia of 50,000 Japanese to build the western end of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Confirmation of this astonishing piece of news was had in Vancouver to-day.

'To-day' mind you; the day before the election.

> All the details of the scheme have been obtained.

Mark that, all the details of the scheme have been obtained.

> And the biggest sensation of the campaign is public property this afternoon.

The afternoon before the election:

> Announcement of the details of the project for an oriental invasion of British Columbia explains the alliance of the Grand Trunk Pacific with the McInnes-Liberal party, and the hostility of the railway company and its friends to the Conservatives led by Hon. Richard McBride.
>
> With money pouring into Vancouver and all British Columbia in fact, from the coffers of the Grand Trunk Pacific, with a lavishness and recklessness never heretofore known in any provincial election in British Columbia, those who concern themselves with the motives that lie behind the actions of great corporations, have been forced to the conclusion that more than the mere desire to get hold of the Indian reserves and other public lands in the province, and escape the incidence of taxation, lay behind the railway company's unparalleled generosity. They feel this, and they were right, as the facts now available show.
>
> It is a matter of history—notorious, but true—that the Grand Trunk Pacific, for some unexplained reason, has delayed fulfilling its promise of commencing construction on the Pacific coast. Every one is also aware that year after year, session after session, the McBride government has introduced and passed legislation virtually prohibiting the entry into this country of oriental labour. This legislation has been as often disallowed by the Liberal administration at Ottawa. Consequently it was perfectly obvious to any intending large employer of oriental labour that as long as McBride was in power he would be a thorn in the flesh.
>
> McBride must be deposed. The Grand Trunk Pacific had decided not to employ one more white man than it could possibly help, in fact to perform the whole work with oriental labour. But McBride, with his anti-Mongolian legislation, stood in its way, and they consequently decided to delay construction until he was rendered harmless.
>
> When the elections were brought on pressure was at once brought to bear upon the Liberal party here by the company's foster parents in Ottawa—the Laurier administra-

tion—to come to an understanding with the Grand Trunk Pacific on this subject, with the result that a hard and fast agreement signed, sealed and delivered has been entered into by which the parties of the first part (the British Columbia Liberals) covenant and agree not to pass any anti-Mongolian legislation, if victorious, while the parties of the second part (the company) bound themselves to furnish all necessary campaign funds, and to buy the 'Guardian' newspaper from Joe Martin and turn it into a Liberal organ, which was done on the first of the year at the price of fifteen thousand dollars. So cock-sure is the company of the so-called Liberals winning that arrangements are now being perfected to flood this country with Japanese coolie labour, in the spring, to an extent undreamed of. And this is how it is being done:

There is a company carrying on business here and in Victoria, called the United Supply and Contracting Company, Limited. This concern is in reality the Grand Trunk Pacific under another name. Its manager is Mr. E. G. Russell, who is, also, the confidential agent for the Grand Trunk Pacific on the coast, and its stockholders are said to be members of the local Liberal machine. This supply company has, it is understood, entered into an arrangement with a Vancouver Japanee employment man named Gotoh, to furnish through one of the largest labour firms in Tokio, Japan (a firm with £45,000 capital), at least fifty thousand coolie Japs during this year, and more later. M. E. G. Russell, accompanied by Gotoh, was up at Prince Rupert a short time ago, to enable Gotoh to look over the ground and examine into conditions, so that he could report favourably to the Japanese government, which exercises a paternal care over all emigrants. Gotoh is now in Japan making all necessary arrangements with the government and the Tokio firm, for the furnishing and transportation of this army of coolies to British Columbia. Every difficulty has been anticipated, in fact, Mr. E. G. Russell recently stated that it has cost the company up to date, over fifteen thousand dollars in expenses, perfecting the scheme.

It may be asked how can the Alien Act be circumvented. The plan is this: The Grand Trunk Pacific will nominally have nothing to do with the bringing of the labour here. The United Supply Company (its creature) can land the coolies at Prince Rupert, under a secret agreement, with the Tokio firm, as to wages, &c., and arrange to erect huge barracks for their accommodation. The Grand Trunk Pacific emissaries can then appear on the scene and innocently hire them just as they would engage any other residents there.

But the worst feature of this plot is the statement made on the authority of Mr. Russell that these coolie Japs are not to be sent back to Japan after the railway is completed, but are to be settled by the railway company all along the line, so that they can be utilized to do the rough operating work of the system. As a consequence the workingmen of Canada, who are helping with their money to build this railroad, will derive no benefit from its construction, nor even in its operation after it is built.

These are the facts. This conspiracy or plot, or whatever you like to call it, is to be made possible by the expectation that the workingmen of British Columbia will vote for and place in power one of the parties to it, the so-called Liberal-Grand Trunk combination.

The presence of all these Japanese will open up other large questions. Who knows but what it is the intention of the railway company and its political followers to eventually enfranchise this Japanese horde? What a fine plan to run British Columbia could be carried out with fifty or sixty thousand machine votes?

Now, Sir, as I have said, that article appeared in the Vancouver 'Province' on the evening preceding the last provincial election. Details of the same article appeared in the report I quoted from the Victoria 'Colonist,' as having been given to the public in a speech delivered by Mr. W. J. Bowser, the now attorney general in the McBride government. Where did he get this information? The evidence brought out by Mr. Mackenzie King goes to show that there was never any such arrangement entered into between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company (or any one representing that company) and Mr. Gotoh (or any one representing Mr. Gotoh). The 'Province,' the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, got this information from Mr. W. J. Bowser, the solicitor for Mr. Gotoh, and the wealth of details appearing in that article they were able to secure because Mr. Bowser drew up the agreement that was entered into between Gotoh and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and not between Gotoh and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. LENNOX. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) allow me to ask him a question. Does the hon. member mean to say that Mr. Bowser personally drew up that agreement, or merely that it was drawn up in his office; does he know that it was personally drawn up by Mr. Bowser or that Mr. Bowser had any actual knowledge of it?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. In reply to that question of the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) I will say this: I am stating it as a fact on my responsibility as a member of this House, that Mr. W. J. Bowser was the solicitor for Mr. Gotoh and Mr. W. J. Bowser drew up the agreement for Mr. Gotoh.

Mr. LENNOX. Personally?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am not a clerk in his office. I do not know. I make the statement that the information contained in the article in the Vancouver 'Province,' published the evening before the last provincial election, was furnished by Mr. Bowser, because he knew it as solicitor for Gotoh and had drawn up the agreement that had been entered into between Gotoh and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Subsequent events demonstrated that the people of Vancouver felt very strongly on this Japanese question. In the face of that article in

the Vancouver 'Province,' with its wealth of detail in reference to a contract entered into between Gotoh and the Grand Trunk Pacific to bring 50,000 Japanese into the province of British Columbia, you could not have elected the Angel Gabriel in the city of Vancouver. More than that there was absolutely no time between the appearance of the article in the paper on the afternoon of February 1 and the election on February 2 to secure any evidence that could contradict it. This is what Mr. Bowser did. He was solicitor for Mr. Gotoh; he furnished the Vancouver 'Province,' the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the details of the contract which he had himself drawn up, and he attached that contract to a purely mercantile concern and made the people of British Columbia and Vancouver believe that this contract was in the interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that Gotoh was in Japan getting Japanese for the Grand Trunk Pacific when, as a matter of fact, he was in Japan getting Japanese for Mr. Bowser's strong political ally, the Canadian Pacific under a contract drawn up by Mr. W. J. Bowser. The question of professional ethics involved I leave to the lawyers in the House, and ask them if it is in accordance with the best traditions of the profession that any lawyer should use information obtained from his client in the way I have related. But let us go a little further. Up to the evening of February 2 the Liberals were confident of carrying five seats in the city of Vancouver. Strong Conservatives admitted, up to the evening of February 1, that at least three of the Liberal candidates would be elected; but, as I said before, with that article staring us in the face, we could not have elected the Angel Gabriel—and that is why we lost the five seats in the city of Vancouver.

But, let us go a little further. Mr. Bowser was profuse in his promises to the people that if he were returned to power he would introduce legislation in the provincial legislature that would prohibit the importation of oriental labour into this country. He was commended in his attitude by the 'Province' and other Conservative organs and he did introduce a Bill into the local legislature. This Bill goes down to history as the Bowser Bill. The enacting section of this Bill reads as follows:

> The immigration into British Columbia of any person who, when asked to do so by the officer appointed under this Act, shall fail himself to write out and sign, in the English language, or any language of Europe, an application to the provincial secretary of the province of British Columbia to the effect in the form set out in Schedule B to this Act annexed, as well as read in English, or any language of Europe, any test submitted to him by the officer appointed under this Act, shall be lawful.

That sounds all right, does it not? But I shall take out the verbiage that surrounds the crux of this clause and give the effect of it: it is simply that the immigration of any person who shall fail to read and write in the English or a European language shall be lawful. This Act would have permitted the admission of any one who could not read or write in an English or European language into the province of British Columbia. This clause is so cleverly drawn that the defect in it escaped the detection of Mr. J. A. Macdonald, the leader of the opposition in the province of British Columbia, than whom there is no brighter or abler lawyer in that province, and it also escaped the attention of the members of the provincial legislature. You have to read it three or four times before you see that the clause expresses a meaning directly contrary to its apparent intent and that as a means of prohibiting the importation of oriental labour it could not be effective. When it was discovered, people were charitable enough to say, not knowing the incidents to which I have referred, that it was a mere lapsus linguae, and there was no intent on the part of Mr. Bowser to draft the Act in this way. But let us see the situation. Mr. Bowser was solicitor for Gotoh. He knew there was a contract in full force and effect between Gotoh and his friend the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let him introduce a Natal Act properly drawn, let him get the assent of the lieutenant-governor to that Act and the Gotoh contract would have been of no value because the Japanese could not have been brought in with this Act in force. He was very careful. He tried to get a little kudos; he tried to carry out his pre-election promise, but he so drew the Act that it would not in any way interfere with the contract of his client Gotoh. He was so successful in drafting it that not a single member of the provincial legislature noticed the defect in that Act. What happened? Mr. Bowser as a good Conservative had something else in view. The first thing to do was to protect the Gotoh contracts; the second thing to do was to compromise the Liberal party in British Columbia. Mr. Dunsmuir, the lieutenant-governor of the province of British Columbia withheld his assent to this Act. Then Mr. Bowser said: I told you, here is a man appointed by the Liberal government at Ottawa as lieutenant-governor of this province and he refuses to give his assent to my Act which was intended to prohibit oriental immigration into this country; if the lieutenant-governor had given his assent to this Act and if it had been vetoed by the government at Ottawa as similar Acts have been vetoed Bowser could always have said: I told you that the Liberals are opposed to legislation restricting oriental immigration. But he could always have been absolutely sure

that the Act which he drew up, if it did receive the assent of the lieutenant-governor and the approval of the government here, absolutely would not prohibit the importation of a single Japanese into British Columbia but would rather encourage it, because it said in its enacting clause that the immigration of any person who could not read in the English or a European language would be lawful.

Mr. SPROULE. If that Act, even if it had received consent of the Lieutenant Governor, would not keep out the Japanese or the other foreigners it was intended to keep out, why would the Lieutenant Governor refuse his assent to it ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I have already pointed out that this clause was so cleverly drawn that Mr. J. A. Macdonald, one of the ablest and shrewdest lawyers in British Columbia, the leader of the opposition, let the clause go through and did not see its defect. And I will undertake to read it half a dozen times to the hon. gentleman, and he will not see the defect, so cleverly was it drawn. How then can he expect the Lieutenant Governor to see the effect, but I am coming to that point a little later.

Mr. McBride, the First Minister of British Columbia, has been making political capital out of this question. Newspaper reports during recent days circulated the statement that when this matter was discussed in the local legislature, Mr. McBride took the extraordinary position that Lieutenant Governor Dunsmuir was only an agent for the Dominion government and was not in any way responsible for any of his acts. I am not going to discuss the position Mr. McBride takes with reference to that matter, but I want to point out that, according to the official record, Mr. McBride did know something about Mr. Bowser's Bill and about what the Lieutenant Governor intended to do regarding it. Mr. Bowser introduced his Bill on April 2, 1907. It was read the second time on April 18, 1907, and considered in Committee of the Whole House on April 20, 1907. The House was prorogued on April 25, 1907, and it is stated in the records of the House that :

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor refuses his assent to this Bill and reserves the same until the pleasure of His Excellency the Governor General of Canada has been signified in respect thereto.

Where was Mr. McBride at this time ? I hold in my hand the report of his mission to London where, as he stated himself, he went to place this grievance of the people of British Columbia at the foot of the Throne. In this report Mr. McBride says :

Pursuant to my commission, as special delegate on behalf of your government, I left Victoria on the 11th day of April, 1907, arriving at Ottawa on April 16th. The same day I called upon the Honourable R. W. Scott, Secretary of State, and requested that I be given the credentials necessary to place me in official communication with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. These I received on the day following, and leaving Ottawa on the same afternoon, I sailed from St. John, New Brunswick, on April 19, arriving in London on Saturday, the 27th day of April.

While getting his credentials from the Secretary of State, the latter said to Mr. McBride : What about the Bill introduced by Mr. Bowser ? Will it become law ? Mr. McBride replied : No, it will not, because Governor Dunsmuir will refuse his assent. I am not quoting the exact words but that is the purport of his answers. As I have said, this Bowser Bill did not receive its second reading until April 18, 1907. Mr. McBride was here on April 16, 1907, two days before this Bill got its second reading. And then he told the Secretary of State, the official medium of communication, what the Lieutenant Governor was going to do seven days later. How then can Mr. McBride tell the people of British Columbia to-day that he did not know what action the Lieutenant Governor was going to take ? Or that he was not consulted about it ? How can he say this when he knew, seven days in advance, even before the Bill got its second reading, that the Lieutenant Governor was going to withhold his assent ? This statement of Mr. McBride appeared so extraordinary to the Secretary of State at Ottawa that he wired Mr. Dunsmuir, asking him if what Mr. McBride said was true, and Mr. Dunsmuir replied that it was.

Mr. LENNOX. Where did the hon. gentleman get those papers ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I think the First Minister announced to-day that they would be laid on the table of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. But the hon. gentleman has them in advance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. He did not get them from me or any member of this government. They were published, I understand, in British Columbia but not by this government.

Mr. LENNOX. That was not the explanation the hon. gentleman gave.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to make my speech in my own way, I will tell him that this information was fully published and discussed in the British Columbia newspapers as early as August last. I did not get any papers from any member of this government, I did not ask any member of this government for the papers, but am giving these facts on my responsibility as a member of the House, and I am bound to say that it is none of the hon. gentleman's business where I got my information.

Mr. McBride was here on April 16, 1907, as he states in his own report. He interviewed the Secretary of State at Ottawa on that day. He told the Secretary of State

what the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia was going to do, and now Mr. McBride tells us that he did not know what his honour, Mr. Dunsmuir, intended doing. Mr. McBride says that our Lieutenant Governor withheld his assent on instructions from Ottawa, but we have had the First Minister stating to-day to the House that no such instructions were given. Mr. McBride cannot escape responsibility for the act of the Lieutenant Governor, in view of the facts I have related. If Mr. McBride knew nothing about the intention of the Lieutenant Governor, how could he inform the hon. the Secretary of State what the Lieutenant Governor intended to do, seven days before the Lieutenant Governor took action, and one day before the Bill even received its second reading in the House ? So that while the Liberal party are receiving a great deal of blame from the Conservatives of the province of British Columbia for their action in connection with this matter, the leaders of the Conservative party were guilty of mendacity and trickery in connection with the legislation which they themselves introduced. So much for that Mr. Bowser's Bill.

I am not here to defend the action of the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia, but I am bound to say that there is a marked difference between this course and that of his two most important advisers. Mr. Dunsmuir is honest, almost as absolutely honest as he is absolutely stupid in matters political. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was left with an enormous fortune. He is of a retiring disposition. For a great many years he did not mix up with people as an ordinary business man would. He is passionately fond of his family and has devoted his time between his office and his home. He knew nothing of public life until suddenly he found himself at the head of 29 members of the local legislature, in a House of 38, by one of those peculiar political turnovers that we sometimes have in the province of British Columbia. He was made Premier, and, because he was honest, because he had never had any experience in dealing with politicians, because he knew nothing of public life, he made a woeful failure of the position of Premier. But, as I said before, he is generous, he is hospitable, he has a charming family, he has great wealth. And, when he was appointed lieutenant governor, it was thought that, with the large number of distinguished visitors who passed through the city of Victoria, he would make an ideal occupant of that high office. And I am bound to say that if he had had honest advisers, instead of two tricky politicians, he would not have got in to the difficulty he did get into. If he is to be censured for refusing his assent to the Natal Act, he is not nearly so much to blame as Mr. W. J. Bowser, the Attorney General of his government, who brought the Act in under the circumstances which I have related, and in a form in which it could not be made effective, even if it had received the assent of the Lieutenant Governor. I am bound to say this, however, that when His Honour the Lieutenant Governor in his capacity of president of the Wellington Collieries Company signed one of these Gotoh agreements, prepared by Mr. W. J. Bowser, he showed his unfitness for the position which he occupies, because these agreements are against public policy and the laws of this country. I am also bound to say, from what I know of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor that he never signed that contract without somebody advising him. And I think that about the time he put his name to that contract there was some brilliant modern Machiavelli near at hand. Because, you see, it was absolutely necessary to commit and compromise His Honour the Lieutenant Governor in some way before Mr. W. J. Bowser could carry out the trick which he began with the publication of the agreement which he himself had drawn up, as an agreement entered into by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, when it had been entered into by his friend the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He began his trickery then and carried it on when he introduced his abortive Natal Act. And once he got His Hon. the Lieutenant Governor into this compromising position, it was much easier for him to make this grand-stand play and carry on the career of trickery which began with the Gotoh agreement. Now, what do we next consider? The report of Mr. Mackenzie King shows that all the trouble which arose in the province of British Columbia was occasioned by these Gotoh agreements. The report of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) shows that, under the arrangements entered into with Japan, no more contract labour will be permitted to leave Japan, except with the consent of this government. The order in council passed by this government, within the past few weeks, will prohibit the importation of Japanese from the Hawaiian Islands. So it is absolutely impossible to bring in more Japanese under these Gotoh agreements. Mr. W. J. Bowser, Attorney General in the province of British Columbia, has no more interest in the Gotoh agreements because they are ineffective under the action taken by this government. What does he do now? The other day he brings in a good Natal Act. Why should not he, now that the Gotoh agreements are of no more avail? thanks to the action of this government. The Act he has just brought in provides that it should be unlawful for any person to enter British Columbia who cannot read or write some European language. It does not say that it shall be 'lawful' for such persons to enter. I am bound to say, speaking as a representative of the province of British Columbia, that I honestly believe that the settlement entered into by the hon.

Postmaster General with the government of Japan, and approved by this government, will be a satisfactory settlement of our difficulty in the province of British Columbia. I believe I represent—and I hope honestly represent—public opinion in British Columbia, and we are anxious to have this question settled. I believe that the settlement effected will be satisfactory and that it will place this Dominion of Canada in a far better position than it has ever held before, because it has demonstrated that, by negotiations, we can settle our difficulties with large and powerful nations. And I believe also that now that no Japanese can be brought in under the contract of Mr. Bowser's friend, Mr. Gotoh, Mr. Bowser is deliberately bringing in in the legislature of the province of British Columbia a good Natal Act for the purpose of endeavouring to create more turmoil in the province of British Columbia and disturbing the satisfactory arrangements made by the Postmaster General, the object being, if possible, to keep this alive as a political question in the province of British Columbia. In view of the facts I have given this House, I hope that the good sense of the members of the provincial legislature of British Columbia will enable them to see through the trickery of Mr. W. J. Bowser, and that he will not be allowed to pass any measure which has no honest object, but which is intended to disturb the friendly and satisfactory relations entered into between the Dominion of Canada and Japan.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not wish to take any part in this discussion, because it seems to me to come very strangely before this House. A motion is made to go into Committee of Supply. Of course it is the right of any hon. member on that motion to bring forward any grievance that can be remedied by this parliament, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Duncan Ross) brings up a question for which he is not attempting to hold this House responsible or to hold the Minister of Justice responsible for giving any advice with regard to it, but is endeavouring to hold the legislature of British Columbia responsible for his troubles. Now, we have nothing to do with the action of the Lieutenant Governor. If the hon. gentleman had followed up his argument by an impeachment of the Lieutenant Governor, then I could see the force of his observations. But he has not done that; he has made some very uncomplimentary remarks concerning him. When he says that the lieutenant governor was so absolutely stupid that he did not know what he was doing, I think he is not speaking respectfully of the Crown.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not want the hon. gentleman to misquote me. I said he was absolutely stupid in political matters, and I reiterate my statement.

Mr. D. ROSS.

Mr. SPROULE. It is political matters we are dealing with, and if that action was not within the line of his duty, what is his duty ? He represents the Crown as part of the political machinery of the province, therefore in my judgment the hon. gentleman has spoken disrespectfully of the Crown. The next question is, why did the lieutenant governor withhold his assent to that Bill ? The hon. gentleman says that if the Bill had passed it would not have been effective in keeping out the foreigners, and therefore the lieutenant governor might have given his assent to the Bill. But why did he refrain from doing it ? It was because, if you can believe the explanation given by the hon. gentleman, the lieutenant governor believed it would stop the influx of foreigners, therefore he disallowed the Bill. But why did he withhold his assent ? To ascertain the views of the Crown, and where would he ascertain the views of the Crown if not from the federal government through His Excellency the Governor General? Yet the right hon. First Minister told us only a short time ago that there was no correspondence whatever between the federal government and the lieutenant governor regarding this Bill. Then the lieutenant governor had not ascertained the views of the Crown. There must either have been some correspondence, or he must have acted on his own responsibility, a right that he enjoys as representative of the Crown. Now surely we can hardly suppose that he would have withheld its assent without consultation with the federal government here, or its representative, the Minister of Justice. It seems to me, therefore, that there must be something following. But according to the information disclosed to this House, there has been no correspondence, and no information given one way or the other. Therefore I cannot understand that the hon. gentleman's address to this House has any point whatever, because it does not deal with any grievance which this House can redress ; it is a grievance against the local government, and one with which this House has nothing to do.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). I cannot agree at all with the remarks of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) when he says that the speech of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) was on a subject with which this House had nothing to do.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say the speech, I said that from the observations the hon. gentleman presented to this House, his grievance was not against this government but against the government of British Columbia.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I see the fine distinction the hon. gentleman draws, but I cannot allow him to get away from his words. The purport of his statement was

that it was not necessary for the member for Yale-Cariboo to bring this question up in the House to-day, and even if it was, he had not made any point. But I think the member for Yale-Cariboo has made a point and driven it well home. The hon. Postmaster General has just returned from a diplomatic mission to Japan, the result of which is fraught with immense possibilities to my province. Had his mission proved a failure, I can assure the hon. member for East Grey that the people of the province of British Columbia would have been very much alarmed at the present time, because they would have felt that the last prop was gone, the last obstacle to save them from an influx of Japanese and other orientals. So in view of the fact that the Postmaster General has just arrived back from Japan, in view of the fact that he has placed before this House and country his interpretation of the arrangements entered into between Japan and Canada, and in view of the fact that it is wise to give these arrangements free rein for some months—because it is only by the actual operation of these arrangements that we can tell whether they are going to be successful, and we are bound to assume they will be successful until the reverse is proven—I say in view of that fact, the legislature of British Columbia are at this moment, or will be in an hour from now, having regard to difference in time, in the throes of a controversy as to whether or not the province of British Columbia shall enact what is known as the Natal Act, having for its object the exclusion of orientals from that country. Now we cannot get away from this one point, that the province of British Columbia, the right thinking men and the right thinking women, are as desirous of seeing a proper solution of this question as they can be of life itself. I can imagine no such excitement, no subject, outside of actual warfare itself, that has so deeply stirred the people of British Columbia as this oriental immigration. In my view the action of the provincial legislature, if it passes this Natal Act, is simply an attempt to make a political football out of a situation which, if they were truly patriotic men, they would be very averse even to mention. I say this subject is fraught with greater possibilities and greater dangers to the people of British Columbia than anybody in this House, outside the members from that province, can at all realize. And I am sorry to say that we have men in our province who are so recreant to their trust, so forgetful of the duties devolving upon every citizen who is desirous of keeping his country peaceful and happy, that they would sacrifice even its peace and happiness in order that they might gain some political advantage. I say that is a matter upon which this House has every reason to spend some time in considering. It is a pity that the members of the British Columbia legislature cannot rise to the occasion and say; we will for the present wait and see how the arrangement works out that was made between the government of Canada and the government of Japan, we will wait a few months and see what will be the result; and if experience shows that this arrangement will tend to keep British Columbia a white man's country, if we find that it will effect a happy solution of this question, then we will be very happy and well satisfied. But our men out there, apparently, are not big enough, are not broad enough, to take such a view, and their action, as shown by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo, proves their insincerity. Why, Sir, is it not the veriest kind of buncombe for the Hon. Richard McBride, the leader of the British Columbia government, to take this action, after he allowed an Act passed by the unanimous vote of the legislature, to be vetoed by the lieutenant governor? If he were in earnest, why did he not protest? But when the lieutenant governor told him, I will not sign the Act, he meekly walked away like a whipped cur.

Is it not the veriest kind of buncombe to suggest that the men who are responsible to the Lieutenant Governor and who are responsible for the failure to put the Natal Act into operation have been pursuing an honourable course? Mr. McBride and his government are the constitutional advisers of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. The people of the province of British Columbia do not believe that the Natal Act, passed by the legislature, is an Act which can be enforced. The government of the province of British Columbia do not accept the belief that the Act can be enforced, because, time and time again, for political purposes only and to pander to a certain class of people, they have enacted the Natal Act. When it was vetoed by this government, as it has been vetoed since 1882 up to the present time, has there been one solitary attempt by any attorney general or any premier of the province of British Columbia to carry it to a higher court to ascertain whether or not they had within their province the power to pass such legislation? That of itself, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, proves conclusively and it proves to every right thinking man in the province of British Columbia, the insincerity of every government which has ever passed that Act. Nay, more, there has been an attempt made on this question by every political party in the province of British Columbia to make capital out of it, Liberal and Conservative, workingman, anti-Asiatic, Socialist and every possible conceivable party. In a country were we have all kinds of possible conceivable parties there has been an attempt made by every party to make political capital out of this question and this present move in the legislature yesterday and to-day proves still more conclusively that they are agitators and not le-

gislators, that they are men who are false to their country and not patriots.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, how far is it possible for a member of this House to attack a provincial government and its leader by calling them false to their trust and traitors ? It seems to me that it is going rather far and I should like to have your cool opinion upon this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule applicable to the question is rule 19 which says that :

No member shall speak disrespectfully of His Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of the governor, nor of the person administrating the government of Canada.

That, of course, applies to the Governor General. Any reference to any person beyond that is a question of taste rather than of procedure, and I am not in the position of being able to enforce any rule as to that.

Mr. MACPHERSON. If I have indulged in language that is not parliamentary, I will say that I have no desire to say other than the truth ; I have no desire to say other than that which I feel to be right in my heart of hearts. Sometimes I do not find the confines of this chamber broad enough for me to express myself as I would like and on this question, above all others, I find myself crimped, cabined and confined. As to my good friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), no pent up Utica will keep him down when he wants to get up and declare himself in strong language and he will have to bear with me if I feel strongly on this question because I feel that I am speaking from my most positive convictions. I never felt called upon to speak on any subject since I have been a member of this House that called for stronger language or for calmer reason than this question.

Mr. SPROULE. The strong language you have, but when it comes to the reason that is the trouble.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is the last man to judge any body as to calm reason. I have sat for six years in this House and I have listened to what we may regard as calm reason but I doubt if there is any man, by the widest and most charitable stretch of his imagination, who could suggest that any of his utterances have been characterized by calm reason. But, to go back to my friend the Premier of British Columbia—and he is a personal friend of my own and has been for many years—when he allowed—and he says he allowed the governor to deal with the Act that was passed unanimously by the legislature there—when he allowed the governor to do that without one solitary remonstrance on his part it is prima facie evidence that the leader of the government of the province of British Columbia was desirous of seeing the governor not give his assent to that Bill. If he, as premier of the province, had been in earnest, when this Bill was brought to the governor, he would have said : You refuse to give your sanction to that Bill, you will give me a dissolution the moment you refuse to do that because I have no longer your confidence and the only constitutional procedure I can follow is to ask to be relieved from the powers of office. It would have been a simple matter for Mr. McBride to have done that and if he had done that and he had been in earnest in doing that he would have swept British Columbia from the west coast of Vancouver to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. There would not have been one man left to go against him upon that subject in British Columbia and he would have come back to the House with a full following enabling and forcing the governor to give his assent to the Bill. But, is it any wonder that the people of the rest of Canada do not believe that we have been in earnest in British Columbia in our attitude towards oriental immigration ? Is it any wonder that the people of Japan have never accepted the statement that we are in earnest when we have the premier of the province advising the governor to sign the Bill and then as he has been charged and charged by members from the province of British Columbia, going down to the office of the Secretary of State and giving the assurance that the governor would not sign the Bill. The word of the Hon. R. W. Scott, whose life has extended over four score years and who for fifty years has taken part in public life, is possibly as good as that of any man in Canada, and the Hon. R. W. Scott, that veteran in the public life of Canada declares that Hon. Richard McBride gratuitously told him, one week before the Bill would have received its second reading, that he need have no fear of the passage of the Natal Act because the Governor would not give his assent. Then we have the Hon. Mr. McBride hieing himself away to the foot of the Throne to present an imaginary grievance when he himself was playing ducks and drakes with a question which was much more important than the question that he carried to the foot of the Throne. I know Mr. McBride and I know him well.

Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, has always been of the opinion, for reasons I have never asked him, that the province of British Columbia was altogether too anti-Asiatic. When Mr. McBride went to the Secretary of State to ask for his credentials, Mr. Scott said to him : No doubt your province will once more resurrect that hardy annual, known as the Natal Act ? Yes, said Mr. McBride, but it will not receive the governor's assent. If Mr. Scott, who is an old and an honest man, had been as

acute as Mr. McBride, he would have put the question differently. Still he was fairly acute and he did not accept unhesitatingly Mr. McBride's statement. He sent a telegram, worded in a different fashion from what my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross), would have worded it. He worded it in such a way so that he put the onus upon the lieutenant governor. The two telegrams were published in the Vancouver and Victoria papers and the eastern papers last September. Mr. Scott's telegram read : Your premier tells me that you will not give your assent to the Natal Act. The lieutenant governor, who would not do a wrong thing if he knew it, replied : Your information is correct ; the Bill will not receive my assent. I have no doubt that this reply pleased Mr. McBride and Mr. Bowser, the father of this Natal Act, and no doubt it created the opinion in eastern Canada and Japan that the British Columbia government was not in earnest and that, in passing this Natal Act, which they knew would not receive the assent of the lieutenant governor, they were merely pandering to the agitation of people who did not take the time to read or think. Then when we consider further that at present, Mr. Bowser, the attorney of the province of British Columbia, is the paid solicitor of Mr. Gotoh, the president of the Canadian Nippon Supply Company as well as senior member for the city of Victoria in the local house, and when we consider further that his name was then prominently mentioned as the next Attorney General and probably the next premier, it is evident that Mr. Gotoh knew where to go. Being no doubt well versed in the trickery of politics, he went to the man who probably had the greatest influence. I am not saying Mr. Bowser is a political trickster, but he certainly comes very close to the border line. When Mr. Gotoh went to Mr. Bowser, Mr. Bowser said: I will draw you up a hard and fast agreement, which will take the place of the Alien Labour Act of the Dominion, and under which you can bring in labourers under contract. This agreement, drawn up by Mr. Bowser, was in existence some time, and when the elections came on, that was the time to bring out this contract, put the onus of it upon the Liberal party, and make them the scapegoats. How well he succeeded we all know, but chickens will come home to roost, and they are coming home to roost to Mr. Bowser. Mr. Gotoh went to Japan and said to the people there : It is all right, the attorney general has drawn up this agreement ; he tells me he has drawn up the Natal Act in such a way that you need not fear anything ; the politicians of British Columbia are not sincere in the matter. Is it any wonder that the people of Japan had a false idea of the attitude of our politicians ? Is it any wonder that we from British Columbia have great difficulty in this parliament and in eastern Canada in convincing this House and the people of the east of our sincerity in this matter ? Any man who will look through the record cannot fail to be convinced that there has been a great deal of trickery going on among Conservative politicians over this whole business. So much for Mr. Bowser and Mr. McBride. Lieutenant Governor Dunsmuir, in my opinion, is the only man who has come out of the deal with clean hands, because he has never been called upon by the government to make a statement explaining why he withheld his sanction.

It would not be the part of wisdom of our government in British Columbia to pass another Natal Act ; and if the Liberal party in our local legislature were to allow such a Bill to go through, in the face of the arrangement which has been arrived at between this government and the government of Japan, they would not be acting the part of wise men and patriots. They can point to that arrangement which we have reason to believe will be entirely satisfactory. They can show the province of British Columbia that if the local legislature did pass that Natal Act, it would not keep a solitary Jap or Hindoo or other oriental from coming into our province over the border line of Alberta. Any man in Canada can travel from one part of our country to any other part, and the laws of this country will protect him in doing so. We can with perfect sincerity then declare that we are ready to give this compact a fair trial. This ought not to be a question of politics. The question before the people of British Columbia is whether or no we shall for all time prevent the influx of Asiatics. If our Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has made such an arrangement as will for ever stop these people from coming to our country, even if the seven men supporting the government from our province should be defeated, they will have left a heritage which will for all time secure to our beautiful province the great advantage of being a country belonging to white people and settled by white people.

PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would point out that the question which was raised by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) just before the orders of the day were called and which elicited an answer from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seems to leave some matters in doubt and it is not clear that the result has been different from that of the discussion which we had the other day with reference to the production of papers. The hon. gentleman from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) made a motion for the originals

of certain papers. In the few observations he made asking for those papers, he gave reasons why he wanted the originals rather than copies, and he was met by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) with a flat refusal to bring down the original documents, that refusal being based on a report of the deputy Minister of the Interior which was absolute and which recommended that in all those cases the word 'original' should be erased from the resolution calling for papers. He recommended also that in no case should any but copies be allowed to go out from the department. The minister declared his policy to be based on that report of his deputy and therefore argued, and in the end came to a conclusion satisfactory to himself, that the originals should not be brought down. I followed the Minister of the Interior and expressed my surprise that he had taken that ground, which I thought was arbitrary, uncalled for and unconstitutional and I expressed the belief that the premier would not be found to support such an announcement of policy or such a constitutional doctrine. The Prime Minister who followed me in his opening sentences affirmed his entire agreement with the Minister of the Interior in the doctrine he had laid down and expressed the greatest surprise that I should have argued to the contrary. After making more or less extended remarks, he took the position that in this case the original documents should not be brought down. The result was that the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) was negatived and so the matter stood for some days. The day before yesterday the leader of the opposition introduced a resolution in the House affirming in short that it was the undoubted right of parliament and the members of the House of Commons to see and examine the documents upon which the business of the country proceeded, provided there were no grave reasons of inconvenience and no state reasons which precluded their being brought down, and declaring also that the refusal of such information to the House would quite justify the denial of supplies to the Crown. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) read that resolution and signified his assent to it, and although it was stoutly argued against by the Minister of the Interior who flatly declared that he would not bring down these or other original documents unless he were so instructed by the House, the motion carried without a vote. I, in common with others on this side of the House, supposed that the question was definitely settled and there would be no difficulty about the documents asked for and which had not been brought down apparently under a misunderstanding of the principle at issue. When my hon. friend asked if that would be the case he was met by the unexpected reply that the papers would have to be called for in the proper way and that a proper reason would have to be given. That leaves the matter exactly where it was, which I may say was not a satisfactory position. My hon. friend in the argument he addressed to the House the last day on which this was debated,—and I will have to refer to that debate in order to make the matter clear—declared that no reason was given, and that my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) was arguing for and asserting the absolute right of any member of this House to call for original documents, and that if he so called the government had no right to refuse him. I think he made that argument on a misapprehension, and that after the speech of my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) had been referred to and parts of it read, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed that there were reasons given; whether sufficient or not, I do not know. There are two interpretations to that. The first interpreter, the Minister of the Interior, holds that no reason would be sufficient unless the member would say upon his honour as a member of the House that the copies brought down were different from the original documents, that there was forgery or something of that kind. I suppose the minister means that a member shall say that a document he has never seen is a forgery. If we are to accept that as the government's interpretation of what is to be a sufficient reason, it will be perfectly impossible ever to have original documents come to the members of this House. No member of this House should be put in the position of having to make that statement with reference to papers that he has not before him and if the only sufficient reason, according to the Minister of the Interior who is a member of the government and is presumably speaking for it, is that the member must state that these copies are not true to the originals, then we are debarred, as I said, from ever having papers brought down. My right hon. friend who leads the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not give his interpretation of the matter in quite the same categorical way, but it left it really in about the same position. He said that the reason must be a sufficient reason. what in his opinion would be a sufficient reason he did not state. He did not state whether the opinion of the government or of the minister from whose department the information was asked would govern, and we are again left entirely at sea. He did not state what he thought would be sufficient reason even although he was asked for it again and again. I endeavoured and so did other members of the House to show to my right hon. friend and to the Minister of the Interior that no further reasons or stronger reasons could be given than those that were alleged in this House by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) and in order to reinforce that I must beg the attention of the House for a short time to a review of the reasons which were given by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division

(Mr. Ames). That speech consists of two parts, one the observations he addressed to the House in asking for the papers, and the other observations that he addressed to the House at the close of the debate after the opinions of the members had been expressed.

It seems to me that the position taken by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the other night is one that cannot be maintained—that the reasons must be given in the first part of a member's speech and not in the latter part. It seems to me that, if anywhere in the course of a plea that a member makes for papers, he gives a sufficient reason, it is purely arbitrary, and, one may say finical, to make the assertion that they were not given at the right part of the speech. A man's plea is his plea, and you must take the whole plea together. And, taking the whole plea of the hon. member for St. Antoine together, I contend that sufficient, fair and reasonable reasons are given, and none further can be given, simply because the hon. member (Mr. Ames) cannot allege what the Minister of the Interior decides to be a reason which alone can prevail, and he does not seem to be able to find out from the First Minister what he would consider to be a sufficient reason. I find here in 'Hansard' the remarks of the hon. member for St. Antoine as follows :—

I am suprised that any objection whatever should be raised to the passage of this resolution, the subject of which has been referred to on frequent occasions in this House. The principle involved is a very simple one. It is simply that we contend that there are certain occasions when we are entitled to access to original documents.

Now, that is not an arbitrary position to take. He does not say : We contend that whenever, from caprice, with good reason or with no reason, we ask for original documents they must be produced. He says simply that we contend that there are certain occasions when we are entitled to access to original documents. He goes on :

I think it is an accepted principle of parliamentary practice that members are entitled to the fullest information upon matters which are of public concern.

No exception can be taken to that.

We who wish to investigate matters are dependent upon the government for this information. A typewritten copy——

And here is the first specific reason that my hon. friend gives :

A typewritten copy of a document does not always carry the information that is desired.

That appeals to every man's common sense—there is no use in beating that old argument over again. The statement is a truism.

There are occasions, such as have occurred several times in bringing down documents to this House, where the documents do not contain all the information which we are entitled to have.

So having stated the general fact, which nobody will quarrel with, he proceeds to supply certain instances which prove his contention :

Now, I think that the government can hardly take the ground that they are entitled to withhold the freest access to certain documents without assuming that there is some state interest which can be evoked as a justification for denying us the privilege of access to these documents

That is eminently fair. If the Minister of the Interior or the First Minister could have risen in this House and stated that there were state reasons why these documents could not be brought down, that would have ended the contention in a moment, as it did the other day in two instances, where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) said that certain papers asked for could not be brought down because the correspondence with the British government was not completed. No one raised any objection. That contention prevailed, and was assented to without a single murmur—as it should be.

Well, there was no allegation that inconvenience would result to the department if these original documents were brought down. That was not the allegation, except as covered by the general report of the deputy Minister of the Interior. The minister himself did not say that great inconvenience would be caused to his department, or injury to the public, by bringing down these papers. Mr. Ames proceeds:

In this case it therefore seems to me that if the government wish to refuse to members of the opposition the opportunity of examining these documents that I mention they must allege that there are grave interests at stake which make it inadvisable that these documents should be seen by members of the opposition. Last year, when a debate was about to take place in this House——

And here he gives another reason :

——a return was laid on the table of the House and several members of the opposition had an opportunity of examining it. There were certain features about that return that led them to think that it would be advisable to see the original. I, for one, called at the Department of the Interior and was shown, without the slightest hesitation by the deputy minister, the originals of the returns which had been copied.

Exactly the same took place then as took place this year. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) had called for returns and copies were brought down. When he examined these papers, he found that they did not, in some particulars, give him the information that he was after—there were certain marks, signatures, dates, and so on, which, if he

could see them in the original, would give him that information. The case to-day is exactly parallel. Copies have been brought down; in reference to nine pages of these copies the hon. member for St. Antoine says that the typewritten signatures convey no information to him, that he wants to see the actual signatures of the documents. Last year, the copies presented to the House did not give the needed information. But, at that time, no question was raised as to the hon. gentleman seeing the originals. He went to the Minister of the Interior and stated his difficulty, and the Minister of the Interior, or some one in that department, said: There are the files; look at the original documents themselves. But now we shall see what took place as detailed by the member for St. Antoine.

I, for one, called at the Department of the Interior and was shown, without the slightest hesitation by the deputy minister, the originals of the returns which had been copied. By having access to these originals I obtained certain information which was of great value in discussing the question in the House.

Every hon. member knows that it was. It was developed in that case what could not have been developed by the typewritten copies—that though the House would have supposed, from the copies, that a man named Brown, said to be living in Montana, had made application for grazing leases, it was absolutely impossible for Brown to have made that application, because that letter would have had to come from Montana to the department here in less than twenty-four hours. And, as a result of this discovery, what did we find? That Brown was simply a go-between, or, worse still, that 'Brown' was simply an assumed name. For four years the department had been hunting for Brown; never could find Brown; and only by the fact that we had access to the original papers was it possible to learn that Brown was simply a cover for McGregor, and, as it turned out afterwards, McGregor was simply a cover for Adamson, and so the whole plot, the whole bad business was exposed. I think that is a reason cogent, actual, and transpiring before the members of this House in the light of day, which goes as near as possible to a case exactly similar where my hon. friend wants to see what will be shown by actual signatures. It is a perfect parallel, and a reason which I think ought to be accepted without any further comment by the government, and as a sufficient reason for founding the demand for these original copies. The member for St. Antoine says:

Therefore, the only method open to us is to ask that these original documents——

The ones he is asking for, the ones he has copies of.

—be laid on the table of the House in order that we may see them in that way. The members of the opposition have introduced some four or five resolutions asking for information regarding certain leases of timber areas in the Canadian northwest. We could not secure the passing of these orders until all reference to original documents was struck out of them. We contend——

Now what is that contention, based on that reasoning, based on those circumstances? I am trying to give everything that the member for St. Antoine said in that speech. You must take every statement he makes in connection with the context and what he is arguing for. He says:

We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals, and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question, because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to timber berths Nos. 1107, 1108 and 1171.

There is not from the first to the last line of that plea a single assertion of that doctrine which I myself am not ready to assert, that a member may stand up without reason, from mere caprice, no matter what the government may urge against it, and demand that originals be brought down. My hon. friend made no such demand. He was arguing a case before this House, a special case, and these are the reasons that he gave for it and these are the arguments which I think ought to have prevailed. Now I go further, to the close of the debate. I am not going to read the whole of his remarks for I do not think it is necessary. But I will read this essential part of it, specially because the Prime Minister said, or I understand him to have intimated, that if the reasons which were given in the closing part of the remarks of the member for St. Antoine had been given in the earlier stages, no objection would have been raised. I have already dealt with that. It does not seem to be essential that the reasons should be given at any particular stage, if they are given at the time the member is requesting the information he is desirous of getting.

I want to see something about the applications and tenders in connection with certain timber limits; I am not going to allege what I believe with reference to these timber limits at this particular time. It is my right in the House to ask this information to be placed where I can see it, and in due time I will give all the information I have with reference to these limits, in a form that will quite satisfy the Minister of the Interior. Here is the return we have been speaking about; it contains 453 pages. I have read that return from cover to cover. Now, there are nine pages of that return which can be illumined if I may see the originals.

There is his reason.

As to all the other pages, the copies are all I want.

He is not after something to make work for or to worry the government. Out of the 455 pages he wants the originals of only nine pages.

As to all the other pages the copies are all I want. But there are nine pages there with respect to which the copy does not tell me all I want to know, or which I have the right to know, if I understand my rights in this House of Commons.

Well, I think I may read what intervenes, because it shows again that the Minister of the Interior is still holding to his first position.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend say that these nine pages differ from the originals?

That is still in the minister's head; that is the one sufficient reason in his mind; the member for St. Antoine must absolutely say that these nine pages are different in the copy from what they are in the original or else he won't get the papers.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend say that these nine pages differ from the originals?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could he tell unless he sees the original?

Mr. AMES. I say that these nine pages will in all probability clear up certain doubts which I have regarding peculiar features in connection with some of these transactions; I say that the handwriting of some of these nine pages may have a very important bearing on the case. The hon. gentleman for Yale-Cariboo made an argument in this House to the effect that a man's title to his timber limits might be involved because these papers may be lost. In the first place the minister can take any precaution he likes to see that these papers when they are laid before this House are properly safeguarded; ten minutes will suffice me to look them through; he can have them back in ten minutes in his department if he wants them. What I am asking for is not the original lease which has been passed between the various owners of these timber limits and the government; that is the official document in which the rights of the lessees have been set forth. What I am asking for are three applications made for timber limits and six tenders in connection with timber limits, in all nine documents, nine pages. Is that a very enormous amount of work for the department to produce these nine pages? Is it running an enormous risk to leave these nine pages here for half an hour, so that I and possibly one or two other members may see them? Is there any great hardship entailed upon the department or any one else to gratify my right to see these papers as a member of this House? The argument which the minister has made falls to the ground in this respect. Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle that when we on this side of the House have what we consider good and sufficient reason we may have the right to see an original document, or else, be prepared to take the odium throughout the country that you do not wish an original document to come to light. That is all I have to say. I simply wish that the question be brought to a vote in order to ascertain whether the government shall take upon themselves to declare, that when a member of this House has what he considers to be a good and sufficient reason, there is no way open for him to see an original document such as this.

Now, I think that shows the matter as plainly and as reasonably as it possibly can be shown. Where then are we on this subject? Has the government acceded to a resolution which the Prime Minister says is reasonable? That resolution is pretty inclusive. It is not an unguarded resolution. It is not just a bald assertion of right to these things without any reason being given, it is not that at all, but it is:

> Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case it is the undoubted right of the peoples' representatives in parliament assembled to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government, and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business; and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.

Has this House assented to it? Has the First Minister marked it with his approval? Does it mean any thing? Then what have we in the resolution? Is it words in the mouth with no substance, is it simply a holding up of the screen that the public may see the words written upon it while behind the screen the same refusal continues and the same indisposition to show original documents when reasons are given? What does it say? If you can show considerations of public policy, if you can urge any that can be validly urged the case drops to the ground, but if you cannot you cannot refuse to give us these documents. The Prime Minister has declared this resolution to be proper. He has instructed his followers to vote for it. They were denied the right to vote against it. He and we stand on exactly the same ground. Now, if we cannot have these nine pages what are the considerations of the public policy that can be validly urged in this case? We have not heard any. That resolution is the only guard that the government has. When a member gets up and wants original papers under that resolution and gives his reason therefor as either that they are necessary in order to illumine what he has in his hand, or to explain what he has in typewritten copy, then the onus is upon the government to state the considerations of public policy that can be validly urged in that case, and if none can be urged and none are urged the resolution says, the Prime Minister says, both sides of this House say that the undoubted right of the people's representatives in parliament assembled is to get this information. The Prime Minister says, this House agrees and we all say that if it is not given supply may be denied to the Crown. That is just

where we are on this question and I invite the Prime Minister to take into consideration the words which I have placed calmly before the House and in as cool and collected a manner as I could. Without adding another word or a single plea to it I have just tried to put a plain statement of this case before the House and I submit it now to the Prime Minister as to whether or not the case is not clear and these nine pages might not better be put down on the table of the House.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This, Mr. Speaker, is a very plain matter and I am surprised really at the efforts—I will not say efforts because I do not want to be offensive ; I want to speak of this matter in the same spirit as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has done—but I am surprised at the mountains which my hon. friend has made out of mole hills with reference to this question. It seems to me to be a very simple one. I stated the other day and I repeat again that the House is entitled to the fullest information upon any thing which any hon. member thinks, in the discharging of his duty, he must obtain. As to the broad principle that is not new ; it has been in existence ever since there has been parliamentary government in this country and in the motherland, but my hon. friend knows, and he knows as well as I do, that there is a proper way for a member to enforce his rights. I call the attention of the House first of all to the motion which was moved the other day by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). He moved :

For a return laying upon the table of this House the original applications and tenders in respect of timber berths 1107, 1108, and 1171.

That was the bare motion which was made before the House without a word of explanation. I do not mean to say that the explanation should have been in the motion, but I call the attention of the House now to the question as to what we are to understand to be the purport and intention of the hon. member when he put such a bare motion before the House. I again call the attention of the House to the words which I read a moment ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my right hon. friend argue that a motion for papers must state the reasons therefor ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I do not say that.

Mr. AMES. May I ask, does the right hon. gentleman recollect that I stated that I had followed exactly the course that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) suggested I should follow in a written communication to me ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that I recollect everything that was said by my hon. friend but I recollect very well the closing remarks of my hon. friend and they were to this effect :

We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question.

What are we to understand from that language ? We have the bare motion before us. We ask for the originals, we contend that we have the right to ask for the originals and we have drafted this motion in order to test that one right. Well, Sir, there was only one conclusion to draw from this and that was that it was open to any member of the House to ask for any originals without giving any reasons at all. The hon. gentleman gave reasons in his speech but if I understood him aright he did not rely upon the reasons which he did give but he simply said that we have the right to ask for originals as well as for copies. This was a statement to which we could not agree. We thought that if the originals were to be presented some substantial reasons should be presented for that course, but the hon. gentleman rested his case upon the proposition that we had to have the originals put before the House whether there were reasons given for it or no reasons given for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my right hon. friend found that upon any thing he can quote?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I found this upon the very words which I have just read and I will read them again :

We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the concluding part of the hon. member's first speech ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That was an observation made by my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) after he had made his whole argument for the production of original papers on this one case and given his reasons why he needed them in this one case.

Mr. LENNOX. And the hon. gentleman said :

This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question.

And he stops there but the sentence does not stop there :

This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question, because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to the timber berths Nos. 1107, 1108 and 1171.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What he contended was: We have sufficient reasons, but we do not rely upon these sufficient reasons; we rely upon the naked right that we can ask for originals instead of copies and this motion has been simply drafted to test that question. That is the way he put it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose he did put it upon the naked right in the first instance, then the right hon. gentleman required reasons, and then in his concluding speech my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) did give reasons and the motion should have been adopted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And what would have been the consequence? Had this motion passed then it would have been competent for any member hereafter to say: Oh, there is a precedent. He would say no reasons were given on this occasion why the originals should be brought down and no reasons need be given in future. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) said: we want to test our right that we have the power to compel the House to order originals to be produced whether there are reasons given or not. That is why we could not comply with the motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not have been competent for a member of the government, my right hon. friend himself for instance, assuming he is right in his contention, to have risen and said: There were not sufficient reasons given in the first instance and therefore we deny the motion, but there are now sufficient reasons given and we will allow the motion to pass.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When the government has taken the position that a motion as made should not pass, it is not right or fair for hon. gentlemen to change their grounds afterwards and substitute other grounds.

M. R. L. BORDEN. Why should we discuss these things at all then?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In order to get light which unfortunately we do not always receive from gentlemen on the other side. The other day the leader of the opposition brought forward a motion which was a pure truism and we agreed at once to this motion, but that was not discussing the one point which had been discussed before, namely: is it allowable under the rules of the House for any member without giving any reason whatever to compel the production of the records of any department on the table of the House? That is a thing which we cannot allow, and we have defined our position in that respect. But I have simply to say that if the hon. member, or any other member brings his motion—we have for instance a motion from the hon. member from Qu'Appelle—the moment reasons are given, the moment the hon. member says for example: I want the originals because I cannot do justice to the case without it, I have not the information in the copy which the original would give me; that would be sufficient reason.

Mr. FOSTER. And that reason has been given.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We want hon. gentlemen to understand that if they want to establish the precedent that they will compel the government to bring down originals, simply upon their ipsi dixit, without satisfying the House that there is reason for it, that cannot be done. The moment they will make a demand which is legitimate, fair and reasonable the rules of the House will be applied as they have always been.

Mr. AMES. May I make that demand now with reference to these nine documents?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly; my hon. friend can move for the papers whenever he wants to.

Mr. AMES. I cannot do justice to the case, I have not the information in the copies. I can say that. May I have the nine documents?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). When my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) moved some days ago for the original papers in connection with applications for leases of certain timber berths in the Northwest Territories the right hon. the First Minister objected to the motion on the ground that no reasons were assigned why these originals should be brought down. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me give my experience in this House for over thirty years. During all that time I never before heard of a reason being required before a motion calling for the production of either original papers or copies was acceded to. One of the first motions that I made in the House was for the bringing down of some papers concerning the postmastership in the town of Lanark. I prefaced my motion by some remarks and was brought to task by the then Postmaster General, a colleague of the right hon. gentleman, for discussing the matter before the papers came down. The right hon. gentleman claims that those who move for papers should give reasons why they require them. That, Sir, has not been the custom in this House either when calling for originals or copies, and we have today the admission of the government that a copy is in the same position as an original. If a member moves for the original

papers, there is nothing to prevent any minister from asking why he requires them, nor is there anything to prevent a minister from pointing out that there was some reason in the public interest why the demand should not be granted. The responsibility of giving reasons does not rest upon the party making the motion, but it rests upon those who refuse to produce the papers to give sufficient reasons to justify their refusal. They can assign their reasons at the time the motion is made, or even after the motion has been carried, the minister responsible may declare that for reasons of state or some other valid reasons, in the interests of good government, it is not proper that the papers should be brought down. And I have never yet heard when a good reason has been given for the non-production of papers any objection expressed by the opposition to that refusal. We have had some extraordinary doctrines laid down by the other side regarding this particular matter. I am not at liberty to refer to a past debate, but let me put an analogous and hypothetical case. Suppose that when a motion was made for the production of papers in the British House of Commons, a minister of the Crown should rise and declare that he stood in that House as the protector of the interests of the people and on that ground refused to accede to the motion. Just fancy a minister of the Crown in England declaring that he and not the British parliament was the guardian of the people's interests. Such a contention would be ridiculed in any other free assembly than the present one. And then just fancy a British minister justifying his course by reading to the House the opinion of one of the officers of his department, stating that in the interests of the department and of the country parliament had no right to the papers called for and ought not to be given them. Let these officials know, or if they do not, let me tell them that if they will not be punished at present, there is a time coming when they shall answer for any such conduct, for such conduct is a breach of the rights and privileges of parliament. An official in any of the government departments is an officer of this House for the production of these papers. He is obliged to bring down every paper ordered by the House. He can neither add to nor subtract from them, and he is bound to see that they are delivered to this House. He may deliver them through his minister, but that is not at all obligatory. When an order of the House is issued, he is obliged to obey it, and it is a gross breach of the privileges of this House for any official to dare adivse his minister either to limit the right of parliament or refuse an order of parliament. What has the parliament of Great Britain and of every other free country been fighting for the last hundred or couple of hundred years? It is the right to review every expenditure, the right to see every particular connected with it, independent of the refusal of the minister or any one else. That right is one which has been acquired by the people of this country, and it is one we intend to maintain. Here is my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) moving for the production of certain papers. His motion was rejected by this House. But afterwards, when the motion was made to go into supply, the principle which my hon. friend propounded was unanimously adopted as the correct one. How is he to get the papers other than by moving for them? He moved that they be brought down. That motion was rejected. Then, on motion to go into supply, he asked in the most modest manner that they be produced. What other way could we adopt? He could not make another motion for these same papers, because you, Mr. Speaker, would rule it out of order on the ground that a similar motion had been rejected already. The only possible way, therefore, in which he could obtain these papers was by the unanimous consent of the House to his request for them on his motion to go into supply. That request is refused by the First Minister. What then is my hon. friend to do? The ridiculous contention was made by some of these hon. gentlemen opposite the other day that we could make a charge, have that charge referred to a special committee, and that committee could have the papers produced before it. But we heard no more about the ridiculous contention that original papers cannot be brought down on a motion. I was prepared to show that in hundreds of cases originals have been produced on motions for returns. Again and again have motions been made in this House for the production of papers and these papers have been brought down and afterwards referred to special committees. There is no other way of getting the original papers unless by the ordinary motion made at the beginning of each session that everything relating to public accounts and the Auditor General's Report should be placed at the disposal of the Public Accounts Committee. Outside of that order, we have no means, except through the ordinary course of a motion of calling for the production of papers. And if the papers are of sufficient importance, they are referred to one of the standing committees for the purpose of inquiry. I am glad to see that parliament has, by a unanimous vote, vindicated its incontestable right to the control of all public documents except those which it may not be advisable to produce in the interests of the country, such, for instance, as the reports by special officers with reference to particular subjects or negotiations with reference to treaties. It is advisable in the interest of the country that they should be produced and they are always produced. It is amusing to hear democrats of the type of the

right hon. gentleman attacking the rights of this parliament. I was in this House when the right hon. gentleman and his then leader insisted on the production for the use of the Public Accounts Committee of certain papers that were refused by Sir John A. Macdonald for the reason that their production might cause the death of parties interested. We all remember that when a certain amount was voted for the purpose of secret service and was expended to secure the most secret information into the affairs of this country, the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues at that time insisted on the production of these papers, and when my leader at that time suggested that the then leader of the opposition and a couple of other gentlemen should be appointed to examine the papers, they said that any expenditure on behalf of the people of this country should be open to examination through the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. They demanded the right in connection with the secret service.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but now their opinions are entirely changed. They rule the country, they stand for the people. As the minister said : I stand here for the purpose of protecting the people of this country and looking after their interests and I will defend them against even a request of the parliament of Canada. What an extraordinary position for a minister to take ! I would like the right hon. gentleman to explain to me why it is taken. Mr. Ames thinks that it is in the interest of the people that certain original applications or tenders for timber limits should be produced ; these papers are refused, the right hon. gentleman, instead of at once consenting, as he ought to, refuses to produce them, on the ground that sufficient reason was not given for their production. That is no reason whatever. The right hon. gentleman should be prepared to give a reason for not producing the papers. The motion for the production of papers has been a matter of form and I never heard of a minister asking the reason why papers should be produced. I have again and again heard reasons why particular parts of papers should be refused in the interest of the country, but never before have I heard a refusal of a request for copies of papers or originals unless a reason was assigned for it. One of the first motions I heard in this House was by an old friend of mine who wanted papers in reference to a dispute between Ontario and Quebec as to boundaries. The answer was that the papers were not in the possession of the government. That was not a sufficient reason ; if papers are necessary and ought to be in the possession of the government it is the duty of the government to see that they have copies of them or that they are in their possession. The motion was finally withdrawn on the ground that it was for the purpose of furnishing evidence in a private suit and the answer was that the litigants in that suit could obtain possession of them through orders of the court. The principle cannot be admitted that only such original papers as the minister chooses shall be produced to this House ; this House has a right to order the production of the papers moved for by Mr. Ames. Is a minister of the Crown by the simple statement that it is an original paper, to be permitted to refuse its production ? It is a right which the people of Great Britain obtained from the Crown and which every self-colony in the empire has inherited and such a right is not to be trampled upon because a minister thinks that the papers should not be produced. The right hon. gentleman and the government had better make up their minds that these papers must be produced in order that the gentleman may examine them.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my understanding of the duties and rights of members of parliament, apart from the duties of the government. Members of the government have certain duties individually but parliament has also duties no less important than those of the government. Parliament has rights no less important than the rights of Ministers of the Crown. We are sent here for a special purpose by the people. We are sent here to legislate upon lines that will give good government to the country, to see that the money of the country is properly raised and properly expended and that a full return is secured to the country for every dollar of expenditure. It is therefore our duty to inquire whether the affairs of the country are conducted on right lines, whether the money voted by parliament has been expended according to the appropriations made that it has been properly expended, that it has gone through the right channels and that we have received a proper return for it. It is also our duty to inquire into other lines of administration. This imposes on us the necessity of obtaining information from different sources. We obtain information in the first place by questions asked of ministers of the Crown, which they are in duty bound to answer as far as possible, and in the second place, by moving for papers, correspondence, &c.

It also becomes necessary for us to go into the departments to carry on our search. It is the absolute right of a member to go to a department and examine documents, unless the government can give reasons of state—as, for instance, the incompleteness of negotiations—why those documents should not be shown. It is the undoubted

right of every member of parliament, a right which inheres in a member by reason of his election by his constituency to represent the people of Canada in this House. This is a right we enjoy by usage, and practice, copied from the practice followed by the mother of parliaments, upon which this parliament is modelled. Now, we are told that we must give a reason before we can be allowed to examine original documents. We are put in about the same position as when one must swear out an information to have a person arrested. I have never understood that that was our position; and I believe that in my understanding of the matter I am supported by the ablest parliamentarians in the world. We are not called upon to give reasons; we have the right, upon suspicion or whatever other grounds we think sufficient, to examine documents, unless there are reasons of state to the contrary. This right, which belongs to every member of parliament, should be maintained by parliament and by every individual member of it. It is a right that is doubly valuable to the opposition, because upon them is laid the special duty of criticism. It is not a right which hon. members on the other side seem to value very highly; they seem to think that their highest privilege is to vote according to the wish of the government—to defeat motions made by the opposition and to carry those made by the government. But we recognize a higher duty devolving upon us, and to discharge that duty, and to fulfil our functions as members of this House, we must claim the privileges which belong to us.

One of the most important duties of the House of Commons is to see to it that the money voted for the public service of Canada is expended for the purpose for which it is voted. In carrying out this duty, as I have said, we need access to the documents in the departments. Another means of making that inquiry is through the Public Accounts Committee. Everything between the lids of the Auditor General's Report for the year previous is referred to that committee. It is the right of members there to move that accounts, letters papers, correspondence and vouchers be laid before the committee—not copies, but the documents themselves; and we have a right to examine these to our heart's content. And, if we are not satisfied, we have the right to ask the committee to subpœna those who can give us information concerning the matters in question. These may be private citizens; they may be officials in the departments; they may be contractors or even ministers of the Crown. And when these parties come before us, we have the right to question and cross-question them, like witnesses before a court, and to have the original documents in our hands to guide us in that examination. So, we have the right to make inquiry along these lines: First, by moving for documents; second, by examining original documents in the departments of government; third, by asking to have documents submitted to the Committee on Public Accounts; and, fourth, by asking to have parties brought before that committee for examination. Whether the parties so summoned belong to parliament or not, they may be required to attend that committee. We have summoned managers of banks to bring bank cheques for our scrutiny. It was by taking this course that we found out certain facts with regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company, facts which would not have been made known if copies of these cheques had been submitted. We found that the $60,000 of public money paid to the Arundel Printing Company was divided into three parts, evidently intended for three different parties. Cheques were endorsed by the individuals who got the money. The banks in which these cheques were cashed had to bring down the cheques. Take another case—not timber lands, with which we are now dealing, but coal lands. Thousands and thousands of acres of coal lands belonging to the public were alienated. Had we examined only copies of the documents, we should have learned nothing except that certain parties had applied for different portions of this coal area, but an examination of the originals showed that these applications were put in by one individual, names being put in by him merely of his own motion—absolute and undoubted forgeries. These applications were put in by the same individual at the same time, and, undoubtedly fraudulently put in. In view of such cases, I say that parliament would be doing less than its duty if it gave up this right of examination. This right belongs to parliament; it is not the gift of the government; it is not within the power of any minister to exclude members of parliament from his department. I have been in this House for thirty years, and, until within the last few years, I have never been refused access to public documents. I have gone over thousands of letters and other documents in the files of the different departments, all handed to me without a word of dissent. The first time I ever was refused was after this government came into power. I went into the Department of the Interior to look at certain documents. The deputy minister told me, in a very courteous manner, that he was forbidden to allow these documents to be seen. I said: 'I do not blame you, but I do blame the one who was ignorant enough, or malicious enough, to give you such instructions.' For such instructions were given in clear defiance of the right which belongs to a member of this parliament. In another case, I was refused access to documents in the Post Office Department. In this case, it was a mere question of some paltry mail contract—a matter of $50 or so for carrying the mail on a certain route, under a con-

tract that had been going on for some time. And yet the member representing that riding was denied the right of looking into that to see who was carrying the mail, who were the tenderers, and whether the contract was given to the lowest tenderer. Is not that tyrannical on the part of a minister of the Crown ? It is, and should not be allowed by this House, and the opposition would be doing less than their duty if they allowed one dollar of the estimates to pass this House until they are given in the fullest manner the right they are entitled to exercise under their prerogative as members of parliament. I say the government cannot stand on the flimsy excuse that you must give a reason—as if you were swearing out an information against a supposed criminal. We have no right to give such a reason ; it is the government's duty, if circumstances warrant, that, for certain state or other justifiable reasons, they cannot grant our request now. It is not the duty of a member of parliament to give reasons why he demands to see documents, but it is for the government to give reasons why they refuse it, because under all ordinary circumstances they are obliged to concede the request, and when they refuse it is for them to justify their refusal. I have been in this House for many years, and I never, until the last few years, saw such a right denied to members of parliament. I consider it high-handed, tyrannical and arbitrary ; it is not consonant with the principles of constitutional government as it has been carried on in Canada from confederaiton to the present time. Parliament would be making a retrograde step if we allowed ourselves to be deprived of that right, a right that belongs to the representatives of the people, and we could not justify our conduct when we went back to the people who elected us, if we by our laches, abandoned it. What do we find this session, and last session ? Why, Sir, that every avenue of information is closed to us. They say this is a fishing expedition. Well, of necessity it is a fishing expedition. They say, when you go to the Public Accounts Committee you undertake an inquisitorial expedition. I say of necessity it is so, it must be so. We are denied the right of having original documents brought down, and we are shut out of that channel. We are denied the right to go into the departments and examine the files, therefore we are shut out of that channel likewise. When we go to the Public Accounts Committee and summon parties before us, and have them sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and when we put a question to him which would reveal the information we desire to get, and have a right to get, some member of the government says : Don't answer that question. Then we appeal to the chairman of the committee to know if the witness is not obliged to answer the question, and he says : No, he need not answer it if he does not wish. Then we appeal to the committee over the head of the chairman, and by a partisan majority the committee votes, almost every time, to sustain the ruling of the chair. Now what other avenue of information have we got ? We are denied the right to examine the witness, we are denied the right to examine the files, we are denied the right to have the original documents brought down for parliament to examine. How then can parliament get the information ? Why, Sir, parliament is shorn of its most valuable right, the functions of parliament are paralysed. It is time the electorate of this country should know that we are turning parliament into a farce, and that the members cannot do their duty by reason of the high-handed tyranny of the government, who are exercising a control that no government in any constitutional country in the world should be allowed to exercise. I am sure the people will sustain us in the stand we are taking, even if we held this parliament for six months until we obtain the concession of that right.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). For once I can agree pretty well with the attitude of the leader of the government, but not with his attitude of to-day. I can entirely agree with his position of two days ago. I read the resolution proposed by the leader of the opposition, and I couple it with the language of the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. Now we have to bear these two points in mind, namely, that the leader of the opposition thought it necessary to fortify that resolution by argument; but the leader of the government went further, and he said, 'That is a truism, you can take that without qualification or suggestion of doubt.' Let us for a moment examine the language of that resolution. I do not ask the leader of the government to go one iota beyond the language of that resolution, but I do say that to-day he should not right-about-face. Forty-eight hours after we passed that resolution, after he had adopted it without reservation, after he had stated that it was a truism manifest beyond all question, we find him going back upon what he said, and turning about, and saying that he will not produce the documents. Sir, it is the most extraordinary change I ever saw, even for this government. We have had marvellous instances of rapid changes of policy on the part of this government. The policy of 1893 has been abandoned, the promises the hon. gentlemen made before they came into power have all been abandoned, but it took some time. But now, two days after the right hon. gentleman, in the presence of his own followers, stated that he subscribed to every sentence of this resolution, he stands up in

the House and says that he will not follow the resolution which he himself counted a truism. Now what does this resolution say? I leave out the exception for a moment, because I wish to draw attention to it in another way. It says:

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case.

I leave that out. The main proposition, and what the leader of the government subscribed to is:

It is the undoubted right of the people's representatives, in parliament assembled, to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government, and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business.

That is what we demanded on the 13th day of this month; that is what the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) demanded, and that is what was refused until the 21st day of this month, and that is what the right hon. gentleman, the leader of this government then asserted was a truism. It was subject to this qualification:

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case.

Has the right hon. gentleman to-day urged any consideration of public policy as an objection to producing these papers? He says to the hon. gentleman who moved the motion: Move it again. If he did so he would be met by the rule that this matter cannot be brought up a second time in the same session and by the new rule of to-day, that you cannot shift your ground and if you cannot shift your ground during the argument; and if the government has ascertained that there was good cause for refusing surely it would not be any better if he moved it to-morrow, or next day or at any other time. The right hon. gentleman has admitted the absolute right to the examination of papers subject to the considerations of public policy that can be validly urged and what further dose he say:

And the denial——

I hope the right hon. gentleman will consider this well.

——of such right by the government justifies the refusal of this House of further supplies to the Crown.

Has the right hon. gentleman changed his mind? He said on the 21st of this month that we had the right to the papers subject to the considerataion of public policy which could be urged by the government as a sufficient justification for the refusal and if they were refused it was the duty of the opposition to refuse the supplies to be granted to the Crown. What is the right hon. gentleman up against? Does he want the supplies? Has he concluded that if we pass the estimates the government has been managed in such a way that hon. gentleman could not borrow money now? What is the reason the right hon. gentleman takes the position that he does to-day? What was the right hon. gentleman's attitude on the 13th? That was an unlucky day for them. They had to back down on the 21st and why do they take a different position to-day? The meaning of the right hon. gentleman was plain on the 21st—because the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) kicked against it right then. He would not show the documents and so it comes to this suggestion: Is the right hon. gentleman unable to control his own cabinet? Is the Minister of the Interior still kicking? Does he refuse to abide by the promise made and the policy enunciated by the right hon. gentleman on the 21st of this month? It looks very much as if he did. Is the Minister of the Interior sulking? He was in a few moments ago; he has gone out; I think he is afraid probably that the right hon. gentleman is about to yield to some of the reasons suggested why the documents should be produced. I do not know. What did the right hon. gentleman say on the 13th? He said:

In this House members have always been given the latitude to move for papers without being asked for their reasons——

Mark that.

——it being presumed that since members move for papers they have good reasons for doing so, and the information is always brought down.

That is true, we say, to-day. Why has the right hon. gentleman changed his position on that? As he went on with his argument he saw that probably he should make a qualification and so he said, before he closed: Let the hon. gentleman give his reasons and there will be no difficulty; the papers will be brought down. Well, the hon. gentleman gave his reasons. I submit that he had given them before that in the debate, but at all events, in the closing of his argument the hon. gentleman who moved the motion certainly did give reasons. What does the right hon. gentleman say to-day? He changes his attitude again. He says: He did not give them at the right time, it is too late if he gives them subsequently. He cannot shift his ground—says the right hon. gentleman—the reasons subsequently given will not do; but then, in the same breath, he says: Put another notice of motion on the paper, argue the matter again, give us your reasons and then the papers will be brought down. Then, of course, as is suggested to me and as I said a few moments ago, he will be ruled out. Now I have other complaints to make against the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. Not only has

he shifted his ground but he has not been fair in his quotations and in what he tried to fasten upon the hon. gentleman who moved this motion. If there is any one in the House who, more than another, should be careful when he quotes, to quote exactly, surely it should be, the leader of the House. What did the right hon. gentleman do? And this is not the first time that he quoted too little in this very debate as I shall show. He reads this:

> We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals, and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question——

And the right hon. gentleman stopped there. The right hon. gentleman was stating that this was not a bona fide motion for a specific purpose but that it was an abstract question to test a principle and he stopped at the very point that would have proved the fallacy of his argument and he stopped in the middle of a sentence. It is bad enough to leave out a portion of the context but it is ten times worse to leave off a portion of a sentence and that is what the right hon. gentleman did upon this occasion. The sentence reads this way and if it is read in full it shows that the hon. gentleman who moved for the papers was not moving in support of any abstract proposition but that he was moving to get specific papers for a specific purpose. The argument going before shows abundantly his reasons for making the motion. He points out the steps he has taken that he has applied to the department, that he has been refused, that he has written to the minister that the minister writes back saying to him to take a specific course, to make his motion in the House and then the House will have the responsibility of ordering the production of these papers. The hon. gentleman does that and he points out that upon a previous occasion upon investigation in the department he had got such information as led to valuable discoveries that could not be ascertained from the mere printed copies. He points out that in this case the production of the printed copies will not enable him to accomplish the object he has in view in testing this matter, and he concludes by saying that he considers he has a right to these papers and that:

> This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question, because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to timber berths Nos. 1107, 1108 and 1171.

So, if the right hon. gentleman had given the whole quotation, instead of proving his proposition it would have proved, as it does prove, exactly the reverse—that this was not a fishing expedition but a specific motion in reference to one transaction and for the specific purpose of getting nine documents that the hon. gentleman desired to see. The hon. gentleman who moved the motion afterwards in his reply stated more particularly the reasons why he required the production of these documents. Will the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, will any of his followers say, on fair consideration of this matter, that it matters one iota whether the reasons are given in the first speech, or the second speech or the fifth speech or the last speech made in support of the motion?

An honest government—I won't say an honest premier because he is controlled by the kicking gentleman from the west, a government desirous of adapting itself to the necessities of the case as they arise would make no bones as to whether the argument came in at the first or the last; they would be only too glad to say: 'at the beginning of the debate the hon. gentleman did not advance reasons why this should be done, but now reasons have been advanced by him and others and we will bring down the papers. The government would have been clothing themselves with honour in doing that; they have not clothed themselves with anything approaching honour in refusing the papers. The beginning of this difficulty lies in the arbitrary position taken by the Minister of the Interior. He decides, and so instructs his deputy minister and his subordinates, that we are not to be allowed to go into the department and examine the documents upon file there, and he says that unless we take the responsibility of charging a fraud or a forgery—unless we in effect institute a criminal charge —we are not to have permission to examine the documents. I take the position definitely, (and I am fortified by authority) that the members of the opposition in this House are not in the position of public prosecutors but in the position of investigators; that we are auditors on behalf of the people, that these are the peoples' documents, that the people would have the right to come here and examine them, and that they delegate to us the duty of examining them on their behalf. Not only is it an absolutely unqualified right in us, but if we think the interests of the country will be advanced thereby it is the imperative duty of every member of this House, whether upon the one side or the other, to examine from time to time the public records; all of which should be constantly open to the people's representatives. I notice that when the Prime Minister the other day refused this motion, he read quotations from Todd, and I am sorry that the right hon. gentleman in reading the quotations stopped short of giving their full purport to the House. The right hon. gentleman read from page 453 of Todd:

> It is the rule of parliament that no papers shall be laid on the table of either House un-

less some sufficient reasons have been stated for their production.

There the right hon. gentleman stopped the quotation, but the quotation continues :

It is irregular to move for the production of papers merely to further the interests or views of private persons, or except for the purpose of founding or facilitating parliamentary proceedings.

We admit all that, when the whole sentence is read. We admit it would be improper for hon. gentlemen to move for private ends and for private purposes or merely to gratify a whim, but that does not meet such a case as this where an hon. member goes to the department in the discharge of his parliamentary duty, asks to be allowed to examine the records, is refused and is told by the minister to apply in another way, and in good faith acts upon the suggestion of the minister, and comes into this House and makes his motion and informs the government that out of the 450 pages of the document he only requires nine pages in order to satisfy himself as to the bona fides of the transaction. The law is this, as contained in Todd, page 439:

It is imperative that parliament shall be duly informed of everything that may be necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of government in any part of the empire, and the fullest information is communicated by government to both Houses from time to time upon all matters of public concern.

That is a broad proposition and without any qualification I demand it on behalf of the people whom I represent. I demand it on behalf of the people of Canada, I demand it on behalf of the representative institutions of this country, and I say definitely and distinctly that the refusal of that right is an outrage upon the people of Canada. On the next page of Todd we find the exceptions, including the exception that is engrafted upon the motion of the leader of the opposition which is :

Considerations of public policy, and a due regard to the interests of the state occasionally demand, however, that information sought for by members of the legislature should be withheld at the discretion and upon the general responsibility of ministers.

I quite admit that. Nobody on this side of the House will insistently demand the papers if the government will say there is any question of public policy which renders it inexpedient that these papers shall be produced. Following that we have this proposition in Todd:

But it must always be remembered that all public transactions of state are necessarily official; and that no public officer would be justified in withholding from official record and access——

Mark you the word 'access.'

Mr. LENNOX.

From official record and access any document emanating from himself in his official capacity, in relation to public affairs.

It was said the other day, and I was amazed at the statement, that the endorsement on a record of the date of its receipt was not part of the record. A more absolutely false position cannot be imagined. A position which would be surrounded with greater danger could not be advanced than that when these gentlemen bring down copies of documents they can suppress the date of the receipt endorsed on them. Their contention is that the date of the receipt is not on it at the time the man wrote it, that it was written by the minister or the official of the government, and in one case when after searching through records and ultimately getting the originals by hook or crook—because we could not get them in the ordinary way from the government —it was pointed out that the endorsation was missing, the answer was : It is not part of the record. One more quotation from Todd, and here again the right hon. gentleman in quoting the other day failed to give the whole story. He quoted as follows:

When copies of correspondence, &c., are moved for by private members it is customary to add 'or extracts,' leaving to ministers a discretion as to despatches which it may be advisable to lay before parliament, and as to those which it may be expedient, in whole or in part, to withhold.

Has that anything to do with the proposition before the House to-day? It is not a question of whether they are to be copies or originals. When, in 1869, in the British parliament, a motion was passed to bring down the record regarding the Fenian Raid, and when, after examining the papers, it was found inexpedient in the public interest that all those papers should be brought down, it was then decided that portions would have to be withheld. But there was no question of original documents or copies. The question was simply whether the whole or only a part of the record should be brought down. Thus the whole case is taken out of its context and made to do service for an entirely different purpose. I regret exceedingly that the right hon. gentleman has seen fit to make this complete right about face on this occasion. I venture to say that when this matter is analysed, the general feeling of the country will be that no more specific, absolute change of face has ever been executed by any public man than has been by the right hon. gentleman who, after subscribing without qualification to the motion of the leader of the opposition—in fact, subscribing to it with gusto, because he said it embodies a truism—now reverses that position, for what reason I know not. Whether the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) be the cause of that reversal or not, the right hon. gentleman certainly stands

in a position to-day that cannot fail to throw great discredit upon him in the country.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). I understand that the right hon. the First Minister rests the position he takes entirely on practice and procedure. He has treated this case as if, in the recognized practice of parliament, there has been some distinction made between production of copies and originals. But I have not heard one word cited by the right hon. gentleman in support of that contention. He certainly cannot find any support in the practice of our own House. Let me refer to the Order Papers of to-day and yesterday as examples of what I have known to be the practice ever since I have had a seat in this chamber. Yesterday there were sixteen notices on the Order Paper calling for papers. Of those sixteen, fifteen were for copies and one for originals. To-day we have seventeen notices on the Order Paper, of which sixteen call for copies and one for the original. I am speaking now, although the right hon. gentleman shakes his head, from an examination of the Order Papers made a few minutes ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For copies or returns ?

Mr. BARKER. On the Orders of yesterday one notice calls for originals and fifteen for copies. On to-day's Orders, sixteen notices call for copies and one for originals.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not for originals, for returns.

Mr. BARKER. I am making my statement from what I see in the Order Paper. Since I have been in this House it has been the general practice for members to ask for copies, and of course it is an exception when they ask for the originals. But whenever hon. members have wanted the originals they have asked for them, and this is the first time I ever heard questioned the right of a member to have the original papers brought down. I have looked at the practice as stated in the books, and I fail to see there the least distinction drawn between originals and copies. Whether the originals or copies be called for depends on the motion made. If an hon. member asks for copies he invariably gets them, unless some reason be given why it is inexpedient that copies should be furnished. When he moves for originals, I presume the same rule prevails, and a distinction between the two was never drawn until it was made within the last few days by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me quote from Mr. Flint's 'Bourinot,' chapter 12, page 359. There Mr. Flint gives the forms of motions:

Returns and papers are moved for in the form either of an address to the Governor General or of an order of the House. A motion for an address should always commence with the prescribed words:

Mr. moves that a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House, &c.

There is no distinction as to whether the hon. gentleman is to move for copies or originals. Then:

In the case of an order of the House, it is simply necessary to make this motion:

Mr. moves that an order of the House do issue for, &c.

There is no distinction, in these forms, between copies and originals, and I do not think the right hon. gentleman can point, in all his long experience, to any distinction of that kind being drawn.

As regards the explanations of motives for moving for the papers, what is the practice ? Take the orders of the day. You, Mr. Speaker, call upon every hon. gentleman who has a notice of motion upon the Order Paper, whether it be for originals or for copies, to make his motion. What then does the hon. gentleman do? He says: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move No. , giving the number of his notice of motion on the Order Paper. That is all of his speech. He gives no reasons, he states no object that he has in moving for the papers. But, according to the right hon. gentleman, if any of us, in years past, who had followed the regular practice of this House and said those magic words, 'I move No. 16,' or whatever number it may be, and then sat down, the right hon. gentleman could have risen and said: You cannot have the papers, because you did not state why you wanted them. The hon. gentleman cannot take the position he does with regard to originals unless he also takes it with regard to copies. And if his contention be accepted, every one of us who has for years past been following the recognized practice of this House, has been subject to the right hon. gentleman's contention that having made his motion without giving any reason, he has no right to have that motion granted. But Mr. Flint shows clearly that such is not the rule, and never was the rule, and never was intended to be the rule. Here is what is said in chapter 16 of Mr. Flint's work regarding motions for papers refused:

Occasions may arise when the government will feel constrained to refuse papers on the ground that their production would be inconvenient or injurious to the public interest.

But who raises that point? Is it the gentleman who gives formal notice of motion or the government which objects to the motion? Surely the common sense decision would be, and that is the ordinary practice, that if any member of the government objects, on the ground of public convenience or inconvenience, to the production of the papers asked for, it is for him to state his objection. Not that the mover must in

every case state his reasons. Consider for one moment what would be the result. Our Order Paper, heaven knows, takes long enough to go through with all these notices of motion; but if on every occasion members, at the peril of losing their motions, had to explain their reasons for making them, the whole time of the House would be occupied with that portion of the paper. If on a very few occasions there is an objection, it is so easy for the Prime Minister, or any minister, to state the objection. Is that not, on the face of it, as stated in Dr. Flint's edition of 'Bourinot,' a common sense and reasonable procedure? I have never heard of any other practice than the simple one of the member moving the motion standing in his name, and I do not know that I ever heard of a gentleman explaining why he made the motion. Had we taken that course and occupied the time of the House and added the expense to the country, the right hon. gentleman would have felt it his duty to correct us, and tell us we need not make explanations.

The Prime Minister stated yesterday, following one of the earlier editions of Bourinot, that reasons had to be given. I looked up the only Canadian authority cited, which was a debate reported in 'Hansard' on a motion by Mr. Fiset, a former member of this House, then a Liberal sitting in opposition. He had moved for the papers with regard to the dismissal of an employee of the government saying that he believed that he had been dismissed without cause. That is the only explanation he offered. Mr. Hibbert Tupper, then the minister, said that he had no objection to the production of the papers, but he added that the gentleman referred to in the motion would not thank the mover for bringing his name before the House or asking the cause of the dismissal. Some debate arose on that. Mr. Mackenzie said that the member moving was entitled to the papers. Mr. Tupper said : I am not refusing to produce the papers ; I am simply pointing out to the hon. gentleman who makes the motion that in asking for these papers he is doing no kindness to the gentleman who is dismissed. That is cited by the right hon. gentleman as an authority to show that you must give your reasons. That is the only Canadian authority cited. You can get authorities for almost anything if you do not look into them ; and I am sure if the Prime Minister had looked this question up he would not have cited it to support his contention. Without quoting any authority he tries to make a difference between the production of copies and of original papers. Every reasonable man will admit that we ought not to seek for original papers when copies will suffice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. Nobody does that, but I say that when an hon. gentleman places upon the order paper a notice of motion that he wants the originals, surely there cannot be any question that the hon. gentleman acts intentionally, that he is giving notice to the House that he does not want copies, and that for reasons sufficient for him, he asks for the originals. That alone is sufficient and that, according to Dr. Flint's book, would call for a reply from the government stating why it would be inconvenient to produce the original papers or any other reason for their non-production. The absolute abstract right of a member of this House is to call for the papers. Surely his primary right is to see the papers themselves. We all recognize that it is a convenience to take copies, but our primary right is to see the originals, not the copies, and we are not obliged to take copies. The importance of this is seen in such a case as occurred in this department where the minister produced an emasculated copy, a copy omitting an important portion of the document, the memorandum on the back as to when it was received which was part of the very question at issue. That shows that we ought not to be put off with copies when we think we ought to have the originals. What could have been more important in that particular case than the fact disclosed by the production of the original documents that a paper which purported to have been written in Montana was written in this city. That was kept back from the House, it was a thing which the minister, in performing his duty to the government, to the Crown and to the people should have been the first to make clear. We wanted to see that paper, when a copy was produced it was not a full copy, and we would never have obtained that information if we had not obtained the original document. Surely it cannot be questioned, that we are entitled to see the original papers. Supposing that a minister or his deputy has endorsed his decision on a document, a letter for instance, but has changed his decision and writen another one, are we not entitled to see the endorsements, even although they are not part of the original documents ? I have seen in the public offices many documents with endorsements by ministers and deputies, and it is of the utmost importance in inquiring into a case that we see the endorsements. And yet, according to the statement of the Minister of the Interior, he would be justified in telling his clerks not to give us copies of those endorsements because they were not in the original document. Could any thing more clearly show the necessity for the production of an original document wherever a member, acting as he does in the interest of the people, thinks that its production is necessary, leaving it to the government in exceptional cases, where such production might be mischievous, to say so. I am sure that every hon. member would be reasonable in such exceptional cases, and that the production of the original paper would not be insisted on ; but his prima

facie right is to get the originals and he accepts copies only as a convenience.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the First Minister this evening, after stating that the only reason that he had a few days ago for refusing to the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) an examination of the original documents in question, was because the hon. member stated his reasons at the end of his speech and not at the beginning. I regret exceedingly that when the hon. member for St. Antoine rose and made his request in the very words which the right hon. Prime Minister desired him to use, the right hon. gentleman did not feel it was due to himself, to the dignity of the House and to the importance of the business the House has to transact, to say: Now that you have made the request in the form in which I think you should make it, I waive technicalities, and you may have these original documents. I am astonished that a man who is so highly thought of in this country, a man for whom so many people have the highest personal regard and respect, should so far forget the dignity of his great position as not to gracefully and at once yield to the courteous request of the hon. member for St. Antoine. What does it all lead to? We are told that the hon. member for St. Antoine, having made a formal motion which has been denied on technical grounds, that motion cannot be repeated in this House. Then, if the hon. member for St. Antoine made a mistake—and we will assume, for the sake of argument, that he made a mistake—and, because he did not know the rules of parliamentary practice, was defeated on technical grounds, what is the position of the First Minister? He says in effect: Having defeated you on technical grounds, I decline, on further technical grounds to allow you to renew your motion, and to get the information which you, as a member of parliament desire to have in order to do your duty as a representative of the people of this country. I submit that there has never been such a spectacle in any democratic assembly of which we have any record, and I trust there never may be again. The right hon. Prime Minister has, on two or three occasions, quoted 'Todd on Parliamentary Practice,' this sentence:

It is 'the rule of parliament that no papers shall be laid on the table of either House unless some sufficient reason have been stated for their production.'

That, as I understand, is the ground of objection taken by the right hon. Prime Minister against the motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine. He says the hon. member for St. Antoine has not an absolute right to see these documents, but has that right only upon stating some sufficient reason for their production. Now, let me show you what the Prime Minister has done. He has added to Todd this dictum: That the member who makes a motion for such papers must state his reasons in his chief speech, and not at some later time before the motion is put. But that is not found in any parliamentary authority in the world. Where does the right hon. gentleman find that stated as authority for refusing a motion of this kind? Why, this carries the technicality to the regions of the merely ridiculous. Suppose that a case were being argued in court: counsel on one side made his case as well as he could and opposing counsel answered him; then, in reply, at the conclusion of his argument, the first counsel thought of some ground on which the court could validly give judgment in his favour. Does any one think that any court of justice would refuse to accept the latter ground because it was stated in the end and not in the opening argument of counsel? I submit the right hon. gentleman has not only gone beyond the regions of logic but entirely beyond the regions of plain, every-day sense. I submit that the people of this country will not be able to follow the reasoning of my right hon. friend in defeating a motion, presented in the public interest, by a technical objection that a reason is stated in the end and not in the beginning of a speech. Let this kind of reasoning prevail and only a skilled constitutional lawyer will be able to present a motion in this House with any degree of success. I do not wish to emphasize this point. I should think that it would be plain to the right hon gentleman and that he would concede it at once and allow the business of the country to go on. If the hon. member for St. Antoine were a lawyer, and the right hon. Prime Minister wanted to show how clever he was in legal technicalities, I could understand him taking this position. But, under the circumstances, it is almost incredible. But that is not all. If you examine the speech made by the hon. member for St. Antoine, January 13, you will find that almost in his opening sentence, he said:

A typewritten copy of a document does not always carry the information that is desired. There are occasions, such as have occurred several times in bringing down documents to this House, where the documents do not contain all the information which we are entitled to have.

Now, I submit that, if the hon. member for St. Antoine, had stopped there, the right hon. Prime Minister should have conceded that he had given good and sufficient reason why he should see these originals. But he goes further and gives an illustration:

I, for one, called at the Department of the Interior and was shown, without the slightest hesitation by the deputy minister, the originals of the returns which had been copied. By

having access to these originals I obtained certain information which was of great value in discussing the question in the House. Since that time I understand that strict orders have been given that no member of this House shall be permitted by the Deputy Minister of the Interior to see any original documents.

I submit that, even if the hon. member for St. Antoine had said nothing further, he should have had his order in this case without argument. But the true reason of the matter, if we examine the discussion, was that the Minister of the Interior, apparently had been advised that public documents should not be examined unless he said so, and that was the proposition the government started to support by a vote without fully considering the matter. But, having had the matter further under consideration, they came to the conclusion that their ground was untenable. They saw that the public press of this country was commenting unfavourably upon their action, and assailing them on the ground that they were refusing to make full disclosures to members of this House, taking advantage of their position, and that they had voted in favour of a resolution against giving the House that to which it was entitled. But as a matter of fact, the hon. member for St. Antoine has not seen these documents, and, so far as the right hon. Prime Minister is concerned, it is apparent that he is prepared to sit here for another six months before he will allow the hon. gentleman to see them. He has defeated the hon. member on a technicality; and it does not matter that the hon. member says: I ask your indulgence and the waiving of these technicalities. The right hon. Prime Minister says in effect: You have made a mistake and must suffer for it; and none but motions that are technically correct shall succeed in this House unless we want them to. There is only one inference that the public will draw from the conduct of my right hon friend, and that is that there is something that the government desires to conceal. Knowing the right hon. gentleman as well as they do, the people will not believe that one so liberal as he is by profession, reputation, character and tradition, would allow a motion to be defeated on a technicality where the member who moved it had merely made a mistake of form and was entitled to the documents he asked for. I am satisfied he would not, under ordinary circumstances, refuse a motion of this kind merely because a mistake had been made—and in saying that the refusal is based on the contention that a mistake has been made, I am taking the best position for the right hon. gentleman. The people will conclude there is something the government wishes to conceal, and that there is special reason why this matter has been engineered in this way through the House, and why the right hon. gentleman refuses to allow a member to do his duty to the people and to his constituents by examining public documents.

Why, Mr. Speaker, this objection is not merely technical, as I have pointed out, it is absolutely unusual, it is absolutely tyrannical. There has been, as pointed out by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) no occasion in this House before where such an objection has been taken in connection with an order for the production of documents. But my right hon. friend, in his straits, was obliged to turn up parliamentary procedure of fifty or a hundred years ago in order to defeat a motion which could only have as a result the promotion of the public interest. I say the people of Canada will have an opportunity now of seeing whether the right hon. gentleman desires the members of the opposition to have that full right and privilege which they should have of examining public documents and which, for good public reasons, they are entitled to examine. I am sorry the right hon. the First Minister should present this spectacle to the people of Canada, because he, above all others, should set an example, not of technicalities, but of fair treatment.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). While listening to this debate I have wondered how an outsider in the gallery would, as they say, size it up. Two days ago the Prime Minister accepted the principle of the production of original documents, and we thought then that the documents asked for would at once be produced. In the interval between the Prime Minister's acceptance of that motion and to-day, I wonder if he has had a consultation with his Minister of the Interior and found out that it would be prudent to back out of the acceptance that he made two days ago, and taking the position of refusing to-day. I cannot for the life of me understand why two or three days time of this session should be taken up by the government turning and twisting in every possible way that a lot of clever men can employ, in order to get out of the necessity of showing to this House nine original documents. We have had on more than one occasion knowledge of the fact that the production of original documents showed that true copies of those documents, that is to say, copies that meant anything, were not submitted to the House when they were asked for. Now, I cannot understand for a moment why, if there is nothing to hush up, these documents should not at once be submitted to the House. Either these particular documents may have some marks on them, some indication that is not shown on the copies submitted, or there are other documents that the government fear may be asked for and they wish to have a precedent for refusing them by rejecting the demand for these particular documents. The only inference I see that can be

drawn from the action of the government is that either in this case or in some other case they have in view, they are willing to stand the brunt through the country of refusing to produce the documents rather than stand the odium that will come to them through their production. That is the only conclusion that I can draw.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). We have asked for the documents referred to in two ways. In the first place, they have been asked for by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) proposing to attend in the Department of the Interior, where the inspection of these nine papers would, I suppose, have taken fifteen minutes. That request was made, and that request was refused. The member for St. Antoine was told to come to this House and move for the papers. He came to the House in accordance with the suggestion of the Minister of the Interior, and moved for the papers. He stated his reasons which, in my opinion, were amply sufficient to justify the House in granting this motion. The Prime Minister thought that those reasons were not sufficient, and by his speech on that occasion, he invited the member for St. Antoine to state further reasons. The member for St. Antoine had no further opportunity of speaking until the debate closed, under the rules of the House he had to be the last speaker in that debate. But when he came to close that debate he stated the reasons, the sufficiency of which the Prime Minister has not challenged up to the present time, and which he cannot challenge, which no man in this House can challenge. I would ask the right hon. gentleman now whether he is prepared to affirm that the reasons which the member for St. Antoine offered when he closed that debate were not sufficient reasons for the production of those papers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The motion of the hon. gentleman was made in such a way as to establish a precedent to the effect that without giving a reason at all any member could ask for the originals and could compel the government on every occasion to bring down the records of the government on the table of this House, and we could not agree to that. That is the position I took.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman does not seem to appreciate the position. I am pointing out that the member for St. Antoine, after that objection had been raised by the Prime Minister, went on to comply with the Prime Minister's suggestion, he adopted the position the Prime Minister said he must adopt and gave reasons. Surely the youngest member of this House, any man who has the most rudimentary ideas of parliamentary practice, knows that everything that takes place in debate until the vote is taken must be considered as enabling the House to come to a conclusion. Does my right hon. friend deny that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the motion had been granted we would have been told that we were climbing down, as was said the other day, and if we had agreed to a motion of this kind, it would have been quoted against us as a precedent later on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman's position now is exactly the opposite of that. The member for St. Antoine stated certain reasons, the Prime Minister did not think those reasons were sufficient, and said if proper reasons were given the papers would be brought down. Then the member for St. Antoine, in closing the debate, adopted the position of the Prime Minister, acceded to all he demanded and gave the reasons which the Prime Minister said should have been stated in the first instance. The Prime Minister perhaps did not observe the strength of the reasons. They are undoubtedly sufficient, he has admitted just now they are sufficient and the only ground upon which the government can base their position in this matter is the ground that these reasons were not stated in the first instance. Why, the government will next take the position that the reasons must be stated in the first part of the speech instead of in the last part of the speech, or some other ridiculous proposition of that kind.

See how easy, Mr. Speaker, it will be to defeat any motion made in this House by the reasoning which the right hon. Prime Minister presents. The universal practice in this House, as every hon. member knows is this : The member stands up makes his motion and gives no reasons. It will be enough to defeat any motion in the future simply for the Prime Minister to say : The motion cannot be allowed because you have given no reasons. Then the member in reply will rise and give his reasons and the Prime Minister will tell him that it is too late. I never heard of such a proposition. If the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, did not give reasons in the first instance—and I for my part, think that his reasons were ample and sufficient in the first instance—but if he did not give reasons in the first instance he did give them before the debate was closed and before the vote was taken, and the Prime Minister should at once have arisen in his place and should have said : Although the reasons, in the first place, were not, to my mind, sufficient reasons, those which have now been given by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, in accordance with my suggestion, are ample and sufficient and I ask the House to adopt the motion. But the Prime Minister says it would have created a precedent. How would that have created any precedent ? It would have created no precedent in favour of my hon.

friend from St. Antoine: it would have created a precedent in favour of the right hon. Prime Minister because the government would have established the position that if suficient reasons are not given in the first instance the motion will not be adopted but that it will be adopted only if sufficient reasons are given later on in the debate. So far as the creation of a precedent is concerned which seems to trouble the Prime Minister more than certain questions of policy, the Prime Minister's position is not well taken.

I do not think that I have taken an unreasonable position in regard to this matter. When the motion was denied I did not know for what reasons it had been denied. It seemed to me that there was a departure from what had been the practice of parliament in Great Britain as well as in this country. So, I sent a note to the Prime Minister on Tuesday, telling him that on the first occasion on which the House would be moved into Committee of Supply I would propose a resolution setting forth what I conceived to be the true parliamentary practice in this regard. I moved my motion. The Prime Minister accepted it and I thought the matter was at an end. He accepted it and to-day he has told us that it was merely a truism. Let us see what that truism is. My motion is in the following words:

> Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right of the people's representatives, in parliament assembled, to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business; and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.

There was no question of copies in that resolution. It affirmed the right to see and examine all public documents, and there was no suggestion of reason in the resolution. It declared the undoubted right of parliament so that there ought to have been no further question after that resolution had once passed the House. It went far beyond the position which the Prime Minister admitted that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, had taken in making his motion. So, I thought the matter was at an end. I thought that, the Prime Minister, having recognized the position, above all having come to an understanding with my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, who, before the conclusion of the debate, gave reasons sufficient in the mind of the Prime Minister himself for the production of these papers, I thought that when I mentioned the matter to the House this afternoon, the Prime Minister would at once get up, save any further time in discussion and offer to my hon. friend either an opportunity to examine these documents at the office of the minister himself, or that they should be brought for a short time into this House in order that the necessary examination might be had to which my hon. friend is entitled under the resolution adopted unanimously by this House and which the Prime Minister declares to be so absolutely true that it is to be regarded only as a truism. But, instead of that we have the statement of the Prime Minister in reply to myself: No, not until reasons are assigned. Every conceivable reason had been assigned; every sufficient reason had been assigned. When I courteously asked the right hon. gentleman to state what further reasons he demanded to be assigned before these documents were brought down, the answer—the somewhat pert answer which I got was this: Oh, bring your reasons along and then we will give them consideration. The Prime Minister knows perfectly well, as every member of this House knows, that under the strict rules of the House if a motion has once been debated and decided the House cannot deal with it again during the same session and it would not be permissible for us to bring the matter up again by resolution unless we were assured beforehand that the motion would be complied with and that the papers would be brought down. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that the time of this House is being wasted—unnecessarily wasted—by the government upon a pure technicality. The Prime Minister has not denied that if my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine had stated in his opening speech what he did state in his closing speech this motion would have been granted; yet, these papers have been denied and are being denied to-day because the statement upon which that right was well founded was made in the concluding speech of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, instead of in his opening speech. The government are obstructing the business of the House to-day by relying upon an absurdity of that kind, because, with all deference and not desiring to say any thing offensive, I affirm without the slightest doubt that a proposition such as that has only one name and that is the most outrageous absurdity that was ever heard in this parliament. What is the object of discussion? Is not the object of discussion that the House, upon hearing every thing that can be affirmed for or against a particular motion, shall make up its mind whether or not that motion shall be accepted or shall be denied? If my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, after the objection raised by the Prime Minister, did state to this House reasons sufficient, even in the judgment of the Prime Minister, for the production of these documents, there should have been no further question about

it and the motion should have been passed upon the reasons so assigned. I regret that the time of the House is being wasted—unnecessarily taken up—in the discussion of this matter, but it is a matter of principle. If the rule laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister be a correct rule, then the government can adopt with respect to every motion proposed in this House for the production of papers, the procedure to which I have just now adverted. A member will get up as usual and say: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the proposed motion standing in my name. The Prime Minister arises and says: No reason has been assigned for the making of this motion, and then the member will say: Well, I have such and such reasons for making this motion and then some member of the government will reply: No, you cannot have them now because you did not state the reasons in the first instance. The absurdity simply comes down to that. It seems to me that I need only suggest it to the Prime Minister to convince him that the position he is taking in this regard is an absolutely absurd and untenable one.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I regret that my hon. friends opposite are in a very unhappy frame of mind to-day. Perhaps we should make some allowance for them and not be too severe in our criticism of their proceedings. I agree with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that we have been wasting a great deal of time—no, I withdraw that; we have not been, on this side of the House, wasting any time but we have been paying hon. gentlemen opposite the respect of listening to them. If there has been any wasting of time they have been doing the wasting, for, with the exception of a very few minutes occupied by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), we have taken no part in this debate. I do agree that we have been wasting time in discussing what is only an academic question. We have not been permitted to discuss the practical side of this question. I take it we are not discussing now merely the small question—to use the words of my hon. friend (Mr. Ames)—merely the small question of producing the particular paper to which the hon. gentleman referred. He has deliberately and of purpose resolved that we shall not be permitted to discuss that small question of itself. He has stated that he declines to have that small question discussed of itself. He desires to test a great principle for which he stands. He insists upon his right to do certain things. Now, if my hon. friend were to step into my office and ask me to show him some public documents, my impression is that he would give me some good reason and I hope I would be able to produce the documents before him.

Mr. AMES. Is the hon. minister quoting from my remarks in saying that I claimed it as a right without giving sufficient reasons?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I think I may say that is the position the hon. gentleman has taken in the House.

Mr. AMES. Will he kindly quote from 'Hansard'?

Mr. FIELDING. I shall try to show so as I proceed. I was saying that if my hon. friend would step into my office and say he desired for public reasons to see some document on file there, I think he would probably give me good reasons, and I think it probable I would produce the document, and that would be an interchange of that courtesy which as far as possible should prevail between members of parliament irrespective of the sides upon which they sit.

Mr. AMES. I may say that that has been the practice which the Department of Finance on one occasion extended to me and which I appreciated, and it has also been the practice of the Department of the Interior always, until the present time, extended to me and which I also appreciated. But that privilege which the Minister of Finance now speaks of has been denied members of the House in reference to the Department of the Interior, and the Minister of the Interior has referred members on this side of the House, to the House as the only means by which that access could be obtained. What the Minister of Finance says as to my calling at his department and securing access to these documents would satisfy me perfectly if the same courtesy were extended in other departments.

Mr. FIELDING. But, I was going to add, that if my hon. friend should come in a different spirit—and that is the spirit in which he comes to this House—if he should come to my office and say, not as a matter of courtesy but by his right as a member of parliament he demanded any document, that would be an entirely different matter; and without any desire to be discourteous to my hon. friend I think under such circumstances I would refuse the document. And we have refused up to this moment to present the document, because the hon. gentleman has approached the question in this House in precisely that way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition and which you accepted.

Mr. FIELDING. I will read that in due time, and I will show my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that he hardly understands the resolution for which he voted. I find that the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) in his first speech —I am quoting from page 1178 of 'Hansard' and if at any point I do not quote enough and my hon. friend will remind me I shall be glad to keep on quoting—I find my hon. friend in his first speech said :

We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing access to such papers. That motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to timber berths Nos. 1107, 1108 and 1171.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. Observe the position the hon. gentleman takes. The hon. gentleman says : We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must allege very good reasons to the contrary. That is reversing the law and procedure of parliament which is, that the hon. gentleman, according to all the authorities that have been quoted, must give his reasons. I was amazed to find the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) treating with contempt the clearly written words of Bourinot who says (page 371) :

It is quite obvious, however, that no member should move for papers except on sufficient grounds. It is clearly laid down by the most eminent of English parliamentarians that it is incumbent upon——

Incumbent upon the government ? No ; incumbent upon the mover of the resolution.

—it is incumbent upon the mover to state the reasons upon which his motion is founded that the House may judge of the necessity——

Not that the hon. member himself may judge of the necessity, but that the House may judge.

—that the House may judge of the necessity, importance and expediency for calling for the papers which are the subject of that motion.

My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) read that and brushed it aside as if it amounted to nothing. We look upon Bourinot as the exponent of our parliamentary practice and when he lays down that as the undoubted rule, I think we may fairly accept it. But if my hon. friend wants a further rule, I will cite May's parliamentary practice, page 539 of edition 1906 :—

But, however ample the power of each House to enforce the production of papers a sufficient cause must be shown for the exercise of that power——

Shown by whom ? By the government ? No. Hon. members have been talking all the afternoon as if it was the duty of the government to show cause, whereas it is the duty of the mover of the resolution to show cause. This citation from May continues :

—and if considerations of public policy can be urged against the motion for papers, it is either withdrawn or otherwise dealt with according to the judgment of the House.

Mr. BRISTOL. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOL. Where does he find in that quotation that the cause must be stated in the beginning of the speech and not in the end ?

Mr. FIELDING. I will come to that.

Mr. LAKE. Does the hon. gentleman deny that good cause was shown ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I do. More than that, I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) refused to show cause. The hon. gentleman declared he was not bound to show cause ; the hon. gentleman said he was bringing this as a test case and that he was insisting on his individual right. Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes confuse two or three things which are not at all the same. We are accustomed to the hon. gentlemen opposite saying : The House demands this ; the House has a right to this, parliament has the right to that ; and all the time they mean that the member for St. Antoine has the right to all these things. Now, there is a wide difference.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Finance speaks of this as being a rule ; has not the usual practice been of late years to make a motion without giving any cause whatever?

Mr. FIELDING. I will come to that also. In the meantime I again insist that the hon. member for St. Antoine not only gave no reasons but he made it a matter of pride that he would not give any reason. He stood on his rights ; it was not this small question of some petty, paltry document he was urging ; he was standing for a great principle. He said :

What method is open to any member who wishes to see original documents? Have I the right to see original documents? If I have that right what is the constitutional method by which I can see them?

Well, my judgment is that if it cannot be brought about by mere interchange of courtesy, then the only way would be for the hon. gentleman to make a motion. Now there is no distinction in the rule between original documents and copies so far as I can see. I think a statement of that kind is correct. I do not remember any such distinction, and every time a motion is made for a return the government would have a perfect right to ask the hon. gentleman who makes the motion to give his reasons, and the rule of parliament would sustain such a request. But we do not exercise that right, and why ? Because where copies of documents are sought there is no public reason

against them unless it be stated they are confidential—and we are not now dealing with that branch of the question—there is no public reason that can be urged except the matter of convenience and the time involved in their preparation. That is not a sufficient reason and so it goes without saying. But when an hon. gentleman demands that an original be brought down, then the situation is different. If the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) has the right—not the right of the House but the right of the hon. gentleman himself, for that is what the hon. gentleman wants to assert—to come down and by his mere word demand that that particular document shall be laid on the table, that same right extends to every other member. And if it applies to that particular document, it applies to every other public document in the archives of the country. And so, by the mere will of an individual member—and I ask the House to observe the distinction between an individual member and the House—you might have all the public documents brought down here and flung upon the table. That is so utterly preposterous that I cannot imagine any hon. gentleman opposite, who knows anything about parliamentary procedure, seriously arguing that such a thing should be done. The preservation of original documents is the best possible reason for treating them differently from copies. When a copy is lost no harm is done, but when an original is lost, it cannot be replaced. Therefore it is the part of wisdom to place some restriction on the production of originals that would not be placed upon the production of copies. That is what justifies us when we say to an hon. gentleman : if you made a motion for copies, no question would be asked; but when you ask for the original documents, it is a proper ground for a minister to take that you should give some reason why you ask for such papers.

Mr. ALCORN Would the hon. minister go so far as to say that when a motion is put on the Order Paper for copies or originals, the hon. member must state specifically, in his notice of motion the reason why he asks for them ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I would not say that, but when it is stated that if the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) did not give his reasons in the beginning of his remarks, he gave them in the end, I think I can show that he did not. True the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) ingeniously, if not ingenuously, tried to read into the argument of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) language not to be found there.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman who leads you admitted it.

Mr. FIELDING. I think not. What the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) did was to give some explanations of reasons why he had moved for some original documents on a previous occasion, but he did not give the reasons why we should produce these documents. Persistently, throughout his speech, he stood on his rights. There is no question of the rights of the House, because there is no limitation to the rights of the House. The rights of the House are practically unlimited. It can make or unmake governments. But it is a great mistake to confuse the rights of the House with the rights to be found under the hon. gentleman's own hat. The two things are not the same at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not the practice in the Public Accounts Committee for an hon. member of that committtee to do just what the hon. member for St. Antoine is doing here, and is it not the undoubted right of an individual member of that committee to ask for the original documents, and are not these documents invariably brought down ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have fallen into a practice in that committee somewhat open to criticism, but that is the practice of the committee, and I am not objecting to it. I want to quote again from the hon. member for St. Antoine division. In each case he has been particular to stand upon his rights in this matter. Let me quote from page 1242 in 'Hansard' :

> It is because of the principle involved that this resolution has been placed upon the orders of the day and that this discussion has taken the form that it has. The simple question is this: Is a member of parliament entitled, if he so desires, to see an original document?

Hon. gentlemen talk of the rights of parliament. This, however, is not a question of the rights of parliament but a question of the rights, the imaginary rights, of the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) :

> Is a member of parliament entitled, if he so desires, to see an original document when no reason of state can be alleged why it should not be displayed?

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. Again he stands on his rights. He is not going to get away from that. But we are told that the hon. gentleman, if he did not give the reason at the beginning, was careful to give it at the end. Well, I shall quote the last passage from his remarks. In his second speech, just before we took the vote, my hon. friend summed up the situation, and his summing up will be found on page 1247. He said :

> Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle that when we, on this side of the House, have what we consider good and sufficient reason, we may have the right to see an origi-

nal document, or else be prepared to take the odium throughout the country that you do not wish an original document to come to light. That is all I have to say.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Read page 1246.

Mr. FIELDING. On page 1246 I find this:

Now there are nine pages of that return which can be illumined if I may see the original.

He has not given any reason.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Read on.

Mr. FIELDING. How much more am I to read ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Just about four or five sentences.

Mr. FIELDING. (reading) :

But there are nine pages there, with respect to which the copy does not tell me all I want to know, or which I have the right to know, if I understand my rights in this House of Commons.

Then there are some interruptions :

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend say that these nine pages differ from the original?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could he tell unless he sees the original?

Mr. AMES. I say that these nine pages will, in all probability, clear up certain doubts which I have regarding peculiar features in connection with some of these transactions.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. (reading) :

I say that the handwriting of some of these nine pages may have a very important bearing on the case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Read page 1245 too.

Mr ALCORN. The hon. minister admitted a moment ago that it was not necessary to state in each motion the specific reasons. In what he has just read, is not the reason for the motion fairly stated ?

Mr. FIELDING. On the contrary all throughout this speech, my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) insists on his right to have this information because he wants it and for no other reason.

Mr. ALCORN. But he has given the reason.

Mr. FIELDING. In his concluding remarks he says :

Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle, that when we, on this side of the House, have what we consider——

Not what the House considers—

—good and sufficient reason, we may have the right to see an original document.

That is what the hon. gentleman, by his last words in this House, asked us to vote for. He asked us to vote for the affirmation of the principle that simply because he wanted these originals, he should get them. Later on he says :

If we on this side think we want a document——

Never mind the reason, it is enough to say we desire the document, and if we desire it, notwithstanding all the rules of parliament, we are entitled to get it. We are entitled to get it simply and solely because we want it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The language used by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) was not at all as the hon. gentleman interprets it.

Mr. FIELDING. His words speak for themselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let him look at them again.

Mr. FIELDING. I have read them twice.

Mr. FOSTER. Read them again.

Mr. FIELDING. I think they are good reading, and I shall read them again :

Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle that when we, on this side of the House, have what we consider good and sufficient reason, we may have the right to see an original document, and so forth.

In other words while all the parliamentary writers say it is for the House to say whether or not the reasons are sufficient the hon. gentleman says if he and his associates think it is sufficient, nobody on this side has the slightest right to interfere. That is what the hon. gentleman asked us to vote for and we on this side very properly refused to vote for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. FIELDING. I read the concluding remarks of the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You read it and you misquoted it.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that I need read it again.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not attend to the punctuation.

Mr. FIELDING. I think I tried to lend to the rhyme of the poet the music of my voice. We have heard something about the resolution which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition moved, and which has been very happily described as a truism. I want to read it now and I hope I shall read it fairly and properly.

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case——

Who is to be the judge of the validity of the reason ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Who is to urge them ?

Mr. FIELDING. Who is to judge them is more important.

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right——

Mr. LANCASTER. Who is to urge them?

Mr. FIELDING. Suppose that any one on this side of the House urges them, who is to judge ? The judgment must be the judgment of the House and not the judgment of the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) or of the hon. gentlemen opposite in their collective capacity.

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right of the people's representatives, in parliament assembled——

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

Mr. FIELDING. Not the right of the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) the right of parliament, in its collective capacity, the members of parliament assembled together and constituting parliament and not the right of the individual member.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the minister says that if the minority want information and the majority do not wish them to have it the minority will never get it ?

Mr. FIELDING. All the books tell us the judgment of the House must prevail. I will take the case my hon. friend supposes, if we can imagine such a case, where the opposition want information and the majority are so insensible as to say that it shall not be given, then the decision of the majority must prevail. Is that not parliamentary government ?

Mr. FOSTER. Then read the second part of the resolution ?

Mr. FIELDING. I will read it all.

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right of the people's representatives, in parliament assembled, to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government, and for that purpose——

That is the members of parliament assembled in parliament, not individually.

—to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business ; and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.

It is about as sensible a resolution as to say : Resolved that two and two make four. We could not go against it, we could not say they make five. We might not think there was any particular occasion for engaging in these arithmetical exercises, but if we were brought face to face with the resolution and we had to vote on it, we would all vote that two and two make four. My hon. friend's resolution states properly the sound parliamentary law on this subject ; but surely in saying that, he does not want to set aside all the rules which govern the procedure as respects the production of documents. There is no getting away from the rule laid down by Bourinot and confirmed by Erskine May that if an hon. member wants information he is bound to give the reason on which he frames his motion. I would not be very critical as to what would be the reason, and I have no doubt if my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) had not stood so much on his right, had not said so much about making this a test case, had confined himself to the simple possession of this paper, he would have seen it in some way. I would like him to see it because——

Mr. AMES. Judging by the hon. minister's remarks the minority have no way in which they could secure access to the paper without the wish of the majority ; therefore it rests with the majority to suggest a means of obtaining access.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has chosen his method of dealing with this question and has chosen to present it as a matter of right ; instead of making an ordinary request he has insisted on making himself a martyr. He is not concerned about the little trumpery paper, but there is a great principle at stake and he wants to assert that. He, the hon. member for St. Antoine division, says he has the undoubted right to get possession of any public document in the possession of the government, and inasmuch as he insisted on that as a matter of right, inasmuch as the adoption of that rule would have established a precedent which would be contrary to all parliamentary practice and all sound government, we on this side affirmed that we would not vote for his resolution.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln-Niagara) When hon. gentlemen on this side of the House an hour or so ago were trying to find out what the Prime Minister meant by his action in this matter, I quite agreed with some who said there was an entire want of logic in the position taken by him, but since I have heard the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I think we have seen ridicule run mad. We have the hon. gentleman who sits next the Prime Minister, in all seriousness or pretended seriousness, telling this House it is not for one member to judge whether his reason for asking for papers is a good one, but it is for the whole House to so decide. I do not agree with him in that statement entirely, but taking

him at his own word I want to know from him now what he as one of the majority has decided? Has he decided that the reasons given by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) are good and valid or not ?

Mr. FIELDING. I decided that the hon. gentleman declined to state reasons. He said that as a matter of right he insisted and as I could not admit the right——

Mr. LANCASTER. We have heard that three times already.

Mr. FIELDING. You will hear it three times more.

Mr. LANCASTER. But we have not heard one word from the minister as to his opinion of the merits of the question. I was not sent to this House to get into any comedies or any farces if I could help it. I represent people who vote against me as well as those who vote for me, and I say publicly to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that in the county of Lincoln he would not get ten Liberals to subscribe to the principles he has stated upon the floor of this House to-night. He says the majority of this House are to determine the sufficiency of these reasons and will not say what is his opinion of the reasons given by an hon. gentleman for moving for original papers, and he will not say what he as one of the majority thinks of the sufficiency of these reasons, and will not say that in his opinion the reasons given are not good and amply sufficient. He is asking his majority to vote to sustain the position taken by his leader and himself without one word of opinion from him as to whether the documents should be brought down on the merits of the case, and he is practically disfranchising all the people represented in this House not only by the members on this side but by about 110 members on the opposite side who are not members of the government. Do the people of this country who are represented by either supporters or opponents of this government not want the information that the public documents of this country contain ? Is the Minister of Finance going to seriously carry out what he has indicated here, whether as a threat or as a mere notice of policy, that we are to go crawling to him upon our knees as representing the people of this country to see what we have a right to see of the public documents? As one member of this House although I am willing to be courteous and polite—and I have always been treated with courtesy and politeness by him—if he is now giving me notice that when I have occasion as representing my constituents to inquire into any matter, desiring to do so on behalf of both sides, because some decent Liberals want to know what the truth is about the affairs of the country, I want to tell the Minister of Finance who says that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) could have got his information if he had been more courteous or time-serving or humble or crawling to the hon. gentleman and had not demanded this as a matter of right, that I will demand information in such a case, not as a matter of courtesy or of grace or of favour from the governement, but as a matter of right.

It has been said: Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. Sir, this government has been treated very leniently by the people of this country. Ever since 1896 they have been charitably; yes, more than charitably, treated by the electors of Canada. They have been allowed to break every pledge they ever made, to set at defiance every principle they ever announced, and now, on top of all of that, and even a short time before a general election, they have the madness—it can be hardly called anything else—to come before the people and say: We will not allow you to see the documents which you have paid for —and which you own unless some member of this House comes to us—crawls to us in servile fashion—and submits a humble request for our consideration. One must wax warm on this subject. It is a matter that goes to the root of our constitution, to Magna Charta itself. Does the right hon. Prime Minister want us to send a petition to the King's representative to ask for a new constitution? For we have understood that, when a government is chosen in this country, it is chosen as a body of trustees for the people. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) does not own the documents which he wishes us to ask for so humbly. He may think he does, but at the first opportunity the people have they will tell him that he is wrong. And that wrong is not to be set right by quoting a sentence here and there from May or from Bourinot. These sentences are not to be understood if taken alone. They must be read reasonably in the light of the constitution which is the foundation of the parliament. I reiterate that the government is the trustee of these documents, and that, as trustee, they must allow the people's representatives to have access to them at all reasonable hours.

A member of parliament does not ask to see these documents for personal or private reasons. I do not know how many souls the hon. member for St. Antoine represents. I myself represent about 35,000. However many the hon. member for St. Antoine may speak for, the fact is that they have no other representative than that hon. gentleman. If he states in this House that he believes it is necessary, in the interest of the people he represents, that a certain document belonging to the people must be shown, that document must be shown unless the government can show

good reason for refusing to produce it. You do not need to quote parliamentary authorities; you do not need to make these specious pleas; you do not need to have what the Minister of Finance has called these academic discussions upon the question. The ordinary citizen of Canada, I care not in what walk of life he may be, knows that what I say is correct and that what the Minister of Finance has said is not correct. That hon. gentleman says that the rights of a member of this House are distinguishable from the rights of parliament and that the majority has to decide whether documents should be brought down or not. But what have the majority decided upon the merits of this question? Have they decided that it is not proper that these documents should be seen? Why, the argument is simply this: The majority must decide it, and, as the majority have not decided it, the conclusion must be in the negative. Because the majority have not passed upon the question and do not dare to pass upon it fairly and squarely and on its merits, the answer must be that the member asking for these documents is not entitled to see them. If that is not absolute nonsense—not to be disrespectful—I never heard anything approaching nonsense. We are told that there must be some allegation of suspicion or some ground of complaint in regard to a document before the people by their representatives here may see that document. That point has been answered but I wish to add one word upon it. What limit is put upon that restriction? If a member wishes to see an original, so that he may know whether it has been correctly copied or not, must he lobby this House, write letters to the ministers, negotiate, stipulate for just what the people whom he represents are to have? Or have the people a right to elect a man who, in their opinion, will have sense and decency enough to ask only what is right and fair and to have that representative see the documents which it is necessary for him to see in their interest? I resent the suggestion that the hon. member for St. Antoine, or any other hon. member in this House, would be actuated by improper motives in asking to see public documents. We are honourable gentlemen—believed to be so by the people who elected us. I am not excluding the other side of the House; I include both sides. For it is only just to hon. members opposite who support the government, to say that not one has had the temerity, the hardihood to stand up in this debate and support the position of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. In the former debate, two or three of these hon. gentlemen did make the effort to show reasons in support of the government's position, but not one of them has dared to rise to-night and say that the position of the hon. member for St. Antoine is not the correct one under the circumstances. Do these hon. gentlemen who sit behind the minister want us to inform their constituencies that they do not claim to be men who can be trusted when they ask for the sight of public documents? The suggestion of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is practically an insult to every private member on either side of this House—that the representatives of the people would be actuated by improper motives in calling for public documents. I am astonished that hon. gentlemen sitting behind the leader of this House and the Minister of Finance do not rise and correct these two members of the government who have in so many words asserted that all private members of this House would be likely to be moved by wrong and improper motives in asking that original documents be laid before this House. I will not sit down until I emphasize the resentment I feel at the insult thrown out to every private member of this House by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Finance who has attempted to come to his relief though—without being offensive—in a very lame way indeed.

I am not going to trouble the House any longer except to say this, that when the right hon. gentleman subscribed to that resolution on the 21st of January, which is on the records of this House and can be put before every voter in this country, he either meant that resolution or he did not. He is up against one horn of the dilemma or the other. He was either trifling with this House and the country, or else he was intending at that time to carry out the resolution which he voted for. Now, forty-eight hours have elapsed, and we find that for some reason or another, whether he fears the resignation of the present Minister of the Interior or not I do not know, but for some reason that he does not choose to disclose, he refuses to apply that resolution to this particular case. The right hon. gentleman will hear about this from Halifax to Vancouver, and he will find that he is up against the people; because he is not merely taking millions of money out of their pockets, money that he ought not to take, not merely advocating improper, ridiculous and improvident measures at the cost of the people, but he now goes the length of undertaking to say to them: When you put me and men like me in power, you must understand that we are going to withhold from parliament all the information that we see fit, we are going to pass a resolution and put ourselves apparently in the right, but within forty-eight hours we are going right back on that resolution.

Mr. G. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). The question before this House is whether the government are going to provide some way or other by which private members may see original public documents which it is necessary for them to see in the public in-

terest. It matters but little to me whether those documents are shown to members in the department, or whether they are laid on the table of the House in answer to a resolution. I am naturally inclined to look at this matter from the ordinary business point of view and not the technical point of view. I know, as a matter of fact, that it has always been customary to allow members of parliament to see original documents, whether that has been done by right or by courtesy. But under the present condition of affairs, private members are unable to see those original documents in any way whatever. Now, I take it that it is the inherent right of every individual member of parliament to get full information. We all know that individual members do not possess the authority of the House of Commons; at the same time, I think that individual members have a right to reasonably full information. I am sure that the public will not feel satisfied if it is made impossible for private members to obtain this information. I understand it used to be the custom to bring down original documents. I do not see that May draws any distinction between originals and copies, and the Minister of Finance has so stated. Let me ask what would happen if the government were to take a position of this kind every time we asked for copies, or every time we put a resolution on the Order Paper asking for ordinary public documents? Ordinarily, copies are sufficient for all purposes, and it is naturally more convenient to bring down copies. At the same time, I fancy it will be admitted that there are times when it is absolutely necessary to see the originals. I am prepared to say that it is imperative that we should be allowed to see the originals, because if it became a custom that original documents could not be produced, how long would it be before we would have reason to doubt the accuracy of the copies? If the government decided that originals could not be seen, how long would it be before some subservient clerk making out these copies would begin to suppress certain things that were damaging to the government? If a government of that kind were in power in this country for ten or twenty years, I fancy that when they were defeated and the lid was taken off, we would have reason to doubt the accuracy of much of the information given during all those years. The ministers and their supporters have given very few arguments why members should not see original documents in the departments. It seems to me that under proper regulations, which would necessarily be made by the ministers at the head of the departments, a member of parliament ought to be allowed to inspect original documents in the department itself. The Minister of the Interior, in attempting to give some reason why members should not be allowed to see original documents in the department, says on page 1701 of 'Hansard,' referring to the transactions in question:

They are transactions between the government, as representing the whole people, and individual citizens; they are transactions which, if they are not completed, then those papers should not be put in jeopardy by being released from the responsibility of the department.

Now, they are transactions between the government as a whole and the people or individual citizens; we are here representing the people as a whole, and surely it is our duty to investigate these matters as thoroughly as we can. The minister goes on:

My hon. friend knows that transactions in regard to timber limits are never closed; that the license is renewed from year to year; and that at any time a question may be raised as to the right of any person who holds that license, and that the only evidence there is as to the right is the documents upon file in the Department of the Interior.

Surely that is puerile argument. The license is what shows the right of a person to a timber limit. These papers asked for by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, are applications and tenders which were called for before the limit was placed under license. They have nothing to do with the title to the property. If they were lost it would make little difference to the person holding the license at the present time. The minister goes on:

It is not a matter of interest particularly to the government whether these files are here or there, but it is a matter of very definite interest to the people whose title to their property rests upon these files.

There is not a word there giving a reason why a member of this House should not see these documents in the department. Even supposing these files were lost what difference would it make or what harm would it do to the owner of these limits? It could not hurt the owner of these limits if my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, saw these files in the department. They could make any arrangement they liked to see that he did not destroy, or steal, or mutilate them. Then the minister goes on at page 1701:

There is nothing to hinder any individual who wants to acquaint himself of the business of another individual asking a member of parliament to go into the department and discover for him information that he wants, information in regard to the personal interests of that other individual, using the member as a medium for acquiring information.

The Minister of the Interior must hold in very poor estimation the members of this House when he can suggest that a member of parliament would go into his department and try to get information which he would not be entitled to get except for public purposes and then try to use this in-

formation to the hurt of some private individual. If there is such a member of parliament he certainly should not be here but I do not see why the regulations should be made to suit one or two such members of parliament to the detriment of all the rest of us and I doubt very much whether there is one single member of parliament who would take such an advantage. Further, I say that the argument of the minister is absolutely useless for this reason; he says that there is nothing to hinder a member of parliament getting information there which he could give to some individual to the hurt of another individual. I submit that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, has copies of these papers in his possession. I ask the Minister of the Interior to tell me one single way in which the seeing of these original documents could by any possibility do any more harm to the owners of these timber limits than the sight of copies, if they are true copies. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, has the copies. If the information is going to hurt any individual he could now be hurt and I defy the Minister of the Interior to show me any way in which the perusal of the original documents by my hon friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, if the copies are true copies, can hurt any single individual. As the Minister of the Interior does not choose to give any reason I gather that he agrees with me on that point. Now, Sir, I wish to call attention to some further words of the Minister of the Interior given at the bottom of page 1702 and the top of page 1703. He says :

Well, will my hon. friends say what reason was given? Was it because the documents before the House were not copies of the originals? Did he say that he believed they were not? He did not say that? Did he say that the originals were forgeries? Did he give any reason except that of curiosity for the production of those documents?

I doubt very much if the Minister of the Interior would go before a public audience in this or any other city and use an argument of that kind in regard to this question. If my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, knew that these copies were not true copies he would not need to see the originals at all. He could get up in the House and say that to his knowledge he knew they were not true copies, that they were forgeries. I submit that the hon. minister is simply trying to make it impossible to see these papers at all. Then, he asks : Did he give any reason except that of curiosity ? Certainly my hon. friend from Montreal, St, Antoine, gave many good reasons and I can say that I doubt very much if that hon. gentleman ever wants to see any of these papers for mere curiosity. When an hon. gentleman of this House goes through files of papers for the purpose of trying to get information he certainly does not want to go through any more of them for mere curiosity. It is hard enough work to go through them for the purpose of trying to get at the way this government does its business without going through them for mere curiosity. I submit, further, that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, gave good and sufficient reasons why he should see the originals. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has stated that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, claimed the papers as a matter of right. My hon. friend's speech must be taken as a whole. Nowhere did he state as a bald fact that he had a right to see these papers, no matter whether any person else thought he had that right or not, but he stated that he wished to know his position in regard to seeing them, that he had reasons for desiring to see these papers, that therefore he brought in his resolution just to ascertain whether, when he had good reasons for wishing to see them, there was any way in which he could see them or not. It is evident the course taken by the government is for the purpose of making it practically impossible for a member to see any papers that they do not wish him to see and it is evident that there is an intention on the part of the government to try and prevent my hon. friend from seeing these particular papers and for that purpose they have raised this purely technical objection and voted the motion down.

I wish to say two or three words in regard to a remark made by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross), found in 'Hansard' at page 1717 :

I go to the Department of the Interior for a legitimate purpose; I do not go poking my nose into other people's business.

It seems to me that that is an unwarranted statement to make and the inference which the hon. member wishes us to draw is that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, wishes to see these papers for the purpose of poking his nose into other people's business. At the same time the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo is able to see the papers that he wishes to see. I submit that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, is doing his duty to his constituents when he wants to see these papers and I can say that if more of us would take the time and trouble to go into these matters and investigate these questions and these papers as my hon. friend does it would be all the better for our constituents. That is what we are sent here for and for any one to say that an hon. member of this House who wishes to see public documents is poking his nose into other people's business is to say something which is entirely wrong. The hon. gentleman wants to see these papers because he is endeavouring to discharge the duties imposed upon him by that portion of the people of Canada who sent him here. I know that the rules appertaining to joint stock companies do not apply in this House, but at the same time

we may liken this parliament to a board of directors of a vast joint stock association holding a trust for all the people of Canada. We may compare the cabinet to an executive committee of that board of directors, and I would like to know what would be thought if an ordinary director of a company were to be refused information by the executive committee of the board of directors. Why, Sir, the mere refusal would be taken as an evidence of fraud in itself. I feel sure Sir, that from the very fact that these papers are refused, the people of this country will believe that there is something wrong about them. If it is not advisable to bring these original documents here and lay them on the table of the House, would it not be very easy to devise some rule under which the representatives of the people could see them in the departments. What difficulty is there about that? The fact is that all this turmoil has been caused by the new regulation made by the Minister of the Interior. Hitherto it always had been the custom to allow members of parliament, under proper restrictions and when they are asked for in a proper way, to see original documents. What is the reason that the Minister of the Interior has abolished that custom? The letter from the Minister of the Interior informing my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) of this new regulation is to be found on page 1202 of 'Hansard,' and I quote from it:

> In reply I beg to say that it is a rule of the department not to allow the examination of the files by others than officials of the department whose duty it is.

In this arbitrary rule as stated in that letter, the Minister of the Interior draws no distinction whatever between a member of parliament and any other citizen of this country. As members of parliament we do not claim that we have very many rights in this House; we on this side of the House have come to believe that we have few rights indeed under this government. But at the same time it seems to me manifest that the representatives of the people of Canada must have some rights in the Department of the Interior that an ordinary person coming in off the street does not possess. I do not say that a private member has the same right as the Minister of the Interior to inspect departmental documents. It would be absurd to contend that. But to say that a rule can be made by the minister that a member of parliament should have no rights whatever to see any paper in a department under any circumstances, is going altogether too far. We all know that the cabinet ministers of this country have taken all power to themselves. We all know that the individual members on the governuent side of the House even have very little to say in formulating the policy of this government or in discussing any public question in this House, outside of the minor questions which may affect their own particular localities. That is true, but at the same time there must be some limit to the power of cabinet ministers, and if the present regime continues the people of the country must soon ask what a member of parliament is elected for any way, and why do they send him here if he is to be treated as an irresponsible individual and denied any rights in the government of the country, and I would like to know how long the people of Canada will stand that kind of thing?

Why, Sir, they might as well not elect any members at all; they might as well permit the members of the cabinet to conduct the affairs of the country and let the rest of us stay at home to mind our own business. The letter of the Minister of the Interior to my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) makes no qualifications. He does not say that my honn. friend cannot see the papers unless he has good reason, but he lays down the absolute rule that he, as a representative of the people, shall not be allowed that privilege. I would like to ask by what right can the Minister of the Interior make such a rule as this without the consent of parliament? Who is this Minister of the Interior anyway? I know that he is not the Czar of all the Russias; I suppose he must be the Czar of all the Galicians. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) in his remarks this evening said that he wondered how any one in the gallery listening to the debate would size up the conduct of the government. Well, the first evening this matter was discussed there was a gentleman in the gallery who wanted to know what was the cause of all this discussion. He noticed the great excitement under which the Minister of the Interior laboured, and he saw the rather unusual and extraordinary perturbation exhibited by the Prime Minister. And this gentleman wondered what the hon. member for St. Antoine had done to cause such annoyance to the Prime Minister; he wondered if my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) had been making any large rake off out of the government or whether he had been getting some of the public domain for a song; but he quickly saw that could not be the reason for these gentlemen who seemed so annoyed were used to that. Was it because of some wasteful public expenditure that the hon. member (Mr. Ames) had caused? It was nothing of that sort; that would be an every day matter any way and not sufficient to cause annoyance on the other side. Then what was the trouble? The trouble simply was that a private member, sent here by some 60,000 people, had asked to see the original of some public documents, copies of which the government had already brought down. That is the only matter which troubles the right hon. the Prime Minister so much. Well, the man on the street will want to know why

the Prime Minister should be so annoyed because the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) asked such a simple thing. I may say that a good Liberal in this city told me yesterday that he could not understand what the government were thinking about when they took such a position, that the position was absolutely untenable and that the people would not stand it. To my mind there is every reason why the hon. member for St. Antoine should see the original documents. What can be the objection to his seeing them? They are of no practical use to anybody. They are no longer of any value to the owners of the timber limits. There are no state reasons given why they should not be shown to the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman has to my mind given good and sufficient reasons why he should be allowed to see them. I wish therefore on behalf of my constituency, and the people of this country, to join the many hon. members who have spoken on this side in insisting that this very reasonable request of the hon. member for St. Antoine division should be granted, and that he should be allowed to see the originals of these documents, copies of which have been produced.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). I always thought that I had some rights in this House until to-night; but since hearing the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I have come to the conclusion that I have none at all unless he chooses graciously to admit them. No matter what I may want, no matter how reasonable may be my request, no matter how necessary in the public interest I may consider that it should be granted, all that is necessary is for the Minister of Finance or his right hon. leader to raise his finger and my right disappears. No member of this House has a right to see the original of any document of public record if any of these ministers object. The individual member of parliament has no right of access to any public record, has no right inherent in his position as representative of the people, according to the doctrine preached to us to-night. Is that the boasted constitutional liberty of the representatives of the people in this country? Is that the doctrine preached at this late hour?

An hon. MEMBER. It is the Liberal doctrine.

Mr. BRODER. A great deal has been said about the public interest suffering. Will any member of the government say that because, for the last twenty-five or thirty years, it has been possible for a private member of this House to go into any one of the departments and examine the original documents, the public interest has suffered? Will any one of them dare say in his place that any serious inconvenience has been suffered by any public department from this practice? There must be some other reason at the back of this refusal. This unwillingness of the government to allow a member of this House to see the original of a public document leads to the suspicion that it is not the public interest but the party interests of hon. gentlemen opposite which will suffer, if the original public document is submitted to scrutiny. No man can come to any other conclusion, more especially when we have seen in this very department, the conduct of which is under discussion, copies of documents brought down with the names torn off. That is a matter of history. Further than that, we have seen reports sent in by the officials of that department mutilated and put in a false light on the records of the country. We have therefore a perfect right to suspect that all is not well with the right hon. gentlemen and with the hon. minister who is at the head of the department, and that they are afraid of the scrutiny of a private member, not in the public, but in the party interests. It is a question whether or not a private member, who is sent here by some 50,000 or 60,000 electors, has any rights. Is this the doctrine of Liberalism preached to-day by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)? If it is, then it is time the people became apprehensive. It is time they became suspicious that there is something in these departments which will not bear the light of day and on which the government are afraid to let the sun shine. It is all very well to say that the government cannot tolerate the confusion and the inconvenience of private members coming into a department and examining public documents. But what are the officials in these departments for? Are they not there for the public convenience and the public welfare, or are they there for the purpose of dictating to the people's representatives? The latter is the position taken by the hon. gentleman at the head of the department in question (Mr. Oliver), and he is backed up by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. What new light has dawned on the right hon. gentleman since yesterday? Has he learnt from his Minister of the Interior that it would not be well to let the documents be seen? There is no other conclusion we can reach judging by his conduct. Whenever we have been able to lift the lid, even in the slightest degree, they put themselves on the defensive in order to prevent the public from seeing any more, and therefore we are told to-night by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that we have no rights at all except such as the government and its majority choose to give us. Is it possible that I, standing here as a representative of the people, have no rights save that which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) may see fit to grant me. I am not willing to accept any such dictum. No man who loves liberty

will submit to such dictation. Men who wish to follow him in that servile manner may sit on that side of the House but they do not on this. And it is just as well to let the Finance Minister understand that though he may force his doctrine on his own supporters, the deacons on this side will not endorse it.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). I was unable to be here when the original debate was on, and to-night I find hon. gentlemen on your left, Mr. Speaker, objecting to the House going into supply until some original documents are produced. And I find that we are discussing the point as to whether it is the right of an individual member or of the House to have original documents produced, unless there are good reasons assigned for their production. It seems to me that this debate is rather peculiar in this respect that there is no resolution before the chair. If I understand well what has taken place, copies of the documents, the originals of which are asked for, were last year laid on the table. These copies were in the hands of the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), and after perusing them he found that only certain of them were required and he asked to see the originals of those which he needed. Therefore the question is now as to whether he has or has not the right to see the originals, the copies of which he had last session in his possession. The right of the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) to see the originals has been questioned. The House has even voted that the resolution should not be carried and that he should not see the original documents.

An important point has been forgotten ; it is that copies of these documents were produced last year by the consent of the House. Bourinot and May have been quoted as to how documents should be produced, but I do not think any of the authors make any difference between copies and originals. The moment documents are voted to be brought down copies are brought down as a matter of convenience, but at the same time there is a distinct right for the member to see the original. Mr. Ames has seen the copies, and he has asked to see the originals. This has been refused him. We are faced by two resolutions, one adopted last year for the production of these very documents and one voted down this year for the production of the same documents, except that the originals are now asked for. I understand it is sometimes dangerous or inconvenient to bring down original documents. For instance last year some originals were brought down and for one reason and another have not been returned to the department. What I fail to understand is why, when Mr. Ames saw the documents last year, and had them in his possession, this year he is not allowed to go to the department and compare the copies he has with the originals in the department. Not only do I not see any inconvenience in that but it seems to me that Mr. Ames has a right, not perhaps as a member of this House, but because last year he had the documents in his possession, to see the originals and there is no parliamentary procedure to say that when he has seen copies of documents produced before the House, he has not a right to see the originals in the department. Bourinot at page 366 says :

> But if a minister cite any such document in the House, it becomes a public paper and should be produced.

The documents were brought down last year and became public papers, and not only has Mr. Ames the right to see them in the department but the right to bring them before the House, because the House last year voted that they should be brought down. Bourinot says further at page 370 :

> All the departments of the public service are kept most laboriously employed every session in furnishing information required by members of the two Houses. The expense entailed in this way is necessarily very large. The right of a member to obtain every information from the government within the limits previously described, is so undoubted that it seems almost beyond the power of a minister to keep the practice within narrower bounds and thereby save much public money. It is quite obvious, however, that no member shall move for papers except on sufficient grounds. It is clearly laid down by the most eminent of English parliamentarians that it is incumbent upon the mover to state the reasons upon which his motion is founded, that the House may judge of the necessity, importance and expediency of calling for the papers which are the subject of that motion.

We are not arguing whether the reasons given by Mr. Ames were sufficient. Those reasons were admitted as good by the leader of the House and if they were sufficient what is the matter now ? The House is blocked from going into supply because the originals of the documents of which copies were brought down last year, were refused this year because there was not sufficient reason advanced for their production. If the documents cannot be brought down, why does not the minister invite the hon. member to go to his department and see the original documents ? Bourinot and May claim it is not the right of a member to ask for documents without giving sufficient reasons, that it is not the right of a member but is for the House to decide. I may say en passant that generally—and this is necessary—the majority in parliament must rule, but the rules of May which are copied by Bourinot apply more particularly to the parliament of Great Britain and I might say—and I hope I shall not offend any members on either side by doing so—that in Great Britain the lines of party are not so narrow and the votes given by members of the British House are not cast in a

mould beforehand; there a member may fail to follow the leader of a party without danger of being looked on as a black sheep. Bourinot says further:

Returns may be refused on account of their voluminous character and the length of time it would take to prepare them, but in order to obviate such an objection, members are frequently invited to communicate with the department direct.

The member in this case could surely communicate with the department direct. But there is no great inconvenience in bringing down this document, and no serious objection unless it would endanger the public policy of the country or where the documents are private and confidential. I am inclined to differ with Bourinot and other authors on parliamentary law, as to whether it is the right of the member or the House to ask for the production of documents. We may say that documents are in the departments in trust, that they are in the hands of the ministers who are the servants of this House, and whether a member represents 60,000 people or 300 people he is a representative of the people; when he claims the production of a document he claims the production of the property of the people whom he represents. You might go further and say that a member asking for the production of documents is only asking for information and that it is the right of any member, before voting subsidies to His Majesty, to have all the information he is entitled to and there is no better source of information than the production of public documents. It is not only his right but it seems to me his duty to ask for it. If I am contrary to the authors on parliamentary law, I still say it is his duty to ask for the information. The House may decide upon it or not, but as I have said, if there is one principle of the British constitution and British institutions, it is that the representatives of the people have a right to every information before voting subsidies to His Majesty. I shall not discuss the sufficiency of the reasons given by Mr. Ames but I would quote part of his speech quoted by Mr. Fielding, at page 1178 of 'Hansard,' where he says:

We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers. This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question, because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to timber berths Nos. 1107, 1108 and 1171.

There is nothing here to the effect that his only reason was as a member of this House; on the contrary he claims he has good reasons for asking for the production of this document. Not only that, but the leader of this House said that the reasons were good. He agreed that the documents should be produced, and now, we find, not only that the documents are not produced, but that the hon. member for St. Antoine had the door of the Department of the Interior closed in his face when he went there to see the originals. What, then is the position? Where does the House stand? The production of the originals has been permitted, or, at the very least, the leader of the House has said that there were good reasons for the production of the originals for the inspection of the hon. member for St. Antoine. Then, why is not the hon. member allowed to see them? Why are we here wasting the time of the House hour after hour and blocking the supplies which should be voted to His Majesty? Everybody seems to agree that the reasons for producing the documents are good, that the documents ought to be produced, and yet, they are not produced.

It seems to be held that the onus probandi rest upon the hon. member for St. Antoine, but that it is in his second speech and not in his first that he made his case good. But if he has made his case good, I think the only thing would be for some representative of the government to assure the hon. member for St. Antoine that he is to see the originals, as it is admitted that his reasons are good. If this were done, the supply would not be blocked any more, but we should be able to go on with the business of the House.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). It seems to me a little significant that on this question, on which, when brought before the House and voted on, the government's majority dwindled to 35, and on which, on its second appearance the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the House, accepted theoretically—academically, at all events—the views of the opposition, yet, to-night, when the question is being debated again, not a single supporter of the right hon. gentleman is found to say a word on behalf of the government. Can it be that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who sit behind the dignitaries of the front benches, think that the day may come when their own rights will be in danger and the interests of their constituents injuriously affected by the principle laid down? Sir, I was amused at the emphasis with which the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) dwelt upon the power and rights of this House. This is the first time I have ever heard that hon. gentleman take such an extreme position on that subject. I wondered if his interest in that mythical house which he had in mind, was based to any extent upon the exhibition we saw here within these walls when this very question was up for discussion. A resolution had been moved by the leader of the opposition

(Mr. R. L. Borden). The discussion having gone on, the question was put to the House, and those on this side cried 'Yes.' Then there arose a burst of sound that almost swelled the rafters from the roof when 'No' was shouted by hon. gentlemen opposite. But the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said 'Carried,' and, in an instant, the amendment was unanimously accepted. And it is to such a House as that that hon. members are supposed to entrust their rights and the rights of their constituents.

I suppose there are different ways of looking at this subject, and I believe it is only fair for a person who wishes to arrive at a reasonable conclusion on any question to try to put himself in the position of one who takes a different view from his own. So, I have tried to put myself in a position—if I can imagine such a thing—of one of the hon. gentlemen who support the views announced by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and alternately advocated and controverted by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It seems to me that, whatever we may think of their position on the whole, there is something to be said in favour of it from their point of view. It is an old saying that self-preservation is nature's first law. Let us see how that would apply. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) asked for the production of original documents. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, before now, produced original documents. It is not unnatural that they should indulge in a retrospective view to see what was the result of their obedience to the law of the land in this matter. They know by experience—as they have been reminded—that if they had kept back original documents they would have saved much unpleasantness and disgrace in connection with certain affairs of the North Atlantic Trading Company; they would have avoided a very great scandal arising out of the transactions of one Charles Strubbe; they would have prevented very discreditable disclosures in connection with the Galway Horse and Cattle Company; they would have kept secret from the people some of the utterly iniquitous expenditures for articles said to have been for the use of sailors on the 'Montcalm.' So, when these hon. gentlemen look back and see the effect of the production of original documents, it is no wonder they dislike the idea of having any more of such documents produced. I remember when, a couple of years ago, the time of members of this House was occupied with, and the attention of the country was fixed upon, a steamer commissioned by this government to discover the North Pole. I remember that I thought it an outrage that we the members of the investigating committee could not get the production of originals. To us had been referred the duty of ascertaining whether the prices paid for goods supplied to this steamer were reasonable or not. Many of these goods were on the boat at Sorel, and we asked that we might be allowed to have samples to see whether the prices paid were fair and equitable or not. I had gone to Toronto and to Montreal, and had taken every means within my power to ascertain the facts, but always there was the same reply: How can any man tell whether the price of this or that was reasonable, unless he can see the article for which the price was paid? Then, when we took evidence, we began to see that the government was not so far astray—from their standpoint in refusing the production of originals. We found, for instance, that handsome figures were paid for fur-lined coats. Everybody will agree that, unless you see the article, it is impossible to say whether any price paid for a fur-lined coat is reasonable or unreasonable. But when we got the evidence that these coats were canvas on the outside and sheepskin on the inside we ceased to wonder that the government declined to have the samples produced in order that the committee might form an opinion on the matter. If I were allowed to refer to the proceedings of a committee of this House now sitting—and I suppose I am not—I could give another reason why hon. gentlemen opposite believe that the production of original documents, even when ordered by this House, may be found very inconvenient. So, perhaps, from the standpoint of these hon. gentlemen, there is something to be said for the view they take. But looking at it calmly, on what ground is this refused? I see that hon. gentlemen opposite place their confidence in Bourinot, as if there were something sacred in the wisdom found in his pages. One quotation that they make from Bournnot is this:

> It is quite obvious that no member should move for papers except on sufficient grounds.

I venture to say that nobody will question that. But it will be observed that this does not say 'except on stating sufficient grounds.' It is merely a principle laid down to govern the conduct of members in the House—that it would be quite out of keeping with the dignity of a member of this House to move for papers recklessly, or merely to gratify a personal curiosity. It is obvious that he should not move for papers except on sufficient grounds. The next sentence goes further, and I admit that it seems to justify the view expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite:

> It is clearly laid down by the most eminent English parliamentarians that it is incumbent upon the mover to state the reasons upon which his motion is founded, that the House may judge of the necessity, importance and expediency of calling for the papers which are the subject of that motion.

You will see, Sir, that there is not a word here giving us the late Sir John Bourinot's opinion. This was a principle laid down by the most eminent English parliamentarians, that it was incumbent on the mover to state his reasons.

I fancy and venture to say, even in the presence of the Minister of Justice, that there is no lawyer in this country who will say that the statement I have just read is justified by the authorities quoted at the foot of the page. The first of the authorities is Lord Melbourne, in the parliament of 1838. That is quite a time ago. You would hardly imagine that Liberals in the Dominion of Canada would seek to bolster up such a position as they have occupied the last two or three days by reference to an utterance made in 1838. But when we come to look at this case in 1838 we see that it does not touch the present case at all. Lord Brougham was speaking, he had quarrelled with his old colleague, Viscount Melbourne, there was a personal struggle on a public question. Lord Brougham was advised to move for the papers and he did, and Lord Melbourne pointed out that he would not grant the papers for state reasons. It was pointed that the rule was as hon. gentlemen now say, but that even in 1838 the practice had for many years been, not to require any reasons. That is one of the authorities. Then there is another authority. I suppose there can not be very many others, when the only other English one quoted by Bourinot goes as far back as 1771. Just imagine, gentlemen, in the parliament of Canada, on this side of the Atlantic, a parliament that we rather pride ourselves on as being more progressive than the parliament of Great Britain, in this year of grace 1908, we are to be fettered by an utterance made by a comparatively obscure individual in England in the year 1771, and this is the other authority. What do we find in this authority ? It is this :

Mr. Welbore Ellis. I shall state my opinion upon the doctrine of calling for papers of state in this House. It has generally been considered wise not to call for them unless they are indispensably necessary to the consideration of the subject then before the House, and the ground of such necessity is clearly stated.

Surely there is no connection between the calling for these papers of state and this particular case. The question then was the interference of France in the negotiations between England and Spain relative to the restitution of the Falkland islands, there were intricate and voluminous papers which he refers to as papers of state, and it is pointed out that it was not considered wise to call for them unless they were absolutely necessary. Surely we are not to be fettered and shackled in the year 1908 by such an opinion as that by a comparatively unknown person on a subject that in no way touches the present subject before the House. One other authority is that referred to by my hon. friend from Hamilton as having occurred in 1878 or 1879 where a motion was made for the papers that would involve an expenditure, and Sir Charles Tupper, then Mr. Tupper, said that he was perfectly willing to produce the papers, but that they involved expense and that he did not think that such a question as the dismissal of a postmaster was of sufficient importance to justify the expense. Therefore he would insist on some better reason than by his hon. friend just saying that he wanted to know why the man was dismissed. The ground given in his speech was that there would be an expense put upon the country. But strange to say, even in that comparative remote period, not remote compared with that of the authorities on which hon. gentlemen opposite are basing their position, even on that occasion a gentleman whose name is now unhappily as forgotten by hon. gentlemen opposite, as his political principles, one Alexander Mackenzie, expressed himself to the effect that it was quite sufficient for an hon. member to be entitled to the information he asked for in a matter of this kind without stating further reason than that he believed the officer had been unjustly dismissed, and that was all that was necessary to secure the papers. So I think I have shown that the quotation in Bourinot on which hon. gentlemen opposite have based their position is really not justified by what is given by Bourinot himself. There is perhaps one significant thing that I might mention. If we look back at the edition written by Bourinot, and without least desiring to discredit the last edition published by another hon. gentleman well known and respected in this House, I find on page 281 of the Bourinot edition these words:

But it must be remembered that under all circumstances it is for the House to consider whether the reasons given for refusing the information are sufficient. The right of parliament to obtain every possible information on public questions undoubted, and the circumstances must be exceptional and the reasons very cogent when it cannot be at once laid before the Houses.

That I do not find in the last edition, but I do find it on page 221 of the original Bourinot. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not seen fit to quote that. Now, coming to the position occupied by the right hon. the Prime Minister I propose to discuss it briefly. Without pretending to make any reflection upon him, I do feel justified in saying that any stranger to Canada not acquainted with the position, character and experience of the Prime Minister, would hardly believe he was sincere in the position he now occupies in view of his own utterances at different times in this debate. The other

evening I pointed out to this House that whereas the Minister of the Interior refused to allow this motion on one ground, the right hon. the Prime Minister cut that ground from under his feet, saying that it had not the slightest weight whatever. It is true, however, that the right hon. gentleman smoothed the feelings of his perhaps outraged colleague by saying that he could agree with him fully. But if we look at page 1178 of the 'Hansard' we will find a certain statement made by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) in moving this motion, and I would like to read, and ask hon. gentlemen opposite what is a fair interpretation of it. This is a quotation from the original speech that he made in moving his motion:

Last year when a debate was about to take place in this House, a return was laid on the table of the House, and several members of the opposition had an opportunity of examining it. There were certain features about the return that led them to think that it would be advisable to see the original. I, for one, called at the Department of the Interior and was shown, without the slightest hesitation by the deputy minister, the originals of the returns which had been copied. By having access to these originals, I obtained certain information which was of great value in discussing the question in the House. Since that time I understand that strict orders have been given that no member of this House shall be permitted by the Deputy Minister of the Interior to see any original documents. Therefore, the only method open to us is to ask that these original documents be laid on the table of the House in order that we may see them in that way.

Here the hon. member points out that he had previously visited the office and had seen the originals and got certain information; afterwards he went back for a similar purpose and was refused the opportunity of seeing them, consequently he had no other recourse than to move for the production of the originals in order to obtain information that he could not get from copies. That is as clear as the English language can make it, and that is in the first speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine. Now looking at page 1686 I find this language used by the Prime Minister:

But there may be other occasions where, perhaps, for reasons which are known to himself, and which I would not question, and which he can state to the House, a member may think that the copies woud not give him the information which the originals would. So far so good, and if he so states it seems to me that he is entitled to have the originals.

My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, says: I saw the originals and I saw copies in another case, and the originals gave me information that I could not get from the copies. This year, when I got copies, I went to the office of the deputy minister, I was refused permission to see the originals and I cannot get the information from the copies. Then the right hon. gentleman says:

But there may be other occasions, where, perhaps, for reasons which are known to himself, and which I would not question, and which he can state to the House, a member may think that the copies would not give him the information which the originals would. So far so good, and if he so states, it seems to me that he is entitled to have the originals.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who made that statement?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The right hon. the premier. I have not heard a reason which would justify—I will not say any member of this House—but any one in this country in believing that it was necessary for the right hon. gentleman to refuse to place these documents on the table on the ground that no reason had been given when my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, gave a reason that he said himself was sufficient. I would like to ask, in view of what the right hon. gentleman thought the other night, when he spoke as reported at page 1686 of 'Hansard,' what has occurred between that time and this that he should now refuse to give what he then said should be given? It is not a question of a backdown on the part of a great government; it is not a question as to their rights; it is not a question of looking to the future to see that no injustice is done, but it is a question of the right hon. gentleman standing by what he promised. That is the question before the House, and it seems to me that the motion is of comparatively trifling importance compared with that. I would like to point out one of the possibilities that arises from the rule laid down by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. It has been pointed out again and again that the hon. gentleman, if he were to undertake to repeat his motion, would, under the rules of the House, be out of order. I think that every hon. member will agree that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, has done everything he could possibly do within the rules of parliament to secure the production of these original documents. He has asked for them, he has appealed for them, he has neglected nothing he could possibly do, he has done everything in his power, and he does not move again simply because he would be out of order if he were to do so. Does it strike the right hon. gentleman that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, is but one member of this House? If he moved that these papers be laid on the table of the House, myself and every other hon. gentleman in this House would be entitled to see them, and therefore we are all interested in that motion. The right hon. gentleman deliberately attempts to punish every other member, because he

says that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, did not move his motion just as the right hon. gentleman thinks he ought to have moved it. I would like to protest against my being punished because some one else in the House has not expressed his ideas as technically as the right hon. gentleman thinks he ought to have done. Is this the state to which we have been brought by a reform government? Is it a Liberal government that we have in this country? Does the right hon. gentleman come from a province where for so many years a Papineau fought for what he conceived to be the rights of the people, and does the hon. Minister of Customs come from a province where his predecessors fought against the family compact? I would like to know if any family compact in the height of its power ever dreamed of subjecting the representatives of the people to what has been attempted in this case?

Now, Sir, I think, under the circumstances, that I am justified in calling the attention of the House to the effect produced on other members by the rule applied to a motion such as this. I do not suppose that there is any member on this side of the House who thinks that the hon. Minister of the Interior has more than four or five transactions in his department each year that he anticipates that we will discover and that he wants to cover up. All that the hon. gentleman has to do is to put up four or five of his own supporters to move bona fide motions for these papers, but unfortunately to fail to express themselves in technical terms; then every member on this side of the House is hopelessly blocked from any attempt to look into the transactions which are thus covered over. That cannot be the object surely, and yet hon. gentlemen on this side of the House might be burdened for years by this handicap. In view of our experience in the past, in view of the turnings and twistings, denials and counter-denials that we have heard in this very debate, in view of the exhibition that I referred to the other night when we saw that at all times hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to vote either way just as the exigencies of the case require, is it any wonder that we feel that much as we may expect to be prejudiced by this extraordinary conduct on the part of the right hon. Prime Minister, far more serious would be the things that, a session or two later, one would be obliged to call attention to, because as we in our innocence could not foresee such depths as have been attained by this government in this debate. So we can not foretell the contract carnivals that they would hold behind the shelter of this new rule.

A great deal has been said about the rights of members of parliament to see documents in the various departments. The hon. Minister of Finance very kindly said that he had no doubt that he would be willing to show documents to any members of parliament who went to his department and asked to see them. That would be very satisfactory in a way, but members of the opposition would like to know what their rights are. Nobody will dispute the legal theory of equal responsibility, but any investigation into the doings of the government, any inquiry into the expenditure of public money, must be by members of the opposition. It is practically certain—we can speak from past experience—that no gentleman sitting beside the right hon. Prime Minister will be in any way alive to or take any part in any such investigation as I have referred to. Now, does it strike hon. gentlemen opposite that it is a reasonable proposition in this twentieth century—I will not discuss what they did in the seventeenth century—that members who come here and investigate these matters and honestly endeavour to investigate these matters, can only do so by the courtesy of hon. gentlemen opposite? Could you impose a heavier handicap on a member of the opposition in trying to do his duty? I go to a ministerial office and say that there are certain papers that I would like to look at, that there is a transaction that strikes me, from my examination of the copies of the papers, as not being a right and proper transaction. You have no right to be there, I am told; you can only see these papers by the courtesy, leave and license of the minister. Am I to be at liberty to investigate these papers? If I desire to go in my right way as a member of parliament in the public interest, must I submit to discouragements and opposition? If the people are willing to allow me to be snubbed in that way, and if the minister does allow me to look into these papers, is it not a little hard for me to come back to the House and launch an attack against his administration, possibly on information obtained solely by the good will and courtesy of the minister? I venture to say that there is many a member of this House who, if he had discovered anything wrong, which he could only do as a matter of gracious kindness on the part of the minister, would be very apt not to bring it before the House, because he would not be inclined to fight the minister who had treated him as he thought a fellow-member should be treated. If any inquiry would be made, if any investigation would be successful, if any minister would be caught, it would be the good, genial soul who tried to do his duty to a fellow-member, and not the sharp old curmudgeon who shut the door and refused to allow you inside. I had always thought that one of the rules of life was that encouragement should be given to that which leads to the higher and better course of conduct, but

the principle laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite would seem to place all the prizes of life in the other direction. The man who does right may be punished, the man who does wrong is perfectly safe; and so, without occupying the time of the House longer at this hour of the night, I feel justified in moving, in view of what has occurred lately and what has been said in this debate:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted and that the following be subsituted therefor: 'Subject to such consideration of the public policy as can be validly urged in any case members of parliament have the right to have access to all the records of the government and to all the archives.'

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). After the very able speech which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) I do not think I need add very much in support of the amendment just placed before the House. I rise principally for the purpose of making my strongest protest against the astounding doctrines which were advanced by the Minister of Finance in regard to the rights of members of this House. Most of his speech was devoted to laying down the principle that the opposition members in this chamber have absolutely no rights except such as may be accorded to them by the majority; a majority which on more than one occasion has shown itself to be tyrannical. To my mind it behooves every man in this House to stand up to assert the dignity of the position he holds as a representative of the people of Canada, and to vindicate the rights which our ancestors have fought for and won during many centuries of struggle. I am astounded that a man who professes to be a leader of Liberals should lay down the doctrine that no private member has any right other than those accorded him by the will of the majority. That statement is in direct opposition to the statement made by his own leader only two days ago. The Prime Minister was in a very considerate frame of mind then, and he sought to make us believe that these documents were going to be laid before the House and that he acquiesced in the demand of the opposition. Here is what the Prime Minister then said ('Hansard, page 1685):

No one denies either that members of parliament, not merely parliament itself, but members of parliament have the right to have access to all the records of the government and to all the archives if they believe that in the public interest they should have such access. Nor do I conceive this privilege has been denied on the occasion to which my hon. friend has referred.

But to-night the Minister of Finance has denounced that doctrine, and he was applauded by members behind him who call themselves Liberals.

Mr. NORTHRUP

Mr. SPROULE. And who applauded the Prime Minister's statement just as vociferously.

Mr. LAKE. Exactly so. But it is not only on this particular subject that the Minister of Finance has gone absolutely against the views which were pronounced by his leader. Had the Minister of Finance been in the House this afternoon he would have known that the Prime Minister stated that the reasons which were adduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) why these original papers should be produced were amply sufficient and in fact the Prime Minister laid down the formula which he considered was sufficient. He said that it was sufficient for an hon. member to declare:

I cannot do justice to the case without the originals.

And the originals would be laid on the table of the House. But we find the Minister of Finance taking a position absolutely antagonistic to that of his leader in this matter and denying that any good cause had been shown by my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) for the production of these papers. I protest in the strongest words against the deadlock to which we are subjected by the conduct of the government. The Minister of Finance talks about wasting the time of this House, when day after day most scandalous waste of time has been occasioned by the action of the government. This is the situation: the application for the original documents was made on January 18, and as the Prime Minister has admitted, more than sufficient reasons were given to justify the House in granting that application. But in spite of that fact the Prime Minister himself called on his supporters to vote down the resolution and to refuse the production of these original documents. To-day the Prime Minister, having in the meantime found that he could not justify before the people the position he had taken, and that he would have to recede from it, and having acquiesced in the motion of the leader of the opposition, he tells us to-day that the fullest reasons were given why these original documents should be produced and he leads us to suppose that this would be done. That must have been his intention in using the language he did. And yet he refuses to take action in accordance with the implied promise he gave to the House, although he left it to be understood that by some unknown means which he would not suggest these documents were likely to be laid upon the table. We know from past experience that the Minister of the Interior will not be bound by a resolution of this House. We know that two or three years ago a resolution was passed by a unanimous vote of this House condemning interference of officials in elections of representatives for the Dominion or provincial legislatures, and saying that these officials shall not engage in partisan work of any description.

That resolution was unanimously passed, but the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) cynically refuses to be bound by it. Although the House has endorsed the resolution moved a couple of days ago by the leader of the opposition, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will not consider himself in any way bound by it. Yet that resolution was passed at the instance of the right hon. gentleman himself who spoke in favour of it. That resolution declares that members of this House have the right to be furnished with the originals of public documents, and we would be wanting in self respect and in our duty to the public if we were now to consent to that order of the House being ignored and treated with contempt by any minister. If the right hon. gentleman was sincere in what he said, he will implement his statement to the House by action and do it right now. It is now for him to show whether or not he acted and spoke in good faith when he called on this House to pass the motion made by the leader of the opposition. It is now for him to show that what he said this afternoon and a couple of days ago was not mere bluff, intended to hoodwink the people. He is the only one in this House who has the power to give effect to the motion which he called on the House to adopt the other day, and it is his bounden duty to see that such action is taken. It is due to the dignity of this House and to his own self respect, as leader of this House, that he should see that his promises are implemented by the action of his ministers and followers. Otherwise the principle is to be forced upon this free, deliberative assembly, that though we may order the production of original documents, their production is to depend on the mere will and pleasure and the tender mercies of the Minister of the Interior. That minister has issued an order to the officials of his department to refuse access to the original files of the department to those whom he is pleased to term outsiders. But we find, as a matter of fact, that that prohibition is not completely carried into effect because it is not applied to supporters of the government. Hon. members on the Liberal side are given free access to these documents but that access is denied to hon. members on this side. We had that clearly demonstrated by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) in a debate which took place a couple of days ago. That hon. gentleman told us that he had seen hundreds of files in the Department of the Interior and that he was allowed to see them because he was there doing business on behalf of his constituents and not simply prying into other people's affairs. Well, I cast the insinuation back in his teeth that members on this side, when they ask to see public documents in that department, are simply prying into the affairs of other people, and not doing their duty as representatives of the people. I myself have had experience in this matter only a short time ago. One of my constituents asked me to go to the land office at Regina and inquire into the condition in which his claim for certain public lands stood at the time. I went to the agent, I read to him the letter I had received, and as courteously as I could I told him that I would like to know the details of the case. He sent for the files and answered some of my questions but not all of them. I said to him that if he would allow me to look at the file a moment or two, I could satisfy myself and give my constituent the information he desired. But the agent refused. He said he had orders from the department not to show these files to any one ; and so I, a representative of the people, had to submit to being refused information by an official of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). But it is my firm conviction that these instructions are not indiscriminately applied at that land office and that the original files of that office are not withheld from the inspection of everybody. It is my firm belief that certain supporters of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) have been allowed to inspect the files in the land office at Regina and in other land offices ; and we have been told in this House by one of the members who are supporting the present government. that he had been allowed to inspect hundreds of files. The Minister of the Interior told us the other day that the inspection of these files was refused to outsiders. No doubt what he means by an outsider is any man who is not a supporter of the present Liberal administration. All who do not support the government are outsiders and are not to be given the privilege of seeing how the affairs of this government are being carried on. A few days ago the hon. minister made a strong complaint that the business of the Department of the Interior was being hampered by the number of returns asked for and the size of these returns. The right hon. the First Minister himself called attention to that fact and spoke of some seventy-five or eighty returns having been already asked for. But does he not know that if the ordinary courtesy were extended to hon. members on this side of being allowed to inspect the files of the department, probably not one in five of these returns would be called for. In the case to which I refer, I was compelled, by the mere fact that I was not allowed to look at the record then in the hands of the official of the department, to move for all correspondence in this office and the office at Regina relating to that matter. No doubt that will be a most voluminous return, which it will take some time to prepare. I asked for it six weeks ago, and there is no sign yet as to when it will come down. But had I been allowed to glance through the file, I would not have been obliged to move for the production of these papers. Therefore if the business of

the Department of the Interior is hampered by the bulk and the number of these returns, that is due to the action of the minister himself in throwing every obstacle in the way of members of the opposition ascertaining what is being done in his department regarding the various matters in which they are interested. When the discretion is left in his hands, are we to expect him to produce these original documents for which we are asking ? I submit that it is the duty of the First Minister to put an end to all this waste of time by having these papers we have called for brought down. He distinctly led us to believe this afternoon that they would be brought down and laid on the table.

Mr. GEORGE O. ALCORN (Prince Edward). I rise merely to call attention to a certain point which has presented itself to me. It is that this matter and the whole matter now under discussion is absolutely concluded by the records of the House, and it is therefore not necessary to cite authorities, to resort to technicalities, or to strain the construction of parliamentary practice. It appears to me that the government by the action of the Prime Minister who speaks for the whole government, has assented to and has made his own and has fastened upon his party the whole effect of the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition in this House on the 21st instant. That amendment includes the whole subject in controversy and is in these words :

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case.

To what do these words refer ? I submit they refer most pointedly and clearly to the authorities contained in the various works upon the subject, which hold that where it is in the public interest that certain documents should not be produced the government are to exercise their discretion upon that point, and if they are convinced the public interest would suffer they are not to produce these documents.

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right of the people's representatives, in parliament assembled, to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government, and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business.

Surely this expression 'documents' necessarily includes 'original documents'. Here is a declaration in as plain language as can possibly be penned, that except in the cases cited in the books as those in which a government may, on grounds of public policy and in the public interest, refuse the papers :

It is the undoubted right of the people's representatives——

——to have sight of all documents, which necessarily include original documents. This amendment in these terms has been absolutely accepted by the leader of the government himself and hon. gentlemen have not only the records of the House to refer to but were present and heard the words and witnessed the action of the hon. gentleman on that occasion. That being the case, it seems to me that the government are absolutely precluded by the action of their own leader from taking the position they have taken to-night that certain original documents should not be produced.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, in view of the late hour I would move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the debate is adjourned I would like to point out, for the information of the Prime Minister, that the language of the motion is his own. At page 1685 of 'Hansard' we find these words :

No one denies either, that members of parliament have the right to have access to all the records of the government and to all the archives, if they believe that in the public interest they should have such access.

I think that sufficiently answers the statement made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) this evening who took the astonishing, the amazing ground that the minority have absolutely no rights in this House.

Mr. FIELDING. Except such as the majority may grant it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Except such as the majority may grant it. That is a new doctrine of consitutional government. I may tell the Minister of Finance, to use an expression used years ago, that I will stay here until I am no bigger than a pipe-stem, before I will submit to any such tyrannical doctrine as that.

Mr. FIELDING. The rule will remain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rule will remain perhaps if it is the right one, but we will remain as long as we can before we recognize it and the minister will find no one assenting to his views on that particular question among those who sit on the left of Mr. Speaker. The rights of the minority depend on the will of the majority ? All the rules of parliamentary government that have been laid down from time immemorial, in the parliaments of Great Britain are to go for naught and there is to be substituted therefor the tyrannical rule of a majority in this House. That is the doctrine which the Minister of Finance intends to force upon this House ? That rule will not be accepted in this free parliament of Canada without a very prolonged and earnest struggle. We have some rights that do not depend on the will of

the majority. We have rights which depend on the immemorial usage of parliament, recognized throughout the British empire, in every one of the Dominions of the British Empire, since parliamentary institutions have been known, and to endeavour to substitute for these, as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have endeavoured to do, the tyrannical will of any majority in this parliament however great will not be accepted in this House, so long as I have breath to speak or any hon. gentlemen on this side has strength enough to remain in this House and fight the battles of the liberties of the parliament of Canada.

Let me call the attention of the Prime Minister to another matter. I understood him to say here to-night—I put the question to him as forcibly as I could—I said: If a man moves in this House as men do every day when parliament is in session, for certain papers to be brought down, without uttering one word of reason in support of that motion, and if the Prime Minister stands up on the other side and says: Give your reasons, then if the reasons are given, the Prime Minister, if he is right in the position he has taken, may answer: You should have given those reasons in the first instance. That is the position he took if I understood him; am I right or wrong?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Absolutely wrong.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I would like the right hon. gentleman to tell me why the reasons given by Mr. Ames in his closing speech were not all sufficient for the purpose of enabling that motion to be passed. Will my right hon. friend tell me that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I have told it three or four times already; because the hon. gentleman claimed it as a right to have these papers produced without giving any reasons at all, he declared it as a right that he could claim the originals without giving reasons and said that he brought this as a test case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the closing remarks of my hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The closing is simply an endorsement of the first part.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg pardon, I will read it again. It is to be found in the debate of the 13th of January; it has been read six or seven times already, but I shall read it again in order that there shall be no misunderstanding.

Here is the return we have been speaking about; it contains 453 pages. I have read that return from cover to cover. Now, there are nine pages of that return which can be illumined if I may see the originals. As to all the other pages the copies are all I want. But there are nine pages there with respect to which the copy does not tell me all I want to know or which I have the right to know if I understand my rights in this House of Commons.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend say that these nine pages differ from the original.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could he tell unless he sees the original?

Mr. AMES. I say that these nine pages will in all probability clear up certain doubts which I have regarding peculiar features in connection with some of these transactions; I say that the handwriting of some of these nine pages may have a very important bearing on the case.

Now, if that is not good reason for the production of the originals, even within the principles laid down by the Prime Minister himself, I am absolutely at sea as to what could be a good reason; and I am absolutely at sea as to what the Prime Minister meant this afternoon, when he expressly stated, as I understood him, that it was a good and sufficient reason and would have been enough if it had been stated in the hon. gentleman's opening speech. Do I misquote the Prime Minister in saying that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was not listening closely——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not the Prime Minister state in this House to-day that, if the reason given by the hon. member for St. Antoine in his concluding speech, had been given in his speech in the first instance, that motion would have been passed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister did not say that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not remember having said it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I misunderstood the right hon. gentleman, and I think a good many others misunderstood him also. At any rate, I can tell him what he said on the occasion of the debate two days ago. Does the right hon. gentleman say that the concluding speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine does not set forth a good reason for the production of these documents?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) would come—if he had come at first—and asked, for reasons, this production, I would have given the most liberal interpretation. I would do so now; I would do so at any time; I would give it the most liberal interpretation possible. But, on the ground on which he made his motion, we could not agree.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister is not giving a fair answer. I say that not in an offensive way, but because I want to keep to the point. Let us not talk of general reasons, but of the reasons I have read. I ask the right hon. gentleman: If these

reasons had been given in the opening speech of the hon. member, would not that be a justification ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would go further. I say unhesitatingly that, when a member comes forward and says : I could not get the information from the copies and I want to have the originals, that seems a fair and good reason for that course. But that is not the position that was taken then. I go further than the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I will answer the right hon gentleman out of his own mouth. I refer to page 1687 of 'Hansard' :

> As a rule, when a motion for papers is made we do not challenge the motive of the member making it, but if the motion is challenged, and we say there is no good reason for bringing down the papers, then it is for the member to give reasons which will satisfy the House.

That is exactly what the hon. member for St. Antoine did. Let us assume that he gave no reason in the first instance—I do not agree that he did not, but let it be assumed for the sake of the argument. His motion was challenged, and then to use the words of the Prime Minister, he gave his reasons in the concluding speech. He met every condition raised, from first to last, by the Prime Minister in regard to this case—every possible condition. And, further on, the Prime Minister says :

> For my part, the moment a member gives a good reason for the production of papers, the production of the papers should take place.

If my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) did not give good reason in the first instance, he did give good reason in his concluding speech, to which speech the Prime Minister has not taken, and cannot take, any exception. Then, why are we delaying ? Why are the government obstructing the business of the House by the non-production of these documents ? What does it all amount to ? Here are 9 pages out of 453. We have been debating the matter for three or four days. But in five minutes my hon. friend from St. Antoine could go to the Department of the Interior and examine these documents or, in fifteen minutes, the documents could be ordered from the department and laid on the table and my hon. friend could look at them and satisfy his mind with regard to them, and we could resume the business of the House. What is all this disturbance ? Why do the government deny this right, when, in the words of the Prime Minister, it should be granted to every member who declares that he desires to see these documents in the public interest. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) has declared that—he has declared it over and over again. He declared it the other day twice, first in his opening speech and then, with more elaborate reasons and in greater detail, in his closing speech. He declared it to-day in the presence of the Prime Minister. Well, we have these admissions, by the Prime Minister on behalf of the government, of the principle, but we have exactly the opposite course of action in their dealing with the hon. member (Mr. Ames). I think that, under the circumstances, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should read over the debate and consider the principles he has laid down, and see whether, after all, he does not come to the conclusion that what has been claimed here is the right of an individual member of parliament, asserted before his fellow members, asserted according to constitutional principles and the law and usages of parliament, a right which has been denied but which cannot be denied with any sense of fairness or any pretense of adherence to those principles which have governed parliaments ever since parliaments first were known.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the course of a somewhat long parliamentary career, I can say that, in all my experience, I never saw such a tempest in a teapot as we have had here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A mere tempest in a teapot. Hon gentlemen have been merely playing upon words; hon. gentlemen have been losing the time of the House; hon. gentlemen have been drawing upon their imaginations in this discussion; hon. members have been trying to bulldoze the government; hon. gentlemen have been taking a position in the first instance which they could never have maintained. I have been the leader of the House for something like twelve years, and so far as I know, I have endeavoured to discharge my duty with fairness to all parties. So far as I know, I never took advantage of any member of this House, even a member of the smallest minority; and, so far as I know, I have always tried to secure for the minority the rights to which they were entitled. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) moved the other day a motion absolutely unprecedented in this House—absolutely unlike anything that had ever been presented in this House, so far as I know. He moved that certain original documents should be brought to this House. Usually, when an hon. member moves for papers, he moves for copies; and copies are brought down, and from these he gets the information to which he is entitled. But on this occasion the hon. gentleman wants to have the originals. If he had asked these originals simply upon the motion which he moved, saying : I have not the information I want; I cannot get that information from these papers—it would have been for us to consider whether it should be given; and I think it would have been given. But it has been stated in this House, and it must be stated again,

that the hon. gentleman said he wanted to make a test case. A test case of what? A test case of having originals brought down, and that upon the mere fact that they were originals and without showing any reason. There are his words, as we find them in his opening speech. They have been quoted before, but I ask the indulgence of the House while I quote them again :

We contend that we have a perfect right to ask for the originals, and the government must allege very good reasons to justify them in refusing us access to such papers.

Now that is an extraordinary contention, that in a matter of this kind it is not for the member who made the motion to give reasons, but it was for the government to give reasons why the papers should not be produced. One would have thought that in a matter of this kind it was for the hon. gentleman who wanted the papers to give his reasons why they should be produced ; but the hon. member for St. Antoine says, No, I have no reasons to give, I ask for these papers as a right, and it is for the government to bring them down. Then he goes on to say :

This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question,——

What question ? The question that they are entitled to have the originals as an absolute right without giving any reasons.

—because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to timber berths.

Now let us come to his conclusion.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the right hon. gentleman allow me one word ? Did not the member for St. Antoine say that it was on the suggestion of the Minister of the Interior that he made that motion in the House ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. member for St. Antoine said many things, and we have to read his speech in the light of the conclusion which he founds upon it. Now I have given the conclusion of his first speech. Let me now read again—because it has already been quoted—the concluding portion of his concluding speech :

Is there any great hardship entailed upon the department or any one else to gratify my right to see these papers as a member of this House? The argument which the minister has made falls to the ground in this respect. Adopt any method you like, move any amendment you want, but establish the principle that when we on this side of the House have what we consider good and sufficient reason, we may have the right to see an original document, or else be prepared to take the odium throughout the country that you do not wish an original document to see the light. That is all I have to say.

Is that not the conclusion of his speech, that when he thought he had a sufficient reason to ask for the originals he had simply to say so ? Does it not then follow that my hon. friend, or any one else, may make a motion for the originals and justify his motion by simply stating that he wants to see them? And if we are bound to give them in one case are we not bound to give them in every other case ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman gather his precedent from the whole record of the whole debate ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The whole debate includes the concluding portion of it. The hon. gentleman said that he made his motion in order to test the question. Under such circumstances what had we to do? We had simply to say that we could not grant the motion on those grounds. But there is a sinister impression on the other side of the House that we want to conceal these papers. For my part I never saw those papers, I do not even suspect what their contents are, but I resent the imputation that we do not want the papers to be brought down because we are afraid there is something wrong in them. They may be right or they may be wrong, for all I know. But so far as I am concerned, I altogether reject the imputation involved in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. I say here at once that if the hon. member for St. Antoine will come now, or at any time, and ask for those papers and give us his reasons therefor, he shall have the same measure of justice which I have always extended to every member of this House since I have been leader of it. I do not look at the consequences, I do not know what they are. The hon. gentleman says he has no other interest to serve but a public interest. Well he is a new member, and perhaps he was a little bold in his attempt. He thought perhaps that he could force us on this occasion, and on every other occasion, to comply with a similar request. We think that his attempt should be resisted. But if this hon. member will come as any other member may come and ask for the papers, giving his reasons—I have already stated that any member of the House is entitled to have the information. But does it follow that we must yield to every member's caprice ? Does it follow that because an hon. member has a right to information he is entitled to it simply to serve private interests ? Surely the House will not allow that privilege when it is desired to serve a caprice. It is supposed that he wishes to serve a public interest. My hon. friend alludes to the fact that when a motion is made in this House for papers we do not ask for reasons. If a member of this House makes a motion we do not suspect his motive, and we grant the papers at once. But they are brought down in the usual form, that is in the form of copies. But the hon. gentleman departs from the usual form and says he wants the

originals. Have we not the right to ask why he wants the originals, what purpose he wants to serve, why he is not satisfied with the copies ? His reasons may be good or bad, and the House will judge of them. But it is not unfair to ask him to give his reasons, and think we may legitimately do so. If on the other hand the hon. gentleman will say that he has no reason to give, if he simply says that he wants the papers, do hon. gentlemen opposite say that under those circumstances we are bound to grant his request ? Do they think that it is treating parliament fairly to ask that such a motion be granted ? What would be the consequence ? I have pointed out the consequences to the leader of the opposition. Why we might have on the table of this House hundreds of documents from the various departments.

Sir, this is really a very small matter. It is a very small matter for hon. gentlemen opposite to lose the time of the House over. We have been spending the whole day upon it. I repeat as I have said in a previous debate, that any member of this House who gives reasons for making a motion asking for such papers, is entitled to them. Let the hon. member for St. Antoine move for the papers and give his reasons, such reasons as he may give, as he says he can give. If he says he wants the information to enable him to legislate, that is a fair reason which he might have given. But when the hon. gentleman comes to us with a club in his hand, we are certainly bound to resist, and resist it we will.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The right hon. gentleman in his concluding sentence made use of a phrase that he had no right to make use of, it carried an insinuation which he had no right to imply. The member for St. Antoine is a human being, he has his own feelings, he has his own manhood. He is just as good a man as the right hon. gentleman, he represents just as good a constituency.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not a bit of it.

Mr. FOSTER. He has just as good men behind him, he has just as good a sense of dignity, and a better sense of true and fair dealing than my right hon. friend. And the proof of that is in the turnings and twistings and quibblings of my right hon. friend within the last five hours in this House patent to everybody on this side of the House. In the first place my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, never came with a club in his hands. I deny it. The right hon. gentleman cannot assert it and prove his assertion. His Minister of Finance sits besides him. Will he controvert what the Minister of Finance said that there is absolutely no difference made in the books as between copies and originals ? The right hon. gentleman agrees with that. Does he know that the motion was made by the hon. member for St. Antoine a year ago for these very papers, that the House ordered them and that they had been down before the House for twelve months or so ? No difference between copies and the originals! said the Finance Minister. This House heard the reasons if there were any given and made the orders and had the papers brought down for these reasons and they remained down in accordance with this order. To-day what is it ? Simply that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, instead of coming with a club in his hand, came as a gentleman, as a member of the House, not crawling as the hon. Minister of Finance wants him to do, not being particularly careful to understand what the exact spirit in which he should approach this high and mighty dignitary, this Minister of Finance, not being careful enough to read the books of etiquette to find out just how many genuflexions to make, just what tone of voice to speak in, just what crook of his back he should use when he bowed down humbly before the Minister of Finance and said : Oh, most mighty one, I beseech you to do me this favour. He did not do that. He came as the representative of the people and he simply asked this House to pass an order which would be exactly on the lines of last year's order which the House passed. The Minister of Finance says that there is no difference between copies and originals, that fact is adhered to by my right hon. friend about an hour ago and my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, asked that these self-same papers ordered in the copy a year ago, should be placed on the table of the House. The question was decided last year. The House gave its decision, the House gave its order, and on that decision copies of all the papers were brought down. But, copies were not sufficient. My hon. friend said that they were not sufficient, stated it in his first speech, stated it in the latter part of his address and the right hon. gentleman knows that he stated it in both the first and last speech. What more could my hon. friend do and keep his dignity ? Contrast that with the operations of the hon. Minister of the Interior and the right hon. gentleman himself. The right hon. gentleman is in a difficulty. We all know that, he knows it himself and he knows it better than we do. All these twistings, quibblings and turnings of black into white and white into black are made in an endeavour to bring himself out of the position in which he has allowed himself to be placed. Then, what is the position of the Minister of the Interior ? My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, was accustomed to receive the courtesy of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of the Interior and, in pursuance of the courtesies and kindnesses in an official way which were extended to him and have been extended by

departmental officers and ministers ever since confederation, went over to the Minister of the Interior and said : I want to see the originals of some strange documents but the originals of documents that the House voted last year I ought to get and which they order to be brought down. The Minister of the Interior said to him; No, Sir, the door is shut ; you cannot see that file and the only resourse you have is to go to the House and ask the House to pass an order for you to get that file. That is a piece of work that a gentleman could do. Nobody could call into question the Minister of the Interior if he thought his rule was right and then said : I cannot break through that rule unless the House orders it; therefore I advise you to go before the House and move for an order. That was the work of a gentleman, that was fair work and the Minister of the Interior might have done that and kept his reputation for fairness, but when, in pursuance of his advice my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, came to this House and made his motion it was not fair and gentlemanly in the public point of view, then refuse him the very thing that he advised him to carry out; tell him to come inside the door and then when he comes bang it in his face and refuse because forsooth he did not kow-tow to the Minister of Finance, move in the right spirit and make the proper number of bows before he approached his high mightiness. The hon. Minister of Finance is not in Nova Scotia now. He is not leading the party of secession as he led it in those good old days and he was just as insincere then as he is here to-day—just as insincere. He did not believe in secession then any more than he does now in this new Liberal doctrine.

Mr. FIELDING. That was in a moment of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. That was not a moment of weakness; that was a whole year and a half of weakness. Now, the right hon. First Minister says that he has always enjoyed the reputation of being a fair man, but was it fair for his government through the Minister of the Interior, to advise my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, to walk in through the only door that he said was open to him and then, when he came, to bang the door in his face? That was not fair or proper. Why did the right hon. gentleman talk about caprice or about private interest and about asking for reasons and the like of that? Does he mean to insinuate that my hon. friend asked for these papers simply from caprice?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite sure that he does not. We will rule that out. Does he mean to say that my hon. friend from St. Antoine has some unworthy private interest to serve? No, the right hon. gentleman does not mean that. He talked about that like many other things that he talks about, but he did not mean it. We will throw that aside. Throwing aside caprice and private interests were these valid state reasons for refusal? No, the right hon. gentleman has mentioned none. He asked for the reasons on the first day of the debate, and my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, gave him the reasons. There is no doubt about that. Yet he quibbles, and yet he refuses, but it is worse than that. The night before last this motion of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) was brought in, and this motion traverses the whole position and declares that it is the undoubted right of parliament, and of the members assembled in this House of Commons, unless there are grave reasons which can be validly urged against it, to have access to all information, to see and to examine. Does not the resolution say that? It throws the onus on the government of urging the validity of reasons. Have they been urged? There are none to urge. The right hon. First Minister has admitted now that there are none to urge. 'Bourinot' must be read in its several parts. 'Bourinot' says :

> Some times the government may be obliged to withhold all information at the time, or they may be able to put the House in possession of only a part of the correspondence.

That is reasonable and we have seen its reasonableness demonstrated time after time in this parliament.

> But it must be remembered that under all circumstances it is for the House to consider whether the reasons given for refusing the information are sufficient. The right of parliament to obtain every possible information on public questions is undoubted and the circumstances must be exceptional and the reasons very cogent when it cannot at once be laid upon the table of the House.

That throws the onus upon the government. I believe honestly that the trend of all the authorities is in that direction. A member of parliament rises in his place and he says : I want such papers, and the whole practice of this parliament has been for him to name his motion even by the number it bears upon the order paper, without giving a reason, and without any cavil, and without any question the motion is passed and the government never thinks of contravening it unless it has a valid reason. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has recently got up in this House and said : I am sorry but there is a valid reason why you cannot have these papers for the correspondence is not yet through with Great Britain. That is a state reason and it is a good reason. But the onus is upon the government to show there are valid reasons why papers cannot be brought down, and a member in his place representing his people with all the dignity of a representative, acts upon

the assumption which we have all got to acknowledge, one with the other if we are gentlemen, that he has a reason for asking or he would not ask. No member of the House is supposed to ask for the production of papers unless he has a good reason, and no man does ask without a good reason. I have been in parliament 25 years and I have never once known of an instance of a member of parliament asking for papers improperly. It has never been bandied from one side of this House to the other even in the most heated times, that any member has risen in his place to ask for information for unworthy purposes. Men have often asked for papers and been refused because of the waste of time which would take place in copying a great many unimportant things in order to get at a few important things ; and how many times have we not heard the minister of the department say : That will take a great deal of time as the papers are very voluminous, but if you come over to my department you can look at the files and select what you want and we will bring you down these. Time and again that has been done. It has also occurred that a member rising in his place, and giving no reason, asks for the production of papers and the House passes the order, and a day or two afterwards the minister of the department says in the House : I find in looking over these papers that there are some parts of them which cannot be brought down, but we will bring down everything we properly can. Therefore the onus of proof is with the government. I say it is the right of a member to ask for the information and it is a duty laid upon the government to refuse only if they have proper reasons therefor. Never once have I heard good reasons given by a minister or by the government, that a member of this House has risen in opposition and tried to contravene these reasons. Why has the First Minister, as a proof of his fairness, hurled the denunciation against this side of the House that we were wasting the time of the House. Did I hear the Solicitor General say we were wasting the time of the House ?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well the Solicitor General had better not talk too much about time that is not taken up usefully. It comes with very poor grace from the First Minister or the sub-minister to say that all this time has been wasted because of the obstreperous doings of gentlemen on this side. Has the Solicitor General yet had sink into his mind just exactly what his leader and his saviour has stated to this House. Said the right hon. gentleman :

For my part the moment a member gives a good reason for the production of papers the production of papers shall take place.

Mr. FOSTER.

Has there sunk into his mind the declaration of the First Minister in so many words, that the reasons given by the member for St. Antoine were perfectly good reasons and more than were necessary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my right hon. friend deny that ? I will warrant you the first minister will not deny it. The first minister has said it over and over again, and the first minister has, after saying it, tried to get off with the quibble—in order to save his face or the face of the Minister of the Interior, I do not know which—that although a sufficient reason was given by my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) it was coupled with a demand of right and therefore he would not give the papers. But the first minister has declared that it is the right of a member to have the papers the moment sufficient reason is given. That is the dictum of the Prime Minister and that condition has been absolutely fulfilled. Why did not the papers come ? Who has wasted the time of the House ? Days ago my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) asked for this information and the government could have given it and there would have been none of this scene in the House. The business of the House has not gone on with because my right hon. friend refuses to give the papers, even although more than sufficient reasons, according to his own dictum, were given by the member for St. Antoine. This will not go down in this House nor will it go down in the country. The people outside, the man on the street knows just what is involved. They see the rights of the minority in this House are denied them, but the people know that there is an unalienable right in the members of this House to ask for information and to get it, provided there are no urgent state or public reasons why the information should not be brought down. My right hon. friend says there is an air of suspicion on this side of the House. I don't think he can wonder at that. I can tell him that this side of the House is not going to be gold-bricked another time. We have been gold-bricked several times. The right hon. gentleman himself stood up in this House in the early times of his first parliament and declared (an eminently fair and just thing) that no man should be turned out of his office unless he had thorough examination and a chance to present his case. He allowed it to go in the form of a resolution and it was placed upon the records of this House, yet hundreds of civil servants and employees of this country were turned out of places without any hearing or any chance of examination. Does my right hon. friend deny it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, my right hon. friend will deny any thing. He will deny his own existence. Does he not know that

after he made that high flowing declaration, after he bound himself and this parliament by the resolution which affirmed it, hundreds of men were turned out of employment and never got a chance to present their case.

Mr. TALBOT. How many more should have been turned out ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is on the records of 'Hansard' and the papers brought down prove it, and I will show it to my right hon. friend if he denies it. I looked over the returns not more than ten days ago, yet the right hon. gentleman say no, no. What more ? A second gold brick. My right hon. friend thought he would gain some glory in the country by coming out strong on high ground regarding the purity of the ballot. He made a wonderful declaration, and all his followers vaunted this great declaration of their leader, and his papers printed it in headliness to show what lofty and noble ground this right hon. gentleman takes. When an investigation went on in the Privileges and Election Committee, it got rather warm in the committee for the government, and the investigation was not concluded when the House rose. The next year when the House met again, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) moved for a continuation of the investigation before the Privileges and Election Committee, but then my right hon. friend climbed down from his high perch and declared that, for some reason or other, as novel as it was silly, this investigation should not be proceeded with. Did he want to have the electorate purified ? If he did, he threw himself straight athwart the road towards its purification, and that is an odd way of giving the people the coin he promised them.

Worse than that. When the fact came out that civil servants, paid by the peoples' money, supposed to have their own work to do, were devoting their time to partisan purposes my right hon. friend stood up again on a popular pedestal and gave out another high flown statement and declared that civil servants should not be allowed to engage in partisan work. But his Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), before the words were well out of the hon. gentleman's mouth, went upon the public platform and repudiated the doctrine of his leader. And up to this day my right hon. friend knows that there are scores and scores of civil employees who are simply the factotums of the Minister of the Interior and the party which upholds that minister. Another gold brick.

Now he comes and supports the resolution which was moved the other night by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) and gets the plaudits of the papers—his own and some independent papers—as being high minded and standing on broad ground. But after subscribing to that resolution and forcing it down some of his recalcitrant followers who did not want to take the medicine, and having it adopted by both sides without a vote, the very moment reasons are given why certain information should be brought down, he refuses to bring it down. Against the doctrine of the Minister of Finance, I protest, as did the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) the doctrine of by-gone days, a doctrine as far removed from true liberalism as day is from night. It is not a doctrine which any sane man can carry out and contend for successfully in this country. Minorities have rights but if this doctrine were to obtain in this parliament and country, then the minority on any side of the House would have no right except what the majority chose to give them. All we would have would be a caucus and a brute majority and the right hon. gentleman could do with the minority what he pleased. But, thank God, there are principles which have been fought for and gained, and which are embodied in parliamentary practice and the constitution of the country, and which, better than all, are embodied in the hearts of a freedom loving people. And all lovers of freedom will cry out against the monstrous assertion of the Finance Minister that a minority has no rights. I am willing to join issue with these gentlemen on the platforms of the country and trust to Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I am, and I will not carry on my campaign with the material with which this pleasant looking minister (Mr. Fisher) carried on his campaign down in Stanstead. I certainly will not. He blushes, and well he may. But if his followers behind him were cognizant of all the facts, the blush that is on his face now would be, compared to the one that knowledge would create, like a mild pink contrasted with the burning red of a fiery furnace. I wish now to enter my protest against this conduct of the government, and my protest is not strong because it comes from myself but because it is embodied in the constitution and the hearts of a freedom loving people in Canada.

Mr. AMES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the business to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same thing, Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 24, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DUNSMUIR.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I said yesterday to my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) that I would bring down to-day what correspondence there was between this government and the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia regarding the withholding by the latter of his assent to certain legislation. The only correspondence we have is as follows :—

Telegram.

Ottawa, April 23, 1907.

Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia, Victoria, British Columbia.

Your premier, Mr. McBride, assured me that the Bill entitled an Act to regulate immigration into British Columbia would not receive assent, but would be reserved for consideration of government. Can I rely on this assurance?

R. W. SCOTT.

Telegram.

Victoria, British Columbia, April 24, 1907.

Hon. R. W. Scott, Ottawa.

Your telegram received. Bill referred to will not receive my assent.

JAMES DUNSMUIR,
Lieutenant Governor.

At Government House, Victoria, British Columbia,

April 29, 1907.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that I prorogued the Legislative Assembly of this province on the 25th instant, at which time I assented to a number of Bills, duplicate copies of which I am forwarding to-day by registered mail.

I have thought it advisable to reserve for the pleasure of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, Bill (No. 30), an Act to regulate immigration into British Columbia.

My reasons for doing so are, that this Bill appears to be but a modified form of other Acts dealing with the same subject, which have already been disallowed by His Excellency, and should it become law, might seriously interfere with our international relations and federal interests.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JAMES DUNSMUIR,
Lieutenant Governor.

The Honourable
The Secretary of State, Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MONTREAL 'STAR.'

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the attention of the House to a misrepresentation made with reference to myself in the Montreal 'Star.' I do not say that it was intentional, but I think it worth while to correct it :

To attack Insurance Bill—Mr. Foster intimates that he has something to say.

Special to the Montreal 'Star.'

Ottawa, January 23.—When the House arose on Wednesday it was announced that the business for to-day would be the second reading of the Insurance Bill. Hon. W. S. Fielding, when the Bill was introduced, said that he was desirous that there should be no discussion of the details before the measure was sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. Hon. Geo. E. Foster afterwards intimated that he did not propose to be silent on the second reading, and he will probably be heard on the general aspects of the Bill and the work accomplished by and the cost of the commission.

What I indicated, as my hon. friend knows, was exactly the opposite.

WEST INDIA TRADE RELATIONS.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) if he is negotiating reciprocity or the lowering of duties with the West Indies ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Information reached us some time ago that a conference of delegates, representing the various West India Islands, was about to be held at Barbados, and the suggestion was offered that the time was opportune for a representative of the government of Canada to meet these gentlemen and that perhaps, out of the discussion, something in the way of closer and better trade relations might be brought about. Responding to that suggestion, without any definite plan, which was offered by Sir Daniel Morris, the Imperial Commissioner of Agriculture for the West Indies, the government appointed Mr. W. G. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Mr. A. E. Jones, a well known West India merchant of Halifax, to attend the conference. They proceeded to Barados and are now attending the conference. Possibly at this moment the conference may be over, but we have not yet been advised as to its results.

DISTRICT JUDGE FORBES.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), or the right hon. the First Minister, when I may expect a reply to a motion for a return which was adopted on January 8, namely:

Mr. Taylor moved for:

A copy of all correspondence between the Department of Justice, or any department of the government, and Mr. Frederick Fraser Forbes, now a district judge in the province of Saskatchewan, or any other person or persons, in reference to the personal or professional status or character of Mr. Forbes, or his appointment as a judge as above-mentioned, and of all writings and documents of any kind in reference to the foregoing matter.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I have no objection to this motion, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that there is no correspondence whatever on this subject, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be in the other departments.

Motion agreed to.

I would ask that the return be brought down from the other departments, and if there is no correspondence in the Justice Department that the return state that.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask about a return brought down of correspondence between this government and the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia during 1905-6. The return contains no record of any advice tendered by this government or the Secretary of State to Sir Henri Joly, the then Governor of British Columbia, with reference to his granting a dissolution to the government of that province, then in power. I would like to ask the Prime Minister—he may not be able to answer me today—whether or not communications passed from the Secretary of State of this government with respect to that particular matter.

SUPPLY—PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Supply, and the proposed amendment of Mr. Northrup thereto.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the question raised by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is one of the most important that has arisen during the history of this parliament. The government's attitude upon the question involved is one of the most tyrannical denials of the constitutional rights of the people which the history of this parliament affords. That a government which presumes to apply to itself the name of Liberal should take such a position upon this question is but another evidence of the absolute infidelity of the gentlemen who now occupy the treasury benches to the principles which they espoused when in opposition. I cannot say that I am surprised, in the light of the record of this government since they have had control of the treasury benches—I would not be surprised at anything. Their whole history since 1896 has been the history of the subversion and betrayal of the principles which have given the Liberal party its name and its identity. One of their first administrative acts violated two of the most prominent planks of the platform of 1893, and at the same time one of the most fundamental principles of representative government, I refer to the Yukon Railway contract whereby the government proposed to hand over to two men 4,000,000 acres of land which they described as the best and richest gold bearing land in the world for the construction of a line of railway 175 miles long. This contract was negotiated on the eve of a session of parliament in violation of one of the fundamental principles of democratic government that no public expenditure can be made, and no part of the public domain alienated without the consent of the people's representatives in parliament assembled. In the platform of 1893 it was set out that all contracts should be put up to public tender and competition, and that the public lands of this country should be for the settler and not for the speculator. Both of these principles were violated in this instance.

Another instance of the government's departure from their principles as expressed while in opposition was their course with reference to railway subsides. We all remember how in opposition they denounced the Conservative government for what they claimed was the iniquitous practice of voting railway subsides. A practice which they said was unsound in principle and tended to corruption. Yet, in the session of 1899, this government put through this House a railway subsidy Bill subsidizing no less than 50 lines of railway with a total mileage of over 1,400 miles, many of these lines paralleling then existing railways That would have been bad enough, but they introduced a principle in that measure whereby the Governor in Council could double these subsidies at their own will and pleasure. By the Act the subsides were at the rate of $3,200 a mile, but this government, which had such a regard for the rights of the people when in opposition, took from this parliament the authority to a member of the government to double the railway subsidies and convert a subsidy of $3,200 a mile into a subsidy of $6,400 at his sweet will. The Bill covered subsidies of over $4,500,000 and the provision I allude to would permit the conversion of these by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals into a subsidy of $9,000,000.

The government have also been false to their principles in connection with bribery

and corruption and other forms of electoral fraud which they denounced throughout this country. I do not propose to enumerate the long series of electoral frauds that have taken place in the interest and under the auspices and protection of this government since they attained power. They are known by the people of this country from one end to the other, and it is only necessary to mention this matter to make the point.

Then, we remember the position they took with respect to the important doctrine of the independence of parliament. Their leaders held forth in all parts of the country in burning denunciation and condemnation of the Conservative government of that time, because, during eighteen years of office, it had appointed seventeen members of parliament to positions in the public service. Yet a return brought down this session shows that these gentlemen, who thus denounced their predecessors, have appointed at least four times as many members of parliament to office during eleven years of administration.

Another principle which this government has violated most seriously is that of opposition to government by order in council. I believe that the history of this parliament cannot show any such glaring instances of the extension of this doctrine of government by order in council as have been shown under this government. I have already given an example of this in their railway subsidies legislation. Hardly an important Bill passes this House that does not contain a provision taking from parliament the power of legislation in important matters and transferring it to the government to be exercised in the secrecy of their own council chamber. Last session I felt it my duty to enter a protest against a very marked instance of this conduct on the part of the government, the case being that of their tariff legislation. I need hardly remind hon. members that the tariff was arranged in three columns, the general, the intermediate and the preferential. It is admitted—it is beyond question—that, in this case for the first time in the history of the Canadian Confederation the government took from parliament the control of taxation in important respects. This Tariff Act gave them authority not only to decrease taxation, but to increase it—a clear violation of the first principles of representative government.

Another matter which was made of great prominence in the Liberal platform was the duty of the government to give to parliament the fullest information in regard to public affairs. That is the question now under discussion raised by this motion. Only last session we had a flat refusal on the part of the Prime Minister to give to the people's representatives in parliament assembled, any information in regard to the constitution of that fictitious, fake company known as the North Atlantic Trading Company which has received, I believe, over $300,000 of the people's money. Notwithstanding that, the people were called upon to pay this immense sum, the Prime Minister took the tyrannical position of refusing to disclose to parliament to whom this money was paid. If every other act of this government were commendable, this one defiance of the rights of parliament is enough to warrant their condemnation by the people of Canada. And here to-day, we are confronted with an even more tyrannical refusal by the First Minister and the members of his government to bring down documents which unquestionably the people's representatives have a right to see. After the debate we have had, I think there cannot be in the mind of any impartial or unprejudiced member of this House, the slightest doubt that that right exists. Sir, I have heard of 'hedging,' and have seen some of it both outside and inside of this House; but I am bound to say that I have never seen quite the equal of such hedging as that of the Prime Minister and the members of his government on this question. But as I have said, though I am not surprised at any conduct on the part of this government, however tyrannical, however unjust, however contradictory of their former professions, I must say that I have been astonished at the various contradictory and ridiculous positions taken by the several members of this government who have addressed the House on this question. Taking the history of this matter as it has developed, I find that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) wrote to the minister on December 3, expressing, in his usual courteous manner, a desire to examine certain original documents which were subsequently set out in the motion he has made. The hon. gentleman was informed by a letter in reply bearing the signature of the Minister of the Interior, that a rule had been made in the department 'not to allow the examination of the files by others than officials of the department whose duty it is.' The hon. member, however, was informed that he could get the papers by a motion in this House. I quote the concluding paragraph of the letter that the language may speak for itself.

> By an order of the House for the production of papers the responsibility is taken off the shoulders of the department and is assumed by the House, I would suggest this means of obtaining what you want.

This is the advice given to the hon. member for St. Antoine, by the Minister of the Interior. In pursuance of that advice the hon. member for St. Antoine presented his motion to the House on the 13th instant. He did so in a speech, which to my mind, furnished abundant reason why he should

receive these papers. But even though the hon. gentleman had not uttered a word in introducing that resolution, I submit that, in view of what had taken place, in view of the correspondence with the Minister of the Interior, in the custody of whose department these papers were, the hon. gentleman was entitled to have that motion passed without objection. Now, the hon. Minister of the Interior, who had asked my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, to take this means of obtaining the papers, was the first gentleman to arise in this House to make objection to the motion which he himself had advised. The ground that the Minister of the Interior took in opposing the motion was that it would, forsooth, be inconvenient to the department. That, Mr. Speaker, was the only ground substantially which the Minister of the Interior then advanced. I will quote a passage from his remarks upon that occasion. In the course of his speech the Minister of the Interior said :

But to transfer the original documents from the department whose business they form an essential part of, to this House where they will only constitute a record, as has been set out very fully in this memorandum, is an infringement upon business methods which it is impossible for the department to consent to.

That is the reason and the only reason which was advanced by the Minister of the Interior for the refusal of the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine. The Minister of the Interior was followed by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who combatted the contention which had been advanced by the minister with an argument, which, to my mind, was incontrovertible and which the subsequent course of this debate has shown was incontrovertible. In summing up, this is what my hon. friend said :

It has always been recognized in this House that unless there are reasons of state that intervene the information is brought down on the call and the wish of any member of parliament who has a reasonable claim and makes it known to this House.

Further on my hon. friend stated :

All proper care should be taken to see that the original documents brought down should be returned; you might even go so far as to demand that when original documents are brought to the House and laid on the table they should be inspected on the table or under the supervision of the clerk.

Now, when the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) rose to reply to my hon. friend from North Toronto he opened by fully endorsing the position which the Minister of the Interior had taken and by stating that he was very much scandalized by the argument that he had just heard put forward by my hon. friend from North Toronto. Notwithstanding, however, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. leader of the House fully endorsed the position which the Minister of the Interior had taken, which position was based entirely upon the convenience or inconvenience of the department, before the Prime Minister concluded his remarks, he made this statement :

My hon. friend says that the inconvenience or convenience of any officers of the departments of the government should not stand in the way of information being given. I agree to that entirely.

Notwithstanding his endorsation in his opening remarks of the position taken by the Minister of the Interior, he, in these words that I have quoted, cut completely the ground from under the feet of the Minister of the Interior. Then, the Prime Minister was constrained necessarily to take some other position and what was the refuge that he then sought ?—that good reasons must be given for the production of original documents. He then argued that there was a distinction in the rule in respect to original documents and copies of documents. That position the Prime Minister has since had to abandon and he was controverted with respect to it by his Minister of Finance in his speech of last evening. There is, I think, no question that under parliamentary practice and the rules of this House there is no distinction between copies and original documents, there is nothing in the rules which requires a statement of the reasons for the production of papers which applies to an original document any more than to the copy of a document, a proposition, which, I think, has already been thoroughly established. We all know in this House what has been the practice in reference to motions for copies. I have been in this House for four sessions and I have never yet known a member of this House to be called upon to state any reason for any motion which he desired to make for papers. I have made several motions myself and I have never once been called upon to state any reason why I desired these papers. I suppose the presumption is that when an hon. member of this House arises to move for papers he deems that he has good and sufficient reasons for doing so. While the Prime Minister quotes Todd, May and Bourinot, he quotes, Mr. Speaker, a rule which is unquestionably obsolete in this parliament and upon which, therefore, no reliance can be placed and a rule which, I may say, has never, in fact existed in this parliament. It remains with this so-called Liberal government to invoke this antiquated rule in justification of their conduct in this matter. That was the position that the matter stood in on the 13th excepting the all-important fact that when the Prime Minister had indicated his disposition to refuse this request of one of the people's representatives his followers in this House accepted his direction with-

out hesitation or demur. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was surprised as a member of this House that such a thoroughly indefensible position should have received the sanction of so many members of this body. Then, we had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) attempting to take a hand. When he saw that the Prime Minister, who had repudiated the position which the Minister of the Interior had taken, was himself constrained to present an indefensible argument in justification of the government's position, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries rose to present another ground which might justify the government's refusal of these papers. What was the position that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took? His argument was that if these particular papers were brought into this House and laid on the table they would become a matter of record and that therefore they would be lost to the department, ignoring entirely the very self-evident fact that if this House had power to order these papers upon the table from any of the departments it had power also to order the return of the papers back to the departments to whose custody the papers belonged.

But, after the speeches from which I have quoted had been delivered, as well as some other unimportant speeches made by gentlemen on the other side of the House, the hon. gentleman from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) rose to close the debate and in doing so he used language which completely met all objections and fulfilled the requirements laid down by the Prime Minister. So that it may be understood by all that the hon. member for St. Antoine had shown ample grounds for his motion, I quote from his remarks:

It is my right in this House to ask this information to be placed where I can see it, and in due time I will give all the information I have with reference to these limits in a form that will quite satisfy the Minister of the Interior. Here is the return we have been speaking about; it contains 453 pages. I have read that return from cover to cover. Now, there are nine pages of that return which can be illumined if I may see the originals. As to all the other pages the copies are all I want. But there are nine pages there with respect to which the copy does not tell me all I want to know or which I have the right to know if I understand my rights in this House of Commons.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend say that these nine pages differ from the original.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could he tell unless he sees the original?

Mr. AMES. I say that these nine pages will in all probability clear up certain doubts which I have regarding peculiar features in connection with some of these transactions; I say that the handwriting of some of these nine pages may have a very important bearing on the case.

What stronger or more specific reasons could be advanced or imagined than those given by the hon. member (Mr. Ames). In what clearer language could these reasons be expressed? His statement completely fulfilled the requirements laid down by the Prime Minister, yet notwithstanding the Prime Minister took the responsibility of calling on his followers to vote down the motion. And that motion having been voted down without any justification or excuse, when next the House was moved into Committee of Supply, the hon. leader of the opposition moved the following amendment:

That all the words after the word 'that' be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, it is the undoubted right of the people's representatives in parliament assembled to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business; and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.

Well, that amendment was accepted at once by the Prime Minister, although greatly to my surprise, and I presume to the surprise of many other hon. gentlemen, in his very words signifying his willingness to accept the amendment he reaffirmed the position he took on the original motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine, and insisted that the papers should be refused because no reason had been advanced for their production. I quote from the remarks of the Prime Minister on that occasion:

But there may be other occasions where for reasons which are known to himself, and which I will not question, and which he can state to the House, the member may think the copies would not give him the information the originals would. So far so good, and if he so states, it seems to me he is entitled to have the originals.

I would ask the hon. gentlemen in this House to mark well these words of the Prime Minister. If a member thinks the copies would not give him the information the originals would, the member is entitled to the papers. I ask this House if it will not declare in all fairness that the hon. member (Mr. Ames) took precisely that position and made precisely that statement. I have read the words used by the hon. member (Mr. Ames) in his closing remarks, and they not only go to the extent that the Prime Minister admits entitled him to the papers, but they went beyond it and gave much more specific reasons than the Prime Minister indicated were necessary. At page 1689 'Hansard' will be found these words of the Prime Minister in that debate:

My hon. friend from St. Antoine division may have had good reasons for his request.

That I am not denying, and if he had said: We ask for those papers because we have good reasons for looking at the originals his demand would have been complied with at once.

Again I ask hon. gentlemen to remember these words of the Prime Minister. Let me revert to the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine in introducing his resolution, a speech delivered before the Prime Minister addressed the House; I quote the very last sentence uttered by my hon. friend (Mr. Ames):

> This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question, because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original applications and tenders in respect to timber berths Nos. 1107, 1108 and 1171.

Here we have the hon. member (Mr. Ames) using the very words which the Prime Minister said, if he had used them, would have entitled him to the production of the papers. After these quotations who would have thought that we would have had the Prime Minister, two days afterwards, taking the position which he did yesterday? What was his position on that occasion? Notwithstanding that sufficient reasons in his judgment had been given, yet because, forsooth, the hon. member for St. Antoine seemed in the very last sentence which he used not to rely on the reasons which he had given, therefore the motion was refused. Is not that a most ridiculous position for a gentleman who occupies the position of Prime Minister of this country to take—in the first place, that it was necessary to state reasons in presenting the original motion, and denying that any reason had been stated, and subsequently admitting that reasons had been stated, but because the hon. gentleman, by the use of a certain phrase, did not seem to rely upon them, the motion should be refused. And how did the right hon. gentleman endeavour to establish this last position? By quoting one half the sentence. He buttressed his position by quoting these words: 'This motion has been drafted purely and simply to test that one question,' and stopped there, omitting the three following lines which completely contradicted the position he was taking. These are the lines: 'Because we consider that we have sufficient reasons for desiring to see the original application. Could any one conceivably, Mr. Speaker, have done more turning and twisting and hedging, than the right hon. gentleman in the course of these several debates.

That would have been enough, I think, to have convinced any reasonable member of this House that there was no valid justification or excuse for the refusal to bring down the papers which were asked for. But last night we had an exhibition which to my mind was still more ridiculous than that taken by the Prime Minister; and I must express my astonishment that a gentleman with the reputation which the Finance Minter has throughout this country should have seen fit to have advanced the view which he did. Contradicting the position which his leader had taken with respect to copies and also with respect to the giving of reasons, the Finance Minister based the conduct of the government on this question upon the ground that the hon. member for St. Antoine had not approached the government in the proper spirit. Imagine a member of His Majesty's government in this country taking such a ridiculous position as that. If the hon. member for St. Antoine was entitled to these papers by the statement of reasons, surely the fact that he was not in a particular humour at the time he made the motion was not sufficient in this democratic country to deprive him of what was his undoubted right—as if his right to papers depended entirely upon his humour, or possibly upon his digestion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel it to be my duty as one of the representatives of the people to enter my strongest protest against this further infringement by this government upon the undoubted rights of the people of this country. I do not think the people will be disposed to take much stock in antiquated quotations from May or Todd or Bourinot. There will be no question in the minds of the great mass of thinking people in this country that the members of this House as their representatives have a right to inspect and examine all public documents. Who is the Minister of the Interior that he refuses to the representatives of the people information to which they are entitled? Are the members of this government the master of the people or are they the servants of the people? I have always been taught to believe that under our system of government the administration of the day are the servants of the people, the trustees and agents of the people, and not their masters. I listened with interest the other day to the speech of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) in reference to the reform of the Senate. That gentleman on that occasion told us that the government of this country were the executive committee of the board of directors of a joint stock company, of which the people of Canada are the shareholders. That, I thought, very aptly described the relation of this government to the people of Canada, and I would like to apply it to the position of the government in reference to the present question. Imagine, as the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) said last night, a member of the executive committee of a joint stock company refusing to disclose to a brother director of that company any information in regard to the affairs of the company. Would any business concern in this country stand for such a defiance of rights as that? Whose docu-

ments are these? Are they the private documents of the hon. Minister of the Interior, or are they the documents of the people of Canada? It is simply a question of principal and agent. The principal in this case are the people of Canada, and the agent is the Minister of the Interior, or the government if you choose. How long would any agent hold his position if he refused the rights of and disobeyed and defied the principal for whom he was acting? He would not hold his position twenty-four hours; and I believe that at the first opportunity the principals in this matter have of getting at these false agents, they will dispense with their services. I cannot conceive of any stronger reason for the dismissal of this government than the miserable position which they have taken in respect to this matter.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House very long, but I feel it to be my duty as a representative of the people to enter my protest against the new doctrine of the Liberal party which was laid down by the Finance Minister last night in discussing this question. I am sure it will be a surprise to the people of Canada, and especially to the province of Ontario, to learn that the Finance Minister of this country laid down in the House last night the following doctrine. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) quoted a statement of the First Minister to be found on page 1685 of 'Hansard':

> No one denies either that members of parliament have the right to have access of the records of the government and to all the archives, if they believe that in the public interest they should have such access.

Then my hon. friend proceeds to comment on that statement:

> I think that sufficiently answers the statement made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) this evening, who took the astonishing, the amazing ground, that the minority has absolutely no rights in this House.

Mr. Fielding then interjected the interruption:

> Except such as the majority may grant it.

I am sure that when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) reads that amazing doctrine in cold print, he will realize that it is a new doctrine to the people of Canada and the members of this House. According to that doctrine, while the people have the right to elect representatives to carry on the affairs of the country in parliament, yet when these representatives happen to be seated on the left of the Speaker, there is to be applied to them the doctrine that they have no rights in this House except such as may be granted them by the government. I should like to have the Liberal party enunciate that doctrine as a plank in their new platform at the next general elections. But whether they do this or no, the people of this country will understand that it is really a plank in the platform of that party, and a plank laid down, not by some humble representative, but by no less a person than the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). We have the right, therefore, to take this declaration of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) as the policy of the Liberal party, and that policy is that the Liberal government will allow no rights to the minority representatives in this House, sitting on your left, Sir, except such as, in their good will and pleasure and in their own party interests, they may see fit to grant them. I listened very closely to the remarks of the right hon. the First Minister last evening. The right hon. gentleman said:

> The hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) moved the other day a motion absolutely unprecedented in this House, absolutely unlike anything that had ever been presented in this House, so far as I know. He moved that certain original documents should be brought down to this House.

I am afraid the First Minister did not put his memory to any kind of a sufficient test or did not make any very extended research into the records of parliament. I have before me a resolution moved by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson) in 1885—a resolution which was granted without dissent—calling for the following return:

> All the original lists and papers, including all declarations, notices of appeal, objections to preliminary lists and relating to all other proceedings now in the possession of the revising barrister or the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in any way affecting the voters' lists for the electoral division of the county of Lennox, as settled by the revision of 1891, together with a certified copy of the revised voters' list of 1891 furnished by the revising barrister to the returning officer.

That is a resolution calling for original documents. I do not wish to load up 'Hansard' with other resolutions calling for originals, but I may say that a careful search would show many resolutions passed calling for the original documents. In this return, the only copy called for is that of the revised voters' list of 1891. I have here another return ordered, giving the quantity, value and kind of fish, &c. I take it that as that return does not mention copies, that the hon. gentleman who moved for it would expect to receive the original documents, if there is any distinction between a resolution calling for copies and a resolution calling for the originals. And I think I am correct in saying that, in answer to similar motions, the practice of this parliament has been to place at the disposal of the House any number of original documents. Why are we having all this discus-

sion? My hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) considered it his duty as a member of the House to find out how this government has been disposing of timber limits in Western Canada. Surely in doing so he was exercising his right as a representative of the people, and surely in that respect his course should meet with the commendation of the people. Following out his duty as a representative of the people, he moved for a return, and the order was granted unanimously, and he received copies of the papers mentioned in the return. He was not desirous of prying into the private affairs of any individual, but simply wished to find out how this government was administering the timber limits of western Canada. What happened? The order was granted and the copies were brought down. On looking over the copies —and they covered a large number of pages, 453 in all—he came to the conclusion that there were nine pages, the originals of which he considered it necessary he should examine as a representative of the people. What course did he then take? He took the course usually followed. He went over to the department and asked to see these originals, but there he was confronted with a new doctrine of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). And if there is any man in the House who, we would expect, would give us liberal doctrine, it is surely the hon. gentleman, because, before he became a minister, he always stood out as an independent member on the government side. Whenever the government took a course which he did not approve, we found him standing up in his place as an independent advocate of the people's rights. But what a change has come over the hon. gentleman since then No sooner did he take his seat in the cabinet than he forgot all his past record and history, and when he is asked to discharge his duty as a minister of the Crown, when he is asked by a representative of the people to allow him access to the original documents in his department, he meets that representative with the declaration: You cannot enter here, you cannot see the original documents in connection with this land deal. Why not? Because the minister has established a brand new doctrine and has closed the door that was formerly open to every member of this House. Did my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) make any very strong protest No, he simply moved a resolution calling upon the government to produce, not the 453 pages of original documents, but only 9 pages of the original documents. That motion was defeated by a vote of the government majority. That defeat accentuated the difference between the opposition and the government, and I am sure it will be a surprise to the followers of the government throughout the country when they realize that these hon. gentlemen opposite, who had denounced the Liberal-Conservative party in earlier days, who had charged the late Conservative government with governing the country behind closed doors, now coming forward refusing to a representative of the people access to original documents which are the property of the people

Why should not the people of Canada be a little suspicious of this government and this department ? During the last few years we have heard hon. gentlemen on this side of the House say to the government : Something has gone wrong in western Canada in connection with the timber limits, because we find that large limits are now owned by members of the Liberal party who are in this House. Would that not be sufficient to arouse any man's suspicion ? The newspapers gave a wide circulation to this policy of the government, a policy of 'get rich quick, if you are a supporter of the government, if you are a representative of the people.' When we looked into the records, when Mr. Ames came to the conclusion that there was something wrong here, and having exposed some conduct of this government in the past was refused the original documents, documents which heretofore he had had the right to examine, was it not his duty to appeal to parliament and if he does not get his right here, the people of this country will give him his rights when they have an opportunity to pronounce upon the conduct of the government. I am sure that the people of this country will realize that something must be done. Statements that the opposition are wasting the time of parliament and spending money unnecessarily will not be believed by the people of Canada. We have heard members of the government stating that having looked into all systems of government, after all the party system we have in this country is the best for Canada. If it is to be said that we have no rights, if we are to have a new doctrine of this kind, what is the use of the people of Canada voting for two political parties ? The government will next say to the people of this country that it is no use voting for opposition members for whatever rights they have in the House of Commons are given to them only by the votes of the majority the supporters of the government. Few men in Canada would subscribe to such a doctrine, and I am sure that electors supporting opposition members will not be driven by it into the ranks of the government supporters but will arise in their might and say : We will go out into other constituencies and will fight for our rights and will see whether the system of party government in this country is to cease, on account of a brand new doctrine introduced by this government in the session of 1908.

I do not wish to cover the ground that has already been gone over. Any municipal council or any school board in Canada would blush with shame to adopt a doctrine of

this kind, and yet we have the government that is supposed to lead us upwards and onward, laying down this principle, a policy that would not be supported by any class of people in any civilized country. We want to enter a protest on behalf of Canada. I want to enter a protest not only for the Conservatives of Peel but for the Reformers who I am sure will vote against a government who will venture to place upon the records a policy which says to opposition members: You shall have rights but these rights shall be prescribed by the will or whim of the government of the day.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I have been here a good many years and this is the first time I have seen a Prime Minister adopt such a policy as has been adopted in this House. I have always been under the impression that when an order was granted by this House, even for copies of papers to be brought down, it was an order that everything in connection with those papers could be seen, that we were entitled to see the originals; I took it for granted that the copies were brought down solely as a convenience instead of removing the original papers to the House. However, I always felt that if it were absolutely necessary the originals would be brought down to the House when that order was granted by the House. If the statement of the Prime Minister is correct I have been entirely mistaken. With him I do not agree.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not agree that the policy he has laid down within the last 48 hours is right. I believe we are entitled to see the original documents in every case, and from what we have found in the cases where original papers have been produced, I think it is time for the Prime Minister to allow the original documents to be brought down. Take for instance the Department of the Interior. There is not, I believe, a department in which there is more wrongdoing going on than the department over which the Minister of the Interior presides. Before the present minister attained office, he was one of those who claimed that his predecessor was practically alienating the lands of the Northwest. He was going to do right but what have we seen since he came into power ? I shall cite a few cases that have occurred before and since his coming into power and I will ask the Prime Minister if these few cases are not sufficient to justify members of parliament in seeing the original papers. I shall take first the case of Mr. Caldwell, a particular friend of the Minister of the Interior, one of his bosom friends, before he became Minister of the Interior. This gentleman comes down here to Ottawa and although the laws allow only one application to be made by each individual, this gentleman sits down in the Russell House and writes out 217 applications for coal lands in the Northwest, all in his own handwriting. Each of these applications entitles the applicant to 320 acres of coal lands. He got every bell-boy, every little boy he could get around Ottawa, every man, woman and child in order to make up the 217 applications and paid them $1 each to sign the applications, and then took a power of attorney from them transferring the grants to Mr. Caldwell; the Minister of the Interior puts this through his department as a right and fair and just application for coal lands in the Northwest. I asked for a return of these documents, but the minister brought down a return consisting of copies of these applications. In each case the copies showed a different person applying for the 320 acres, but this man incidentally disclosed the method of his application to a friend and it was published in a newspaper that he was applying for the 217 applications and the Minister of the Interior had to publicly disclose it in the House. Does this not show that he as minister is willing to allow wrong-doing to occur in his department without interfering ? Here is a simple case in which it was absolutely necessary for the opposition to have access to the original papers, or otherwise they could not have shown that the Minister of the Interior in allowing this rascality to go on in his department, is not fit for the position he holds.

Then, we had the Robbins Irrigation deal. In this case $850,000 was made by friends of the Minister of the Interior, and the original documents, when examined, showed that it was practically a fraud. We have another case, the Galway Land deal made by this man known as Brown. When we got to the original papers, we found that the two men in this whole deal were the hon. member for Humbolt (Mr. Adamson) and the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Everybody knows that, five or ten years ago, every dollar these men owned was the suit of clothes on their backs ; and to-day they are travelling around worth a million. One of them was an officer in the Department of the Interior, and is now going around the country to explain one of the greatest scandals ever perpetrated by any Canadian government. And yet the Prime Minister is not willing that we should see original papers because of what those original papers may disclose.

Then, we had the North Atlantic Trading Company deal. In this case, the Minister of the Interior brought down the papers, actually, with the signatures torn off. But had we been restricted wholly to copies of documents, we probably could not have shown that there was anything wrong at all. But the Department of the Interior is not the only one ; there are others almost as bad. There are three specially in which, the Prime Minister knows, there is the greatest rascality going on—Railways and Canals, Marine and Fisheries, and Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't forget Public Works.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, and Public Works is nearly as bad. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us the other day that he was compelled to put the brakes on the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) though he had been in office only two or three months, and would not grant him the amount he asked. In the Marine and Fisheries Department, when we got the original invoices in the Merwin case, we found that the name F. L. Brookes and Company was scratched out and George T. Merwin's name written in. It was shown that Brookes and Merwin were the same identical person. Had we not had the original papers, how could we have found this out? Then, as to the Railways and Canals Department, when we asked for the original papers in the Grand Trunk Pacific case, the government voted us down and absolutely refused to let us have them. Had these original papers been brought down, it would have been shown that before certain legislation agreed to by the Prime Minister was put through this House it cost about $165,000. Lawyers in the city were paid $10,000—for what? As I understand the matter, the Bill was drafted in the Justice Department, and there should not have been any trouble about it; yet $165,000 was paid before the Bill was got through this House. Then we have the Halifax Land deal. In that case we got the original papers, and found that, instead of all the money going to the party from whom the land was supposed to be bought, part of it went to B. F. Pearson, one of the Liberal organizers or heelers there. Then we had the Moncton land deal and others. Where we have had original papers, we have been able to show that things are in a much different shape from what they have appeared had we had only the copies.

We were told by the Minister of Finance last evening that we, as an opposition, have no rights in this House except such as the majority of this House give us. I do not believe that the people of this country will uphold such a doctrine as that, and certainly the members on this side will not agree to submit to it. Personally, I feel very sorry that the Prime Minister has taken the position he has taken. He has not taken such a position in any previous session. We can only suppose that the reason why he refuses us these original documents is because, by means of original documents, we have been able to show so many cases in which the people of this country have been robbed, and he knows that, if the opposition are allowed to go on, they will make such exposures as will sweep him from power. I may be wrong, but I believe that further rascality will be shown if the papers asked for are delivered to the hon. member for St. Antoine. If the Prime Minister is prepared to prevent access being had to these original documents, he must assume the responsibility, and we must allow the people to decide. And then, if he does not allow those who are fighting for him to use too much of the material that was used in Stanstead and South Huron, the result will be very different from what it was in those ridings. There is not a man on the other side who dares to rise and declare himself in favour of the position the Prime Minister has taken. I hope the right hon. gentleman will see that he is wrong, and will agree to lay these papers on the table and allow us to proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I wish to offer a few words of protest against the way in which we have been treated in connection with these papers. I cannot help feeling that when the people of this Dominion realize the position the government is taking, they will resent that action. When I came to this House, a few years ago, it had never occurred to me that the government would take such a position as it has taken within the last few days. I assumed that a representative of the people in this House had a perfect right to examine the public documents wherever he found them, and especially documents relating to important transactions in regard to the public domain. These are dead documents as has already been said. They cannot be of any great interest to the people who own the land or the timber limits, and it is important we should have them in carrying out the investigation which we have undertaken. The people of this country do not attach any great importance to the statements which have been made in regard to the position that Todd or Bourinot takes on this question. The position of the people, I think, upon this question, will be this: Is it right or is it wrong that our representatives in parliament should have access to the public documents and be given every opportunity to make a thorough investigation of them? Within the past few hours I have sent in a notice of motion asking for reports, plans and specifications in regard to docks and piers up in the western part of Ontario. I have not been able to give sufficient reasons possibly for asking for these reports, but I believe that when the time comes it will be necessary for me to make an investigation of some of the original documents in regard to some of the public works on Lake Huron. Take, the town of Bayfield, a town in which I have taken considerable interest in the past few years and in which a public meeting was recently held.

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. 'Hear, hear,' says the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson).

Yes, that hon. gentleman was up in that riding, it is true. It is true that he was talking about the grand old Liberal party and the grand old Liberal platform and telling the people that they should stand by them, but did he tell them of the nefarious transactions of this government, did he tell them of the corrupt measures that have been carried under his very eyes and which he has been defending from year to year, did he tell them of the reckless and extravagant expenditure of this government? No, Sir, but he was trying to tell them of the wonderful development that this country has witnessed during the past few years in which this government has been in control of its affairs. He was telling them of that development but he cannot point to one important piece of legislation that has been placed on the statute-book of this country whereby the prosperity which he boasted of has been brought about. Time and again have we thrown that statement across the floor of this House, and yet this government has never been able to explain it away. Now, let us come back to the town of Bayfield. On the platform at a public meeting in that town was one of the prominent citizens of Bayfield, and what did he say in regard to the public expenditure at Bayfield? He said that it was most reckless and extravagant and that the careless manner in which they built the dock and pier in that town was something which should not be countenanced by any fair-minded citizen. He told us that the contract called for cribwork to be sunk 16 feet in the sand, whereas they only dredged to a depth of 12 feet for that crib and then started to build the crib. The council of the town of Bayfield telegraphed down to the Public Works Department telling this government that the contractors were not doing the fair thing in the building of the pier. Did the government send back any man to investigate that question? No, did they even reply to the telegram that the council sent. This gentleman said that they did not even reply to the telegram and the outcome was that instead of the crib being sunk 16 feet it was only sunk 12 feet. The contract called for the filling of the crib with stone and what did this gentleman say on that public platform? He made the statement that instead of the crib being filled with stone it was filled with stumps, brush, sand and gravel that could be shovelled from a nearby place. Yet you will find these gentlemen going about and telling of the splendid works that have been built and the splendid expenditures they are making for the benefit of the country. Let them go on to St. Joseph, just a few miles along the same shore and what will they find? They will find that on this work there has been spent $18,000 or $20,000 of public money, that it has not been wisely or judiciously expended and that at the place where this wharf is there is no likelihood of a boat ever stopping or of there ever being any business or commercial reason for the construction of a work of this kind. Look at it for a moment. This government went to work and built a wharf at St. Joseph, there being only one little fisherman in the district and only some $18 of post office revenue. If you go up and investigate this work you will find that it was built in such a careless and reckless manner that parts of this same work are drifting along the shores of Lake Huron. Go up to St. Joseph, look at this pier, as I have done within the last few months, and investigate the repairs which are going on in connection with it. What did I find? I found that instead of a good pile driver that would drive piles which would make a pier that would be worthy of the construction of this government, a pile driver that had been used by the farmers in driving posts in different parts of the district was employed. You would find that the piles, instead of being of reasonable length and of some practical use when they were driven in the ground, were similar to the posts that a farmer would use on his farm, 6 to 8 feet long. You could go a few miles further down to Grand Bend. If the hon. Minister of Customs had gone to Grand Bend what would he have found? He would have found a public wharf built at the expense of the country, and I must say it was needed as far as Grand Bend was concerned. But, a public wharf was built, and how was it built? It was built practically on top of the sand. Then the waves came along, dislodged and undermined it and year after year contractors have been going back there, repairing that work and spending thousands and thousands of dollars in trying to keep it in reasonable repair. The same story is being told about the wharf at Grand Bend, as I have told in regard to the wharf at Bayfield. Instead of it being dredged out, put in the proper place and the cribwork filled with stone, it has been most carelessly and recklessly handled.

In what position do we find ourselves today? We find my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, moves for papers and he gives good and sufficient reasons for moving for these papers. He tells the government that it is necessary for him to have these papers so that he may make a thorough investigation in regard to some of the large timber sales in the Northwest. But the Minister of the Interior refuses to bring them down. His reasons are not fair, they are not reasonable, they are not reasons which could be given by any man who was willing to open up his department to a thorough investigation, and we cannot help but feel that there is something wrong in that department, because otherwise they would be more ready to open up to the members of this parliament the papers that are necessary to be investigated. The right hon.

Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agrees with his minister in this regard and defends him day after day. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) introduced a resolution asking that the rights of members on this side of the House be recognized. After the question has been evaded for some time the minister accepts that resolution and then a few days afterwards he goes back on practically every word that is contained in the resolution. And in the face of all that, instead of the hon. member (Mr. Ames) being able to get these papers now, an attempt is made to force him into the humiliating position that he must declare that these papers are a forgery or that there is something radically wrong about them, before he will be allowed to look at them even for a few moments. Sir, we are fighting not only to obtain these papers but we are fighting for a principle. I state here that unless we can have access to the original papers in connection with the transactions of this government we cannot depend upon the copies that are furnished us from time to time. This government is intoxicated with power, and the people seem to be lulled into a political dreamland by a venal press such as we have in Canada to-day. When you look at the tens of thousands of dollars that go to the Liberal papers every year, you can see to what extent that press will defend this government and its nefarious transactions. It is all right enough for us to sing :

Canada, dear Canada, men of the North are we,
For thee we live; for thee we die
That evermore thou shalt be free.

We may sing the words with our lips, but we have no real freedom under this government. The Minister of the Interior closes the door of his department against the members of the opposition and refuses them access. I believe, Sir, that when the people of the country come to understand this question they will demand with no uncertain voice that it is the right of the representatives of the people in this House not only to have access to these public documents, but to make a thorough examination of them. Spain fell because of corrupt politics ; her officials were robbing and looting her treasury ; her ministers and her leading statesmen were taking advantage of their position to enrich themselves. That was the cause of Spain's downfall. And is it any wonder that she fell ? Canadians are more intelligent and more far seeing than the Spaniards, and surely in this progressive country of ours the people will not uphold the government in such a course as they have now decided on. It is all very well for us to say that our soldiers and sailors are braver and our statesmen wiser than those of any other land. But, when we see the government of this country taking such a position on this public question, and refusing information on public affairs to the representatives of the people, how humiliating is the spectacle. Am I to go back to my constituents and tell them : I am of no use to you at Ottawa because the government in power have refused time and again to give the opposition members information in the Public Accounts Committee, and now they have refused to give us access to the public documents of the country. I may do that, but I can tell the people that if Canada is to have progressive legislation such as is promised by the leader of the Conservative party, the people must turn the present government out of power. Within the last few years we have cleaned some of the barnacles off the ship of state, and we are continuing the good work in that direction, but we want the government to open up that ship, we want to get inside of her, we want to improve her machinery, we want to get rid of the microbes that infest her and steer her towards the progressive legislation which the Conservative party can give. I rose to enter my protest against the conduct of the government in this case. I am glad to see the stand many of the members on this side of the House have taken in regard to the question. It is our duty to stand by our rights in this parliament. It is our duty to vindicate the rights of the representatives of the people to see these public documents. It is our duty to make the walls of this old building ring as they never rang before in advocacy of our rights and in denunciation of the denial of these rights. I believe yet that the government will see that it is in their own interests as well as in the interests of the country that they should recede from their position and allow us access to these public documents.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Northrup).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lennox,
Ames,	Leonard,
Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Avery,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Barker,	Marshall,
Barr,	Martin
Beattie,	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Bergeron,	Monk,
Blain,	Morin,
Borden (Carleton),	Northrup,
Bristol,	Owen,
Chisholm (Huron),	Paquet,
Christie,	Porter,
Clements,	Pringle,
Crocket,	Reid (Grenville),
Daniel,	Roche (Marquette),
Foster,	Schaffner,
Ganong,	Smith (Wentworth),
Haggart,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Stanfield,
Herron,	Staples,
Kemp,	Taylor,

Lake, White,
Lalor, Wilmot,
Lancaster, Wilson (Lennox & Addington.)—50.
Lefurgey,

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archambault, Laurier (L'Assomption),
Aylesworth, Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Beauparlant, Law,
Black, LeBlanc,
Bourbonnais, Lemieux,
Brodeur, Logan,
Bureau, Loggie,
Burrows, Macpherson,
Calvert, McCool,
Carney, McCraney,
Caron, McIntyre (Perth),
Carvell, McIntyre (Strathcona),
Cash, McKenzie,
Chisholm (Antigonish), McLennan,
Clarke, Major,
Conmee, Marcile (Bagot),
Copp, Martin (Montreal, St Mary's),
Crawford, Martin (Wellington),
Cyr, Mayrand,
Delisle, Miller,
Demers, Oliver,
Desjardins, Pardee,
Devlin, Paterson,
Dubeau, Pickup,
Dugas, Proulx,
Fielding, Reid (Restigouche),
Finlay, Rivet,
Finlayson, Roche (Halifax),
Fisher, Ross (Cape Breton),
Fortier, Ross (Rimouski),
Galliher, Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Geoffrion, Schell (Glengarry),
Girard, Schell (Oxford),
Gladu, Sifton,
Gordon, Sloan,
Graham, Smith (Nanaimo),
Grant, Smith (Oxford),
Greenway, Talbot,
Hall, Templeman,
Harty, Tolmie,
Hunt, Turcotte,
Jackson (Selkirk), Turgeon,
Johnston, Turriff,
Kennedy, Watson,
Knowles, Wilson (Russell),
Lachance, Zimmerman.—95.
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Telford,	Tisdale,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Wright (Renfrew),	Lewis,
Beland,	Elson,
Carrier,	Osler,
Savoie,	Jackson (Elgin),
Brown,	Bennett,
Tobin,	Hughes (Victoria),
Meigs,	Cockshutt,
McColl,	Ward,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Wright (Muskoka),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McLaren,
Caldwell,	Broder,
Dyment,	Seagram,
Guthrie,	Fowler,
Emmerson,	Clare,
Maclean (Lunenburg),	Perley.
Pugsley,	Forget,
Ratz	Walsh (Huntingdon),
German,	Boyce,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne).	Brabazon.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Amendment (Mr. Northrup) negatived.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to say, in reference to the matter which has just been before the House, that on Monday next, when the temper of hon. gentlemen on both sides has had time to cool down, I shall have a statement to make in regard to the same.

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

Mr. FIELDING. At the time when it was expected that the estimates would be taken up yesterday, it was announced that the Minister of Public Works would bring his estimates forward. He is, however, obliged to be absent to-day, and we will proceed with the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. That is probably unavoidable, but it would have been very much more convenient for us on this side of the House if a little foresight had been used and we had been told of this change. We have to arrange our business on this side of the House just as well as the government have to arrange theirs; we have certain committees to take charge of certain things, and we had prepared, and had received no notice otherwise, to take up the Public Works estimates to-day. I know that these changes must take place, but there is no excuse for not giving fair notice to the opposition when the changes are known. Surely the Minister of Finance must have known yesterday or early to-day that the Minister of Public Works would not be here, and it would have helped us very much if he had given us that information. However, he has not thought of it, and I am not going to say more than that the Minister of Marine must not complain if his estimates are delayed.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a good deal of force in what my hon. friend says. I must be candid with him. The suggestion was thrown out last night that we would not get into Supply to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. There is every difference between getting into Supply and getting supplies.

Mr. FIELDING. We quite realize the difference, and my hon. friend has had occasion sometimes to know the difference too.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps it would be as well for the Minister of Finance to call it

six o'clock, and by the time we get back at eight o'clock he will be cooled down, and perhaps the right hon. leader of the government will then be prepared to make a statement. Our committee can get together by eight o'clock and be prepared to go on with the work.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend think he can be cooled off by eight o'clock ?

Mr. TAYLOR. We are perfectly cool now, but until we hear from the premier, I think the statement made last night by the leader of the opposition should be carried out. Therefore it is only a waste of time to go on from now till six o'clock. If the premier is prepared to make his statement now, we will listen to him, or we will wait until eight o'clock and hear what he has to say then.

Further amount required for the construction of an ice-breaking steamer for Northumberland straits, $150,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the minister to give us a full and comprehensive statement of what has been done by the ice-breakers in the employ of the government—how many there are, what work each of them has done, and the general results of the policy.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I do not know whether the hon.. gentleman was here the other night, but I will repeat what I said in reference to the service of the ice-breakers. The ice-breakers we have are the 'Minto,' the 'Stanley,' the 'Champlain' and the 'Montcalm.' The 'Minto' and the 'Stanley,' as every member of this House is aware, are engaged in the winter service between Nova Scotia or New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The 'Stanley' was bought nineteen years ago, and has been on that service since that time. The 'Minto' has been in the service eight years. In the summer the service between the island and the mainland is made by boats belonging to independent companies. In winter, in order to carry out the terms of the entry of Prince Edward Island into confederation, the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley' ply between the Island and the mainland. Does my hon. friend wish to have the number of employees ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. On the 'Minto' there are one master, two mates, four engineers and a crew of thirty-nine. On the 'Stanley' there are one master, one mate, one chief engineer, two other engineers and a crew of thirty-four. The estimated expenditure for the 'Minto' for next year will be $70,000 and for the 'Stanley,' $45,000. The 'Champlain' is carrying on the service between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay in conection with the Intercolonial Railway. She calls on the north side of the St. Lawrence at three ports during the summer—Murray bay, Cap à l'Aigle and Ste. Helene.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the 'Champlain' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The estimate for next year is $22,000. The employees are one master, one chief officer, one second officer, two engineers and a crew of seventeen. The fourth ice breaker is the 'Montcalm.' The work of the 'Montcalm' is divided as follows: In the spring she goes down to the Gulf of the St. Lawrence and the Straits of Cabot, and being provided with wireless telegraphy she keeps in communication with vessels going into the straits and informs them regarding the best way to avoid the ice. During the summer she is used for provisioning our lighthouses in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence. In the winter she is employed at Quebec breaking the ice at Cap Rouge. She has been three years in that service. The first year, she kept the channel open a certain time, but owing to an accident had to stop.

Mr. FOSTER. How many days work did she do that first year in breaking the ice ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About a month.

Mr. FOSTER. How many hours per day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She works day and night. When it is found that there is danger of the formation of an ice bridge, she goes up to Cap Rouge and breaks the ice.

Mr. FOSTER. The first year she did about a month's work.

Mr. BRODEUR. My deputy thinks about fifty or sixty days.

Mr. FOSTER. Is your deputy sure that she worked more than 208 hours the first year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Last year she was employed in the same business, but outside of that she made two trips down the river in order to find out whether winter navigation was feasible, and the result was entirely satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. During what months ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In December and in January or the beginning of February.

Mr. FOSTER. What did she find in December ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She went as far as Seven islands. The trip was made without difficulty. She found, however, that the ice was rather thick in the bay but she steamed through it and reached the harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. What time in December ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About the middle of December.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there much ice there?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a lot in the harbour, and the weather was very cold. There was floating ice in the river but none to prevent her getting down.

Mr. FOSTER. She practically met with no ice until she got to Seven islands ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What boats frequent the Seven islands in winter time ? Do ocean steamers go there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at present, but they may be expected later.

Mr. FOSTER. What does go in the winter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are very extensive works being established there, costing several millions of dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. What navigation is there in the winter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is none now.

Mr. FOSTER. What particular service is accomplished by this boat going down to Seven islands in winter, when there is no navigation there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She carried some hay, passengers and provisions. Last year several accidents happened during the fall, and some schooners, which were carrying provisions to the lower St. Lawrence, were wrecked and there was a shortage of provisions. The 'Montcalm' carried some of the provisions for the provisioning of the people and especially some shanties.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this service for the public ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was public service then.

Mr. FOSTER. The 'Montcalm' is a very expensive ice-breaker. She goes out in December when there is no ice to break and steams down to Seven islands where there is no navigation at all in the winter and sails about the harbour smashing up ice just to see what she can do. In the fall she brings down provisions for settlements. Are those settlements maintained by the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then she was not doing government work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We wanted to find out whether winter navigation could be effected, or not, and we sent the 'Montcalm' as an experiment.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend was trying to find out whether the 'Montcalm' could go down in December to Seven islands or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, in order to see whether navigation could be carried on in winter.

Mr. FOSTER. Where from and where to ?

Mr. BRODEUR. From Quebec to the lower St. Lawrence. It has been often stated that we should have winter navigation on the St. Lawrence, and we sent the 'Montcalm' for the purpose of finding out whether it was possible.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean ocean navigation ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. When the boat got to Seven islands, was it all clear from that out to the ocean ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The report says that it is generally clear on the north shore.

Mr. FOSTER. Do ocean steamers take that passage after the 1st December ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Of what particular use is the 'Montcalm' going to be if you do not expect ocean steamers to take that passage ?. You have had this expensive steamer during three years, have any ocean vessels taken that winter trip during any of these years ? Are they doing it this winter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister tells us that some time in December the Montcalm took provisions for traders or private parties in certain settlements not owned by the government or not supported by the government, then she went to Seven Islands and proved that she could break some ice. But neither that nor the next year nor this year has a single ocean vessel travelled in winter on that route. What does he propose to do with the 'Montcalm' on that route ? She has been three years at it now and is in her prime. If she can do anything, she ought to do it the first three years. What have you done except provide settlers and traders with some provisions for the winter season ? What have you done with the 'Montcalm' with reference to the only object for which she was purchased, keeping open navigation for ocean steamers in the winter if possible. It is up to my hon. friend, without floating around with this $75,000 a year and all this remarkable jewelleryand fixings on the 'Montcalm' to show what she has done in the line of her intended purpose, which was not that of a supply boat but of an ice-breaker to make a commercial path for ocean steamers.

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Montcalm' was purchased for the purpose first of breaking

the ice in the St. Lawrence river, especially at the ice bridge which tends to form at Cap Rouge, some 6 or 7 miles above Quebec, near the site of the Quebec bridge which collapsed. Owing to the strength of this ice bridge the water in the St. Lawrence is backed up in the spring with the result that the upper parts of the St. Lawrence and also of its tributaries are flooded. If we can succeed in preventing the ice bridge from forming, we will prolong the season of navigation by enabling it to be carried on earlier in the spring. This will probably make a difference of one or two weeks in the season of navigation so that this service will be a great help to ocean navigation and at the same time will be an immense advantage to the farming district bordering on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has had three years' experience and I would ask him to detail what he has accomplished each year with reference to this particular boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. The first year the boat was at the ice bridge for one or two months and prevented the formation of the ice for a certain time.

Mr. FOSTER. When did she commence butting the ice, how long did she keep at it and what were the effects ? If we are to pay the money we must know what she is doing.

Mr. BRODEUR. All this information is contained in the reports of the department for previous years. I have not the report of the first year but I have sent for them and in the meantime shall read the report for the year, 1906-7 :

From December 11, 1906, the 'Montcalm' made almost daily trips to Cap Rouge to prevent the formation of the ice bridge there, and succeeded until January 24, 1907, when the accumulation of ice became so great and the weather so severe that the ice bridge stuck. The ship was kept cutting the jam until February 6, and during this time a track of 800 feet was made from a little below the site of the Quebec bridge to a little above Pointe-à-Basile lower range light.

On February 14, the steamer left for Seven Island and called at several points on the north shore to land mails and freight, she returned to Quebec on the 20th of the same month. Owing to the immense fields of heavy ice met in the river and gulf and the severity of the weather, the trip to Seven Islands was the hardest ever experienced by the 'Montcalm.'

Mr. FOSTER. Why did she go to Seven Islands ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Just to study the situation of the winter navigation in that part of the country, carry the mails and carry supplies.

Mr. FOSTER. Supplies for whom ?

Mr. BRODEUR. For the people of the settlements on that shore. I have explained that, during the previous fall, there had been serious wrecks of schooners, and actual famine was feared in some places. Representations that there was this danger were made to the department, and we were urged very strongly to carry supplies to these districts.

Mr. FOSTER. For humanitarian purposes ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Having the ice-breaker, we thought it well to use her for this service. Before she left, we had every reason to believe that the ice bridge should not form during her absence—

Mr. FOSTER. How did you do that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. By the study of the tide and the moon.

Mr. FOSTER. What ? You sent the steamer, and then prevented the ice bridge from forming by studying the tide and the moon? Wat amount of subsidy was paid for the work that the tide and the moon did ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It may be very pleasant for my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to laugh at my expressions, but I think he must know that the moon has an effect—

Mr. FOSTER. However, while the steamer was gone, I suppose we were not paying much money for what the moon and the tide did ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows, of course, that the tide is much less at some times than at others.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want to make sure is that the government do not take credit for what the tide and the moon did. But what I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) was : During the few days the 'Montcalm' was away on this service, how did he prevent the ice bridge from forming. And he said he did it by studying the moon and tide. But suppose the moon and tide had not come up to time, what means had he for tiding over the absence of the 'Montcalm,' and keeping that ice bridge from forming ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, I suppose I need hardly give such information to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ; but the tide is not always the same—

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I have read that.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) takes advantage of the fact that I am not very familiar with his language—

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, don't put it on that ground.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I put it on that ground—he takes advantage of the fact that I do not speak English perfectly—

Mr. FOSTER. Next thing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) will say is that I am attacking the French language.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) takes advantage of the fact that my expressions are not perfect. But I am trying to explain the case to him. I suppose he will admit that the tide is not always the same. At a certain time, it might be of one character, and a few days after of a different character. Perhaps, I do not express myself very nicely, but I think my hon. friend knows what I am trying to say—that the strength of the sun or the strength of the moon has its effect upon the tide.

Mr. FOSTER. So, my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) took good care to send the 'Montcalm' down to Seven Islands at the particular time when the moon and tide would keep the way open while she was away. Well, now, the stuff he took down was provided by the government, I understand. Did the traders for whom it was taken there pay freight to the government for having the stuff carried down ? The minister was performing a commercial service ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say that it was exactly a commercial service. It was rather a humanitarian service.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it was for poor people who could not otherwise have been supplied ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is aware that there is no communication with that part of the country in the winter. The territory beyond the Saguenay is cut off by that river, and during a certain period of the year there is no communication. Of course, there is no railway communication at any time. We feared a famine ; there was danger that these people would be exposed to death. So, when the reports came to us, I thought it was right to send provisions for these people.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not find fault with the hon. minister for that. But what I was asking is whether these provisions were sent for trading, or were they contributions for the poor people ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They were for people who were interested in these settlements and who were in trade.

Mr. FOSTER. And the traders would supply the people ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister charge a fair commercial freight rate for taking these things down ?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. But, of course, the traders would charge on the goods sold as though freight had been paid, and the poor people would have to pay.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The consumer pays everything.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and therefore I am asking whether the minister took precautions to provide that the traders should pay the freight that they would charge to their customers.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I did not go as far as that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the minister was performing a service to the traders—that is he was performing a service the profit of which was reaped by the traders.

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not admit that. I thought it was the duty of the government, on humanitarian grounds, to see that these people were not exposed to famine. And, as the 'Montcalm' could make the trip and still be ready for the ice breaking service, we thought it well to send her down.

Mr. FOSTER. As I told my hon. friend, no one would quarrel with him for that. But, suppose that these provisions had been contributed for the benefit of these people, the government would have carried out its duty if it had provided the steamer to carry the things down to Seven Islands. That would be all right. But if the government simply provided a means for getting the traders' supplies down to the settlements, they were not doing a charitable work and the traders should have paid a fair freight rate on the goods taken down. Charity and the protection of people against famine is one thing ; but I think the government steamers are not there for the purpose of taking down supplies out of which traders may make a profit. That is all I want to say in reference to that. Do not let my hon. friend try to make any point of the fact that we are criticising him because he went down with the supposition that there was to be a famine and gave a chance to these people to get something to eat during the winter. We find no fault with that. How long after she was down there were you butting the ice ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She left on the 14th and came back on the 20th.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what did she do ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (reading)——

On her return to Quebec the steamer commenced the work of breaking ice below Quebec and continued at this work until March 1. Work was resumed at the Cap Rouge ice bridge an April 2, and the steamer made her way through very heavy ice from Sillery

Point to Pointe au Baril upper range light, cutting a channel 1,000 feet in width.

Mr. FOSTER. What length was that channel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is about three miles, I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. Did she keep the ice-bridge from forming that year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but the ice-bridge left earlier on account of the work which had been carried on there.

Mr. FOSTER. She did not prevent it from forming ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She did not prevent it from forming.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because she was not successful.

Mr. FOSTER. The ice was too strong for her ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. But your conclusion is that as a result of her work the ice-bridge moved out earlier than it otherwise would ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How much earlier ?

Mr. BRODEUR. A couple of weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the gain was two weeks in that year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. And it prevented a flood too.

Mr. FOSTER. It might have prevented the duration of the flood but would it prevent the flood at all ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, because the flood generally took place in former years after the ice was moving, or after the ice began to move from the upper part of the St. Lawrence. This channel was opened by the action of the 'Montcalm' which prevented the flood and at the same time gave navigation an earlier opening.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the result of last year's work was that you probably facilitated the breaking up of the bridge by ten days or a fortnight and you prevented a bad flood ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That was the result.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my hon. friend tell the committee what particular good all those expensive furnishings of the 'Montcalm' did during that arduous winter's work ? What particular use were all those thousands and thousands of dollars worth of plate, silver, tea sets and all that sort of thing ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They were not used during that winter, I am told.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend admits that these were not bought for the workmen ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will not be positive ; it may be that the officers were using them.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the common men who do the work use them ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have their own service.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the ad captandum argument of the minister the other day that everything had to be good for the sailors does not apply because this was not used for the sailors at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was simply answering the hon. gentleman when he suggested that these things were too good for the sailors.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has given us what the ice-breaker did from 1906 until some time in 1907. What did she do from the 30th June, 1906 to the 31st March, 1907—during the nine months of the fiscal year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the early part of July, 1906, the 'Montcalm' went to the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Labrador coast, about 500 miles north of Belle Isle, and then she was engaged in provisioning lighthouses in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by the Auditor General's Report, page P—23 the following item :

Joseph Raymond, Quebec, pilotage of vessels from Quebec to Sorel and return, $74.75.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us the detail of her first year's work when we get back again ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 16) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—Mr. Sam. Hughes.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Herron.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—Mr. Power.

Bill (No. 76) respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—Mr. C. Marcil.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. When the House rose at six o'clock we were reviewing the expenses of the steamer 'Montcalm.' Can the minister give the House the quantity of freight that he took down on that trip and the parties to whom it was consigned ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will get the information later and supply the hon. gentleman with it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is necessary. How far is Seven Islands below Quebec ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About 180 miles on the north shore of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. FOSTER. And that is as far down as the vessel went on that trip ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Seven Islands a farming country ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a fishing place, there is a pulp wood industry, mills, and a whaling industry.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a pulp wood company down there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not precisely at Seven Islands, but some miles from it.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the settlements there called ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Seven Islands.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this pulp-wood concern on the bay at Seven Islands ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is on the river, twelve miles from the bay.

Mr. AMES. I may explain, as I am quite familiar with the locality, that it is a large bay, and Clarke city on the southwest side of the bay, within the sheltered portion of the bay.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the port to which the vessel goes ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She anchors in the bay at Seven Islands, near the lighthouse, and discharges her cargo of supplies.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a wharf at Seven Islands, is there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that there is.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the business people at the place ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The whaling industry, which is carried on, I think, mostly by people from Montreal and Gaspé. The other people are fishermen. Then there is Clark city, which is outside the bay itself. I think it is on the river, some distance from the bay.

Mr. FOSTER. Who owns the wharf at that place ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister has told us that the ice-breaker was sent down for the purpose of conveying provisions, hay and other things for the settlers. How was that done in former years ? Why was there a change, and why had the government steamer to be made use of for the purpose of conveying what no doubt had previously been conveyed by ordinary trading vessels ? It seems to me rather remarkable that a vessel so elaborately fitted up as the 'Montcalm' should be put into a service of this kind. It must have supplanted some of the ordinary vessels that were trading on the St. Lawrence, unless it happened that on this particular occasion sufficient supplies had not been taken there during the season of open navigation. There is something about it that I can scarcely comprehend, for I do not for a moment suppose that the government is entering into competition with the ordinary trading vessels in carrying supplies to the settlers of that district. Though it is a whaling station, I do not suppose that there are any whales caught at Seven Islands. Consequently those engaged in that industry have, no doubt, vessels of their own which go down to the Gaspé coast or the coast of Labrador to capture whales, and their catch would be brought to Seven Islands for the purpose of having the oil, &c., extracted. The owners of the whaling industry would doubtless have vessels to take in all the supplies they wanted for the winter season, and these vessels must have been supplanted when the government in its generosity provided the means of sending down from Montreal or Quebec the necessary provisions for the sustenance of settlers. Perhaps the minister can give us an explanation of this extraordinary policy.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not entered into competition with any existing lines. The service we are performing is performed at a time of the year when there are no vessels at all engaged in the transportation business. As I have explained, there had been several schooners sent from Quebec to

provision the settlements on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and some of these schooners were wrecked. According to statements made to the department, there was fear of a famine amongst the settlers on that coast, a result of the wrecks of schooners taking supplies in the fall. The settlements on the north shore of the St. Lawrence are not very numerous, and they have no communication at all during the winter. So we were not engaged in a business which could compete with any transportation industry—quite the reverse.

Mr. AMES. Did the government charge freight on the provisions carried at regular rates ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we did not charge any freight, because the quantity was not very large. It was done simply for the relief of those people.

Mr. AMES. Did you carry stores for the pulp company at Clarke city free of charge?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. How is the trading of the pulp mill transacted ? Has the pulp company no steamers of its own ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before recess I inquired what the 'Montcalm' was doing during the months of July, August, September and October, 1906. All the report gives us is what she was doing from December up to the 31st March.

Mr. BRODEUR. During the summer she is engaged provisioning the lighthouses. Last spring she was sent to Cabot strait to meet the vessels going into that strait.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was in 1907, but I am asking with reference to the summer 1906.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the month of July 1906, she made a very successful trip to Rigolet on the Labrador coast.

Mr. FOSTER. Where was she from March until July ? We left her in March butting at the ice at Cap Rouge.

Mr. BRODEUR. I said that in July she made a trip to Rigolet.

Mr. TAYLOR. What did she do in August ?

Mr. BRODEUR. My deputy informs me that in August and September she was attending to the supplying of the lighthouses in the Straits of Belle Isle and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was she carrying these gas buoys or coal oil or what kind of supplies ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The supplies for lighthouses generally during July, August and September.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was she doing in October and November ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She must have been attending to that same work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then she was engaged the whole summer from the 1st of July to December carrying supplies to the lighthouses.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. The salaries of the officers for the nine months from 30th June until the 31st March amounted to $5,380. The wages paid the crew amounted to $10,360, and $5,113 for their board. So that she was engaged all the time from the 30th June until the 31st March—steadily running all the time.

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say that she was running all the time. But generally speaking she was employed provisioning the lighthouses. That is the work she attends to during the summer. If the hon. gentleman wants the exact dates, he may get them from the log book.

Mr. TAYLOR. According to the Auditor General's Report, page 323, she made a trip to Sorel and return. Was she up to Sorel carrying supplies and in what month was that? Did she take that trip up there to see what the tides and the man in the moon were doing ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some repairs were made to the vessel in our own yards at Sorel.

Mr. TAYLOR. She had to go there for repairs ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not ice-breaking or carrying supplies. The next item is for pilotage of the vessel, Quebec to Montreal and return, $92.50. What was the occasion and date of that trip ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy and commander cannot now give me that information.

Mr. TAYLOR. At page P—22 the minister will find the following account :

Drolet, F. X., Quebec : installation of steering gear as agreed, $325 ; labour, 6 days at $4.50, 214 days at $4, 242 days at $3.50, 661 days at $3, 80 days at $2.50, 173 days at $2. 199½ hours at 45 cents, 3,340½ hours at 40 cents, 5,003½ hours at 35 cents, 5,430½ hours at 30 cents, 144 hours at 20 cents, (2 men) 22 days at $5, 229½ hours at 60 cents, 1,117 hours at 50 cents; engineer and firemen running engine at night, 56 hours at $5; machine screws, 58 at 30 cents.

A total of $15,257.62.

Judging from the number of days' work that boat must have been laid up for two months while the minister says that during the whole six months she was running.

Were the crew paid while she was being repaired ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the account before me. This account might have been incurred in 1906-07 or in the previous year, I am not sure about that. My impression is it was incurred the year before and paid this year. As to the number of days' work in the account, my hon. friend understands that when a vessel is to be repaired it is important that a large number of men should be put on her so as to rush the work through and save the dockage charges, which are very heavy.

Mr. TAYLOR. But there is a large number of days as well as a large number of hours.

Mr. AMES. Did the 'Montcalm' meet with an accident this fall and have to go into dry dock ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, while near the Straits of Belle Isle provisioning lighthouses she struck on a rock. I ordered an investigation and it was shown that this rock was not on the chart which was in the hands of the captain, who was found to be not to blame.

Mr. FOSTER. Night or day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. At 6.26 in the morning.

Mr. AMES. How seriously was she damaged and how long has she been in Davis' dry dock ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She is still in the dry dock.

Mr. AMES. Five or six weeks ?

Mr. BRODEUR. More than that, she was rather seriously damaged.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are the repairs yet completed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is the extent of the damage known ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know exactly the damage done and the cost of the repairs.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will she be ready in the Spring to take up the work at Cap Rouge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. PRINGLE. Were the supplies for this vessel purchased by tender for instance this $12,000 for coal ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The coal was purchased by tender and as to the supplies, prices are asked from a certain number of people, competitive prices, and they are given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. PRINGLE. Take the account of G. T. Davie & Sons for $3,627.34 at page J—22.

Mr. TAYLOR. Many of these items could not be by tender as they are for work, but were the supplies purchased by tender ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work cannot be done by tender because when an accident happens to a vessel it is impossible to state what the extent of the repairs will be.

Mr. PRINGLE. The account of J. B. Côté is almost entirely for supplies, $1,864. This includes such items as burners for steam launch, galvanized sheet iron, &c., a large number of articles which could be very easily purchased by tender.

Mr. BRODEUR. In some cases it is absolutely impossible to ask for tenders because something may be needed for the boat and has to be purchased by the agent. I do not know whether the articles charged for in this account were bought on the same day. Probably not. This is made up of a number of items grouped together by the Auditor General. Besides, the hon. gentleman will see that there are articles there which could not very well be bought by tender, because we do not know the quantity that will be needed.

Mr. PRINGLE. Take, for instance, the account of F. X. Drolet, of Quebec. Here are charges for such things as brass, copper and muntz metal, 2,326 pounds at forty cents. Were tenders called for this ? There are many items here for which, I should think, tenders might be asked.

Mr. BRODEUR. But we do not know what amount will be required during the year. Take the case referred to, that of Mr. Drolet. Mr. Drolet is a boilermaker and machinist, the best in Quebec ; a man of experience in these things. When a vessel goes into dock, he is called upon to make the repairs, and makes those repairs under the direction of the ship's husband. If he supplies materials for repairs, these cannot very well be bought by tender.

Mr. PRINGLE. Well, you have here items for clothing amounting to thousands of dollars. Of course, for use on an ice-breaker warm clothing is required. I see that overcoats are charged at $30, big prices for suits of clothes, rubber boots, and so on. Surely, these could be bought by contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) must admit that we must look after the clothing of these men, and, as the conditions are severe, they must be supplied with good articles.

Mr. PRINGLE. They should be warmly clad, and, of course, the tailors should get a fair profit. But one man should not have a monopoly of making the clothing for the men on these vessels.

Mr. BRODEUR. This question of clothing was raised on a former occasion by the

hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I may inform him and also my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Pringle)that, though the price of clothing has gone up within the last few years we are paying the same price for uniforms as in 1896.

Mr. TAYLOR. They ought to be cheaper.

Mr. PRINGLE. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) say that the price of clothing had increased. I thought that, under the preferential tariff, the price of tweeds had decreased slightly. I quite admit that these prices are good, substantial prices.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The price of labour on clothing has increased from twenty-five to forty per cent and the prices of woollen goods have increased quite considerably.

Mr. PRINGLE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Zimmerman) tell us if that increase is owing to the fact that our woollen mills have been put out of business ? In my town, Cornwall, we had a very prosperous woollen mill, which made a fine class of tweeds, but, owing to the preferential tariff, it had to go out of business. Is the increase in price of tweeds due to the fact that the competition of the Canadian manufacturers has been removed ?

Mr. TALBOT. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) aware that in parts of Canada other than Cornwall—a very thriving town —the woollen manufacturers have increased their output and the number of their hands ?

Mr. PRINGLE. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) was discussing the question of clothing. On that subject he speaks with great authority. Can he tell me if the tailors have increased their prices ?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The minister states that he has paid the same price for these uniforms as was paid in 1896. I say, if he is doing that, he is getting cheap clothing, because the prices have unquestionably gone up from twenty-five to forty per cent.

Mr. PRINGLE. No doubt the hon. member has looked over these items, and is prepared to say that the charges for clothing are reasonable charges.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am not prepared to say anything of the kind. What I say is that clothing to-day is more expensive than it was a few years ago and I say also that a good article ought to be supplied.

Mr. BLAIN. I am surprised that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) should venture to remind us of the old story we have heard so often about the great prosperity of our manufacturers in Canada.

Mr. TALBOT. I said in other places outside of Cornwall the woollen manufacturers have increased their outputs and the number of their hands.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. member would give us a list of these prosperous factories.

Mr. TALBOT. St. Hyacinthe, for one.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman must remember that it is an every day story with manufacturers——

Mr. TALBOT. It must be a good story.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) is not bound to endorse the story until he has heard it. It is an old story for us to be reminded of the prosperity of our manufacturers. But, to-day, our manufacturing establishments are shutting down and discharging their hands. I do not think there is a manufacturing town in the province of Ontario in which a number of hands have not been discharged during the last three months. In some of the most prosperous sections of Ontario we have the exhibition of municipalities supplying three meals a day for unemployed citizens.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Where ?

Mr. BLAIN. In Mr. Zimmerman's own city, there are many unemployed hands.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I can assure my hon. friend that there is no city on this continent that is proportionately busier than the city of Hamilton to-day. We have fewer men walking the streets in Hamilton to-day than any city in this country and the great majority of the factories are quite busy. I am engaged in a maufacturing business myself and we can hardly get enough help to do our work. We have heard the factory of the International Harvester Company mentioned as having been closed down. They have to-day 1,400 men working, just 400 less than they had in the busy season and 300 more than they had this time last year. That is so in regard to many other manufacturers. It is not a matter of being idle for the want of business ; it is a matter of being idle for the want of capital. The banks, as we all know, have curtailed the credit of the manufacturers and business men to such an extent that they have been compelled to lessen their expenses in some way; consequently a few men here and a few men there were let go but it is not a case of not having the business. They have all the business they can attend to. I was speaking to a manufacturer on Saturday last. He said that he had at least five months works ahead of him and yet they are closed down for two weeks. I presume that is one of the factories that my hon. friend

refers to. They are closed down for two weeks for repairs and he is begrudging the time that they are closed down now.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend will not make that statement that there is not a large number of unemployed mechanics in his own city, will he ?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will say that in so far as the regular factory hands are concerned they are more than fairly well employed.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There are quite a number of men engaged in the building industry who are idle, as they are always at this time of the year, but they have made enough money in the busy season to carry them through the winter season.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid we are wandering away from the subject. We should get back to ice-breakers.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to enter into a controversy with the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman); I merely wish to take a moment or two to answer what my hon. friend has said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is irrelevant is it not ?

Mr. BLAIN. Well, I will not trespass on the rights of the committee and we will take another opportunity of answering my hon. friend. Since the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is so anxious to get back to his ice-breakers I want to ask him a question or two. I see that this unfortunate vessel, the 'Montcalm,' was six days in dry dock being repaired and that it cost the people of the country $500 a day or, $3,627 to repair that vessel. I am informed now that the same vessel has been in dry dock for about two months. Am I correct in that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, about six weeks.

Mr. BLAIN. Now, there is a puzzler for my hon. friend. If it cost the people last year to repair this vessel $500 a day for six days how much will it cost for repairs going on for six weeks ? Perhaps my hon. friend will tell us what estimate his department has made as to what the repairs on this vessel will cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We cannot estimate before she goes into the dock the cost of repairs which are to be made because we do not know exactly what the nature of the repairs will be. The boat is now in the dock and the work is being carried on under the supervision of the ship's husband.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the ship's husband ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN

Mr. FOSTER. Who is he ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He used to be employed in the Imperial dockyard at Halifax.

Mr. BLAIN. Then my hon. friend is not able to give the committee an estimate of what it will cost to complete the repairs of this vessel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we cannot do it because when you commence the repairs you do not know exactly the extent of them. It is only as you proceed that you can ascertain the nature of the work that is to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. That bill will evidently be a large one.

Mr. BRODEUR. Probably.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably ? It cannot be any other way.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be a very large bill. Besides that you are losing the use of the vessel entirely for this season. How is the ice bridge progressing down there at the present time ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is pretty mild weather just now and Providence is still with us.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been some pretty sharp weather, has there not ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not so far.

Mr. FOSTER. And there is no formation of an ice bridge yet ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No formation of an ice bridge yet.

Mr. FOSTER. The moon and tides are getting in their work.

Mr. BRODEUR. The moon and tides and everything else. Providence is with us.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You do not always give credit to Providence.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as this year is concerned the country has got on just as well without the ice-breaker as if you had her; in fact the country has got on a great deal better except that while the critter is up in the straps she is costing the country a large amount of money. Who is conducting the investigation into that accident, which perhaps ought not to have occurred, and which is responsible for all this cost and all this loss ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The wreck commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the wreck commissioner ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Commander Spain.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any written report been presented to parliament in reference to it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No report has been presented to parliament but a report has been presented to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish the minister would bring the report down.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had this net result from the 'Montcalm'—she was first put into service at what date ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Three or four years ago; I do not exactly remember the date.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the time. I want to know what she has done since you have had her.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am very willing to give that information but as the boat went into commission four or five years ago I think the hon. gentleman is asking a good deal of a minister. But, I am willing to give it. I will try to get it for my hon. friend although I do not think it is information I should be called upon to give. We are now discussing the estimates for the coming fiscal year, and I do not know that it is exactly fair to ask that I should give information about expenditures that occurred three or four years ago and give the exact date at which each vessel went into commission. It is going very far to ask me that. However, now that the question has been asked I shall try to get the explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me explain to the minister why I asked this. I would have asked the same question if we had had no little trouble during the last three or four days. I do not want him to run away with the idea that this comes because there has been a little brush between the two sides of the House. What I am after is this : This government has started in on the policy of ice breakers, it commenced with one, it now has four. Now, after the 'Montcalm' your first great ice breaker, has been at work for four years it is quite time we should review the situation so as to determine whether or not the policy of getting ice breaking vessels as it has been developed by the government, has proved successful or not. I suppose the minister will agree with me that an ice breaker like the 'Montcalm' is a very expensive vessel to employ from the 1st of May until December in the lighthouse supply service. She is a costly vessel, she was never built for that service, and is a most expensive vessel to maintain. Three fourths of the time of the 'Montcalm' is taken up in general work of supplying lighthouses which is a lighter vessel with less power and far less expensive to run could very well do. In the interval for about three months she is doing more or less ice breaking. If after four years you find she performs no very great service in ice-breaking and that three-fourths of her time is taken up in supply business it becomes a question for a thoughtful and economical minister to find out whether or not his policy in this regard is right. So far as two years are concerned we have got pretty well the history of this vessel—one year she succeeded in making about a fortnight's advance in the going out of the ice bridge; that is presumably she did, but no one knows what the moon and the tide were doing all this time and what the peculiarities of the season were doing towards making the ice bridge move. All that is claimed for her is that in that three months she was instrumental in pushing out the ice bridge by two weeks and in preventing may be some floods. The other part of her winter work was to run down to Seven Islands carrying a lot of freight for traders and supply people without charging them anything for it ; cavorting around a little in the harbour and then coming back to take up her work at the ice, presumably on the ground that the moon and the tide by that time had got pretty tired out and wanted a little rest. This year her record is infinitely worse. For some reason or other, or for no reason, while she was engaged in work she never was built for or intended for, (and which could only be excused if she had performed very important and successful work in the winter time ice breaking) she runs upon a rock, is disabled from doing any work, this winter, has been in dock for six weeks and the minister does not know how long she will remain there. Fifteen thousand dollars was put on her and charged to the people of the country in the last fiscal year of nine months.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thirty thousand.

Mr. FOSTER. In the one single case of Drolet, that was the Bill. She then went to Sorel.

Mr. TAYLOR. $10,000 at Sorel.

Mr. FOSTER. Now she is in dry dock and she will cost an immense amount of money. I want to know the whole history of her work for the four or five years we have had her and then we can know whether it is a wise policy to go on buying other ice breakers.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Before the minister proceeds to give the history of that boat for the past forty or fifty years I want to make a few suggestions to him.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman. I am trying to get some information from the minister and the minister is ready to give it and we will take the suggestions from my hon. friend (Mr. Johnston) later, if it is

just as convenient to him. I know I deprive myself of an immense amount of benefit but I am willing to run the risk of that for the sake of getting enlightenment which will come from the minister himself.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I want to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that I am not going to make any suggestions to him. In his wildest moments I hope he would not accuse me of that.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the right to have my question answered by the minister.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have the floor. Representing as I do probably the second largest shipping port in the Dominion, I have to say that last spring the 'Montcalm' rendered splendid service to the shipping interests of the port of Sydney. She was in the Gulf during the months of April, May and June, and she then rendered great service not only to the shipping entering Sydney harbour but to the shipping navigating the Gulf.

Mr. BERGERON. Did my hon. friend see the 'Montcalm' down there then?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman was in Ottawa at that time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. No. After the results of the elections of the last day or two, it is not surprising that my hon. friend for Beauharnois should be astray. He thinks the House was in session last year in June and July.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not speak of June and July. The hon. gentleman spoke of April and May.

Mr. JOHNSTON. After the House adjourns, I will take my hon. friend out and tell him the time the House rose last year. However, this is only in keeping with his conduct of the last few days, when he was talking about things of which he knew nothing. To come back to the ice-breaker, I want to suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that every possible effort be made to get this steamship repaired, so that she may be ready next spring to resume the work which she was doing last spring, and which was of immense benefit to shipping. The purchase and equipment of this ice-breaker has been and is to-day approved of by everybody who has any interest in shipping in this country.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the hon. gentleman tell what she has done?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I could tell my hon. friend very well, but I want to address the few words I have to say to the minister.

Mr. DANIEL. Might I ask my hon. friend what service the 'Montcalm' was rendering?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The 'Montcalm' was rendering splendid service in the gulf and River St. Lawrence.

Mr. DANIEL. I thought my hon. friend was speaking of the eastern coast of Nova Scotia.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am speaking of Cabot Strait, in which last year there was more than the usual quantity of drift ice, causing considerable delay to navigation. Take, for instance, the port of Sydney, where there is an important coal trade, important not only to Sydney but to the whole of Canada. That trade was seriously interrupted last year by the unusual quantity of drift ice in Cabot Strait, and shipping was facilitated by the operations of the 'Montcalm.' The ice was moving from time to time, sometimes to the Newfoundland coast and sometimes to the eastern coast of Nova Scotia. The 'Montcalm' communicated by wireless with Sydney, and reports were sent all over the country as to the flow of ice, so that steamers could take the southern route or the northern route according to the direction of the flow.

Mr. PRINGLE. Might I ask my hon. friend if the 'Montcalm' got the ice out of the harbour of Sydney?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am addressing my observations to gentlemen who have some conception of the nature of shipping.

Mr. PRINGLE. I have some conception of the fact that the 'Montcalm' cost this country $100,000. The hon. gentleman was talking about the harbour of Sydney, and I want to know what service she rendered in that harbour.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If my hon. friend asks any member of the Shipping Federation in Montreal, I care not whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative, he will tell him unhesitatingly that the 'Montcalm', not only last year, but every year that she has been in commission has rendered splendid service to the shipping of this country. I was pointing out that the 'Montcalm' from time to time, during April, May and June, directed ships as to the course they should pursue in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. STANSFIELD. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He stated that during the months of April, May and June Marconi messages were sent to Sydney. I call his attention to page P—23 of the Auditor General's Report, where a charge is made for an operator employed for three months to September 30. There is no charge for April or May.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I suppose my hon. friend would be surprised if I told him that we have had Marconi operators employed at Sydney for the last four years, and ships have been communicating every day with

Glace Bay. Surely my hon. friend knows that. I speak of the service rendered by the 'Montcalm', because it has been of supreme importance not only to my constituency, but to shipping interests generally; and I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see to it that every possible effort is made to have her placed in the same position as she was in last spring, in order that she may continue to do the work which is of so much importance to the people of this country.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Where was she going when the hon. gentleman took that trip on her ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In view of the observations made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) it may be necessary for me to explain why the government purchased the 'Montcalm' and some other ice-breakers. The hon. gentleman stated that this policy of ice-breakers has been started by this government. I suppose he forgot that the first ice-breaker bought for this country was the 'Stanley,' which was purchased in 1885 or thereabouts.

Mr. FOSTER. The 'Stanley' was not engaged for this ice-breaking policy.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has referred to the four ice-breakers that we have.

Mr. FOSTER. If you count her as an ice-breaker ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' are ice-breakers.

Mr. FOSTER. They were built for commercial work entirely.

Mr. BRODEUR. And at the same time for breaking ice.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to tell the hon. member that if he would put a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, he could do without an ice-breaker.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will discuss the tunnel at another time. I am glad the question, whether we should have ice-breakers or not, has been brought up. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) criticises the government because we have purchased an ice-breaker for the river St. Lawrence. I take issue with him. The shipping interest, which has certainly done the most in building up navigation, have been for years asking that ice-breakers should be put on the St. Lawrence route. My hon. friend wants to know what the steamer 'Montcalm' has done. I suppose it is hardly necessary for me to argue that the work was useful. I would simply say that all those connected with the navigation of the St. Lawrence approve of our having an ice-breaker like the 'Montcalm,' and it was in response to their repeated representations that we purchased that vessel. My hon. friend seems to think that the 'Montcalm' has not been doing anything to help navigation. Let me tell him that if he will go to Montreal and consult the people interested there in shipping, he will find that there is not one dissenting voice among them regarding the advisability of our having such a vessel as the 'Montcalm.' But possibly my hon. friend does not care much about the shipping interests Possibly he may say that the shipping interests are simply looking out for themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so.

Mr. BRODEUR. But my hon. friend might say so.

Mr. FOSTER. I might not say so.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then why does my hon. friend criticise the policy of this government in purchasing ice-breakers ? He says he is not sure that the policy is a good one. He might argue that the shipping interests are simply looking after their own particular advantage and not the interests of the country generally. Well, the whole country is interesed in every possible advantage being given to facilitate navigation ; and if by breaking up the ice, we succeed in lengthening our season of navigation, if we thereby enable the exporters of this country to ship their products ten, fifteen or twenty days or a month longer than they are now doing, it seems to me that we are doing what everybody interested in trade cannot but approve. Let me give, not only the opinion of the shipping interest but also the opinion of the men engaged in the work of the 'Montcalm.' Take the report of Captain Kœnig, an experienced sailor, who has been in the service of this country some thirty years. This is what he reports of the work done by the 'Montcalm' in the year 1904-5, her first year of service :

> I believe that the 'Montcalm' has rendered valuable services in assisting to open navigation at an earlier date than usual, when it was left to follow the natural course as in past years. Another result of ice-breaking in the jam is the prevention of the river floods which occurred yearly between Quebec and Montreal, when the channel was blocked by the ice in the jam at Cap Rouge.

Will the hon. gentleman say that we were derelict in our duty when we took the proper steps to prevent the flooding of the immense quantity of land on the banks of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal ?

Mr. DANIEL. What report is the minister reading from ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am reading from the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1905. My excuse for quoting from that report is the request of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to be informed of all the work done by 'Montcalm' since she was purchased. That vessel gave us earlier navigation and also prevented floods. Will my hon. friend dispute the utility of such a work ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the minister contend that it is a great advantage to prevent the flooding of lands along the river St. Lawrence in the spring ? I have understood that the overflow of the St. Lawrence on those hay lands made them very much more fruitful and enabled the farmers to raise twenty years in succession large quantities of hay upon them. Possibly, therefore, the advantage may not be what the minister pretends. However, I am not an expert. Possibly the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) knows more than I do and possibly more than does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BERGERON. He knows more about straw.

Mr. TALBOT. As the hon. gentleman admits that I know more about the district than he does——

Mr. HENDERSON. I would much rather have the information from the minister responsible.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member for Bellechasse knows more about straw than anything else.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want the information from the minister, because it will come from him with an authority which it would not have coming from the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). If we had it from that hon. gentleman, we could not go to the country and say we have it on the authority of a minister of the Crown. On this side we have to be very modest as all we can get is what the government chooses to give us. But what we want is the very best of what little we can get. I do not want anything second hand when I know I can get it first hand. Consequently the hon. member for Bellechasse will excuse me for setting him aside at this moment and getting an expert opinion from the Minister of Marine. No doubt the minister is an authority on hay because he is an authority on most things in the province of Quebec and therefore will be able to give an opinion on the question I put to him.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have always thought —I may be mistaken—because my hon. friend has very much more experience than I, and is a little older and has been in the House many more years, that on a question such as this, as to whether swamp lands are better than drained lands, he could express a better opinion than I can. While I think my hon. friend, with his knowledge, could answer the question much better than I can, still I am willing to give my opinion although it is not an expert opinion.

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh then, we do not want it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought it was an advantage to have the water off the land when seeding began.

Mr. HENDERSON. But this is hay land.

Mr. BRODEUR. But there is some seeding. We are not a very large province, but we do some seeding.

Mr. BERGERON. I would suggest that instead of reading the report the minister should give us the dates of the opening of navigation for eight or nine years before the 'Montcalm' was put in service and since her acquisition.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am reading from the report of a man who has experience, Captain Kœnig. He says :

> The very fact of a broad channel, four miles long, cut through a wall of deep ice, must have let out an immense amount of water, which would have, otherwise, accumulated above and caused the usual floods.

I suppose my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) does not object to our taking means to prevent the floods?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will not take my suggestion which would shorten the discussion and give us the dates; we can judge better than Captain Koenig.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what I was coming at. Captain Koenig says :

> Then again the fact of the ice giving way during the ebb tide for the first time to the knowledge of any man is another important evidence of the work of the 'Montcalm.' This is backed by the fact that the ice, when it did come down, was firm, deep and very heavy; so much as to block up the passage behind the 'Montcalm.' Another evidence of the extraordinary thickness of the ice cut by the ice-breaker is that, when it moved down the river, it blocked the channel by actually grounding far out on each side of the river.
>
> After the 'Montcalm' got her work well under way it was observed here in the port of Quebec by the masters of ferry boats, that the currents were stronger than ever before, when an ice bridge existed from Chaudière up; therefore, this is another convincing proof that there was a greater flow of water than there would have been had the channel been blocked as it formerly was when the ice bridge existed its full length and breadth.

Nothing could be clearer than that; it shows conclusively that we have opened navigation earlier and prevented the floods.

That is not all. I have said that the 'Montcalm' assisted in navigaion, and had prevented serious accidents in Cabot Straits. I find in this report:

Left from Quebec on April 25, and went down the river to the gulf, in the vicinity of Cape Ray. On the 28th we met the ss. 'Manchester,' and gave her assistance through the ice on the way to Sydney, Cape Breton.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And that is only one year.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is only one year. The work done in 1906 is to be found in the report of 1906, and from it we see that the Montcalm worked steadily in December, January and February breaking ice at Cap Rouge.

Mr. BERGERON. Give the dates.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say as a general statement that the work of the icebreaker has resulted in the opening of navigation from ten to fifteen days earlier than formerly, and steamers with fruit arrived from the Mediterranean two years ago at Montreal, two weeks earlier in the spring than formerly.

Mr. MORIN. At what date?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the exact dates, but I may get them.

Mr. FOSTER. When did the 'Montcalm' first go into commission?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was built in 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. When did she go into commission?

Mr. BRODEUR. As soon as she came out.

Mr. BERGERON. Was money voted for her before she was bought?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose so.

Mr. MORIN. How many tons of coal does that boat consume per day?

Mr. BRODEUR. About 40 tons.

Mr. MORIN. Where is the coal bought?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Nova Scotia—Canadian coal.

Mr. MORIN. How much is paid per ton?

Mr. BRODEUR. We pay, I think, $3.50 per ton at the mine—$4.10 at Quebec.

Mr. MORIN. Does not the hon. minister think he pays too much for his coal?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the lowest price we can get it. We called for tenders and gave the contract to the lowest tenderer. And this year, the company will not renew the contract at the same price, and we have had to call for new tenders.

Mr. MORIN. Could not coal be got from Baltimore or Pennsylvania a good deal cheaper?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so. Pennsylvania coal is hard coal. What we require is steam coal.

Mr. MORIN. Pennsylvania has both hard and soft coal.

Mr. BRODEUR. We must try to encourage Canadian coal.

Mr. MORIN. Coal could be got loaded on cars in Pennsylvania for about $1.05 to $1.10 per ton. The haul to Niagara Falls is about 250 miles. Your coal would cost you about $4 a ton, but then you would have an extra coal, for Pennsylvania coal is better than coal from Sydney.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MORIN. Hold on gentlemen—

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a very serious charge against our country.

Mr. MORIN. No charge at all. I want to show these gentlemen that they are laughing too soon—they are trying to walk before they can creep. Take the vessels of the sixteen steamship companies that come to New York. Years ago, they used to coal in England for the round trip. Afterwards they bought part of their coal in Cape Breton—some as they passed eastbound, and some as they passed westbound. The Pennsylvania coal was discovered in 1865. People from Nova Scotia have brought cargoes of coal to Philadelphia, New York and Baltimore, but they cannot sell that coal to these great steamship companies at all—they would not have it as a gift. The coal is bought for some of the small vessels, but these sixteen companies that carry the mails between Europe and America will not have anything but Pennsylvania coal. The coal from Sydney is impregnated with sulphur. So, gentlemen, I know what I am talking about. You can laugh, if you please, now.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) should try to induce this House to believe that our Canadian coal is inferior to Pennsylvania coal. My department has been using Canadian coal for some years past, and we are perfectly satisfied with it. When the hon. gentleman says that we can get coal cheaper in the United States than here, he is mistaken. The American coal dealers could tender, but where they have done so, we found that the prices, with duty added, would be higher than those we pay for Canadian coal. The hon. gentleman says that coal can be bought in Pennsylvania at $1.05. I do not understand that, for, at that price, I should think it could be brought to Sorel—because that is where we purchase it—at a lower figure. But I know that, with the duty added, the price is higher than that of Canadian coal. I think we should not be justified in discarding Canadian coal under the circum-

stances. I suppose that, in view of these explanations, my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) will say that the department is justified in its action.

Mr. J. D. REID. When and where did the department advertise giving the Americans an opportunity to tender ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Public advertisements were put in the newspapers.

Mr. J. D. REID. What newspapers ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Newspapers in Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. J. D. REID. When were the tenders called for ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I should be glad to ascertain the dates. We have advertised in the newspapers a number of times calling for tenders.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the hon. minister copies of the tenders here ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I want to get back to the information I asked for. Is the hon. minister now ready to tell me at what time in 1904 the 'Montcalm' was put in commission ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the date.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it in the summer of 1904 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am advised that she arrived in December, 1904, and was put in commission.

Mr. FOSTER. What work was done in December 1904, and January and February, 1905 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I see that she left Quebec on December 23, at nine a.m. and proceeded up towards Cap Rouge. On the way up she met some accumulated ice. On December 29, she found some ice jammed between the Quebec bridge and piers and broke her way through. On the 5th and 6th January, about the same thing. During January and February she was working on these lines. That is the report I read a few moments ago.

Mr. FOSTER. What was her success ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The result, as shown by the report of Captain Koenig, he says:

I believe that the 'Montcalm' has rendered valuable services in assisting to open navigation at an earlier date than usual, when it was left to follow the natural course as in past years. Another result of ice-breaking in the jam is the prevention of the river floods which occurred yearly between Quebec and Montreal, when the channel was blocked by the ice in the jam at Cap Rouge.

Then the report goes on to show that when April came, the 'Montcalm' went down to Cape Ray and met the 'Manchester' and gave her assistance through the ice on the way to Sydney.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) seems to doubt the accuracy of my statement that the coal costs $1.05 to $1.10 at the coal bank in Pennsylvania. I know very well the price of coal there. I saw coal sold and I sold it myself for seventy cents a ton loaded on the car. I know that prices have gone up since then, but I know it sells for $1.05 and $1.10 yet because I am selling some to-day.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh.

Mr. MORIN. Yes, there is a difference between the man who speaks from what he knows and the one who speaks from hearsay. The minister says I want to discredit Canadian coal. I say nothing of the kind. There is coal at Springhill, George's Creek, Maryland, and Mahoning Creek, Pennsylvania. It makes no difference what you say, the coal is there and you cannot make it any better or any worse. You have to get your anthracite coal from Pennsylvania because you cannot get it anywhere else. It is the same with 'E' vein coal. It is ahead of English, Scotch, Sydney or Springhill coal. I do not want to discredit anybody's coal. I am here to speak from what I know and from my experience.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us a statement of the work of the 'Montcalm' in 1905? During the summer, I suppose, she was engaged as usual.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And in December she was at her work again?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, on the 3rd December, 1905. The first work that she did was to break the ice ahead of the 'Lake Michigan.' She accompanied the 'Lake Michigan' to Manicouagan, Martin river, and she cut the ice ahead of that steamship.

Mr. FOSTER. Coming up or going down?

Mr. BRODEUR. Going down. They received orders on the morning of the 3rd December to get ready to proceed down to Manicougan, Martin river, and cut the ice ahead of the steamship 'Lake Michigan.' At 3 p.m. they were at Quebec, alongside of the 'Lake Michigan' in order to be ready at daylight. At 6.30 p.m. they left for Louise Basin to joint the steamship 'Lake Michigan.' That was in the month of December.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the 3rd December?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th. She had been working the whole time. I am simply giving what she had been doing during these days.

Mr. FOSTER. Well? She took out the 'Lake Michigan'?

Mr. J. D. REID. That is 20 hours that she was at work in that year.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is not serious.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes.

Mr BRODEUR I read that on the 3rd December she received orders from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to get ready to proceed down to Manicouagan, Martin river, and cut the ice ahead of the steamship 'Lake Michigan.'

December 4, 3 p.m., left King's wharf and proceeded to Louise basin, and went alongside the 'Lake Michigan,' in order to be ready at daylight.

December 5, at 6.30 a.m., left Louise basin with ss. 'Lake Michigan.' Weather cold and fine, strong west southwest wind, river covered with ice from five to eight inches thick. Proceeded ahead of her to cut the ice.

You see the importance of the work she carried on that year.

Mr. BERGERON. Is she a bigger boat than the 'Lake Michigan'?

Mr. BRODEUR. In so far as her tonnage is concerned I do not think she is but she may be more powerful.

Mr. BERGERON. How could she break the ice any more than the 'Lake Michigan' could?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because she is more powerful and she is an ice-breaker. On December 7 and 8 she was working with the 'Lake Michigan.'

Mr. BERGERON. That is the second year?

Mr. BRODEUR. The second year.

Mr. BERGERON. In the first year how many days did she work? My hon. friend says 208 hours. That must be a mistake.

Mr. BRODEUR. It must be a mistake. On December 23, 1904, she began work and she worked on December 29, continuing in January and in February. The days are all given in January and February, and she continued on.

Mr. BERGERON. She did not work every day?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was at the wharf and sometimes she would go up the river. If the weather was mild and there was no necessity of her to go up the river she would not go.

Mr. BERGERON. She was under steam all the time?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was under steam all the time. Now, coming again to 1905—

Mr. FOSTER. You have got to the 8th and she is cutting ice ahead of the 'Lake Michigan.'

Mr. BRODEUR. On the 8th she was in Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. On the 8th she came back then?

Mr. BRODEUR. She arrived at Quebec at 3.15 p.m. on the 7th. On the 8th at Quebec; on the 9th at Quebec; on the 10th at Quebec; on the 11th at Levis; and on the 12th at Lévis.

Mr. FOSTER. Was she at work on these days?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was waiting for the high tide. You there see the importance of the high tide.

Mr. FOSTER. She was waiting from the 7th to the 9th?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, she was waiting until the 12th.

Mr. FOSTER. What was she doing on the 7th, 8th and 9th?

Mr. BRODEUR. Waiting at Quebec for high tide.

Mr. FOSTER. She was not at work; she was simply waiting.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose the weather was mild and there was no necessity for her to go up the river. On the 14th she was in dock.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the matter?

Mr. BRODEUR. The blades had to be changed.

December 15—Finished putting blades on at noon.

At 8 p.m., at highwater, she left Mr. Davie's dock. On the 16th she went up to St. Nicholas to pick up a buoy reported adrift in the ice. On the 18th she went to St. Nicholas. On the 19th, 'the ice in the river running down freely'; she was in Quebec. On the 21st, 22nd, 24th and 25th she was there ready for her work. During all the remaining days of December and during the days of January she was going up the river when it was necessary, or at Levis on the other side, and that continued until the 31st March.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the ice bridge form that year?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. She successfully broke up the ice bridge and the ferry boats protested against the ice floating down and making the crossing difficult for them.

Mr. BERGERON. When she is not breaking ice what does she do?

Mr. BRODEUR. She is on the lighthouse supply service.

Mr. BLAIN. At page 13 of the Report of the Marine and Fisheries Department I find this statement:

In the early part of July, 1906, the 'Montcalm' made a very successful trip to Rigolet, on the Labrador coast, about 500 miles north of Belle Isle, to bring back a party of surveyors sent there by the local government of the province of Quebec.

It cost $250 a day to run that vessel; did the Quebec government pay for this work?

Mr. BRODEUR. This was in connection with a survey in which both the Dominion of Canada and the province of Quebec are interested. The Newfoundland government claim a larger strip of the Labrador coast, not only in the territory of Quebec but in the territory of Ungava which belongs to the Dominion, and this survey party was sent there in that service.

Mr. BLAIN. How did it come that the surveyors were employed exclusively by the Quebec government.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were making a survey to delimit the line. The Newfoundland government is claiming a much larger strip than is shown on our maps and a survey party was sent there in connection with the case which is now before the courts.

Mr. BLAIN. How did the province of Quebec come to appoint the survey party if the Dominion government is interested?

Mr. BRODEUR. We did the transportation and they did the survey.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that according to agreement between the two governments?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand so; it took place some years ago. The provincial government asked that we should send a boat to carry out that party of surveyors who were engaged in this work.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister bring down the correspondence between this government and the provincial government relative to the survey.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. This House has a right to complain of the meagreness of the information given in the Report of the Marine Department in regard to these vessels. The minister has been asked a great many questions to-night which there would be no need for asking if the information that ought to be given in this report were given in it. All the information that is in the books with regard to the departmental steamers is contained in 67 pages of pretty large print which is pretty widely spaced. That information is very meagre. For instance all that is said about the 'Lady Grey' the last steamer that we purchased is this:

The 'Lady Grey' is a twin screw steamer which was built for the department last year by Vickers, Sons & Maxim, of England. She has performed excellent work in regard to the St. Lawrence ship channel and is under the control of Mr. Cowie, the superintending engineer.

There is not a word as to her length, as to her width, as to her depth, as to her indicated horse-power; there is nothing in that report to give one the slightest idea as to whether the steamer is 2,000 tons or 100 tons capacity. We have good reason to complain of that lack of information. We can form no idea of the value of the vessel or what she is capable of performing. This ice breaking business is largely experimental in Canada, although it is not experimental to the same extent in the gulf of Finland and other parts of Europe, and we should have full particulars with regard to it. I looked through this report expecting to find statements from the navigating officers of these ships telling us what they have done and what they are capable of doing in the matter of ice-breaking. We know there are ice-breaking steamers at present in use in other countries that are capable of cutting through ice 25 feet thick, but there is no information in this report with regard to the capacity of the 'Montcalm,' the 'Stanley,' or the 'Minto'.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The 'Minto' wont cut much ice if you look at what she has been doing this winter.

Mr. DANIEL. The report of the captain of this steamer would give us the thickness of the ice met with in the straits of Northumberland.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The captain's report would not be worth anything.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know how otherwise we can get the information. The opposition in this House is charged with seeking information in the interests of the public. The information which we cannot get in regard to our own steamers is very fully given in regard to steamers of other nationalities and in other places. Looking this evening through a copy of the Scientific American, I came across a very interesting article about ice breakers. This report gives the indicated horse-power of the 'Montcalm' as 3,000, the tonnage as 1,432 tons and the displacement as 2,130 tons. This article describes a similar ice breaking steamer, with an indicated horse-power of 2,250; so that she is not so powerful a vessel as the 'Montcalm.' She is called the 'Sampo' and was built in the River Tyne. She has a propellor at each end, the bow engine being 1,200 indicated horse-power and the stern engine 1,350. She is 202 feet long, with 2,000 tons displacement. The 'Montcalm' is 252 feet long. The 'Sampo' has a draft of eighteen feet, with all her coal and stores on board and her sides are angled considerably. She was put to work at the commencement of the winter of 1898, and has been most successful during her

career. As to the thickness of ice she has been able to go up against and break through, this article says :

The actual performance of the 'Sampo' in the Gulf of Finland shows that she has a very efficient form for ice-breaking; she passes through field ice of twelve inches to sixteen inches in thickness at eight knots an hour. The thickness of the drift ice she has generally been at work in is some eight to ten feet, through which she can pass at from two to three knots an hour. She also breaks down larger packs without much trouble. It is found in practice with this vessel that charging in drift ice is more effective than cutting it down with the bow propellor, as is advocated in America.

It would seem that this ship is really not as powerful as the 'Montcalm.' So far as I know, we have no information as to the capabilities of the 'Montcalm' in these respects, and that is where I think this report is faulty in the extreme. I do not know the thickness of the ice in the Northumberland straits, but I do not think it is more than twenty-five feet, which the 'Ermack' is capable of going through. I suppose there is a good deal of floating ice and spongy ice, which is easily broken through ; and it may be that with strong winds there is a thick ice pack, which is a different proposition. But it would seem as if there ought not to be any difficulty in obtaining an ice breaking steamer which would be capable of keeping the Straits of Northumberland open in the winter time. This book does not give the horse-power of the 'Stanley,' though it gives her length, her beam, her depth of hull and her gross tonnage. In the case of the 'Minto' it gives her length, her depth, her width, her tonnage and also her indicated horse-power, which is 2,900. The latter vessel ought to be able to do as well as the steamer I have just referred to. I would like the minister therefore to tell the House if he has the information, what the capabilities of the 'Minto' are in regard to going through ice. That would give us some idea as to whether we are getting full value for the money we have been paying for these ice breaking steamers, which have been expensive both in their initial cost and in their upkeep. One member spoke of our paying $500 a day for dry docking the 'Montcalm.' I would like to know whether that took place at the government dock at Quebec or at some other dry dock. As the government built the Quebec dock and is keeping it up, it certainly ought not to be obliged to pay when it puts government steamers there.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend probably had not the opportunity of reading over the whole report. On page 65, the 'Lady Grey' is described as a twin screw steamer, which was built for the department last year by Vickers Sons & Maxim of England. She has performed excellent work in regard to the St. Lawrence ship channel and is under the control of Mr. Cowie, the superintending engineer. If he had read page 85, he would have found there a description of the boat. On page 9 he will find what the 'Lady Grey' has been doing :

The steamer 'Lady Grey,' a powerful and well-equipped ice-breaking, surveying and sweeping tug, was built in Great Britain and arrived in Canada late in the season of 1906. This vessel, immediately on her arrival, was able to render assistance to the 'Athenia,' a Donaldson liner. The 'Athenia' was relieved from a very dangerous position at Cap à La Roche and prevented from being wrecked or very seriously damaged, by the timely aid of the 'Lady Grey.' The vessel, with its large cargo, was estimated to have a value of $1,000,000, and was floated by the aid of the 'Lady Grey,' before any serious damage had been done to the ship's bottom, and she proceeded on her voyage to Glasgow without more delay than a few hours.

Mr. DANIEL. I find that the description of the 'Lady Grey' is given in the list of tugs. I never thought the 'Lady Grey' was a tug and imagined she was worthy of a better name. So I did not look in the index under the word 'tugs' for a description of the 'Lady Grey.' I did not think we had to send to England to have a tugboat built.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend had read carefully page 85, he would have found the report of Mr. Cowie on the work done in the St. Lawrence ship channel. The dredging plant employed in that channel is described on pages 83 to 88 and he would have found there a description of the 'Lady Grey.'

Mr. BERGERON. What did she cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have the figures somewhere, but the 'Lady Grey' does not come under this item.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the price of the 'Montcalm' ? Was she built by order of the government on the authority of parliament, and when was that authority given ?

Mr. BRODEUR. She cost $265,233 and was ordered by the government. She must have been ordered on the authority of parliament because we could not pay the money without such an order.

Mr. BERGERON. Some moneys are paid without the order of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. How about those buffaloes?

Mr. FIELDING. They were bought on the authority of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. No, on Governor General's warrant.

Mr. FIELDING. Parliament authorized the Governor General's warrant.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the money voted after the boat was purchased instead of having the authority of parliament before the purchase, and having the advisability of the purchase discussed ? The department buys steamers and then comes to parliament for the money

Mr. FIELDING. In exceptional circumstances, the minister might make a bargain of that nature, but it would have no effect if parliament did not vote the money. The minister would make the bargain subject to parliament voting the money.

Mr. NORTHRUP. In discussing the work done by the 'Montcalm,' I said it had worked 210 hours in the year ending June, 1905. I made the statement in good faith, but now I find, on looking over the official report, page 212, that she only worked 208½ hours in that year, and I therefore withdraw my previous statement and apologize to the House for having made it. I think we may be thankful that she did not work any more days, and I think the country ought to be grateful too. I see that she used over $17,000 worth of coal, so it is fortunate that she only worked 20 days of ten hours a day. The poor old boat was built for the government very rapidly according to the report of Captain Koening and arrived in Quebec in such a condition that a large amount of money had to be spent on her to put her in proper condition to work in the ice. A boat laden with such valuable glassware, with teacups at $4 apiece was perhaps safer moored to the dock, but it is possible that instead of loading the boat with such perishable freight and tying her up at dock it might have been better to send her out to break the ice.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the statements made by my hon. friend are not absolutely correct although he has apparently intended to be frank. He claimed that the work of an ice-breaker is simply when she was working at the ice, but in this he is mistaken. When it was necessary she went up the river to break the ice, but when the ice was flowing down the river it was not necessary to go up although steam had to be kept on. My hon. friend will remember that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) took the government to task some years ago because of the floods on the St. Lawrence, saying that we had not done our duty because we had not ice-breakers ; but now when we have the ice-breakers my hon. friend criticises us because we do not have them working when there is no ice.

Mr. BERGERON. Is my hon. friend serious in saying that the boat has prevented floods ? We are threatened with floods between Montreal and Lake St. Louis, but the work of the 'Montcalm' has nothing to do with preventing floods there.

Mr. TALBOT. The ice bridge at Cap Rouge, the narrowest part of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal, is a key, and when the ice from Montreal and the upper St. Lawrence strikes the ice bridge there, the water backs up until every parish in Berthier and Maskinongé is flooded. The work of the 'Montcalm' has been to try to break the jam, and not being able to do it in the winter her work was to do it in the spring, in order to allow the ice to flow down. That has been the 'Montcalm's' work and it has been done satisfactorily. My hon. friend asks whether it was done on the 15th or 16th of April ; that does not cut any ice as far as the ice breaking is concerned. But the question in which the country is interested is this : Has the 'Montcalm' opened navigation earlier in the spring ? Has she done satisfactorily the work for which she was intended in the interest of shipping and of Canada ?

Mr. BERGERON. But everybody knows that, regardless of the work of the 'Montcalm,' sometimes there are floods on the St. Lawrence in spring and sometimes there are not. And the opening of navigation is sometimes earlier and sometimes later. To be able to judge of the work of this steamer, we should have a statement of the opening of navigation for a number of years.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is not the breaking of the ice at Cap Rouge a good service ?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know. I think that the Quebec people are not altogether satisfied.

Mr. TALBOT. There is a Quebec and Levis ferry company, operating a ferry every quarter or every half hour. When the ice-bridge is formed above Quebec, they have clear water for their boats. But the work of the 'Montcalm,' they say, makes navigation harder for these ferries. These are the people who are not satisfied—the representatives of interested capital. But there is a greater interest than this, the interest of Montreal which, I know, is close to the heart of the hon. member for Beauharnois and to the interest of all the people of Canada, of which Montreal is supposed to be the national port. As Quebecers, we should be willing to see Montreal jammed, but as Canadians we are glad to have the 'Montcalm' carry on her work, even though it be against the interests of Quebec. The 'Montcalm' has done good work and nobody criticises it.

Mr. BERGERON. When I speak of the Quebec people, I do not refer to the Ferry company. But I was told that, before the work of the 'Montcalm,' there was an ice-bridge formed at Quebec. With an ice-bridge, of course, the business of the ferries would be reduced because the people would cross on the ice.

Mr. TALBOT. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is honest in this matter. But the fact that the ice-bridge of which he speaks is not formed at Quebec but five or six miles above Quebec. And when it is formed there is clear water for the ferries. The moment the 'Montcalm' ceased to be of use in this work, she was sent down the St. Lawrence river to help the steamers coming up early in the spring. Also she was sent with provisions to a part of the province of Quebec which is shut off from communication in the winter, except when a steamer is able to make the trip, and where the people might be in danger of starving if the 'Montcalm' did not carry provisions to them.

Mr. BERGERON. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) is training to be under secretary of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. TALBOT. I refuse it.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask him : Did the 'Montcalm' break the ice last year at Cap Rouge and render service to navigation ?

Mr. TALBOT. The department will answer that.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, I will ask the minister.

Mr. BRODEUR. She rendered great service to navigation last year, as shown by the report published by the department. Not only by breaking the ice at Cap Rouge, but also by cutting a channel and helping the flow of water in the spring.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it true that, last spring, some boats from Liverpool for Montreal had to wait at Quebec for eight or ten days because the ice was not broken ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I explained that, but my hon. friend was not here. The ice-bridge was formed, but in the spring flooding was prevented by breaking the ice earlier than in former years and permitting the flow of the water.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the thickness of the ice ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The report says it was heavy ice, but does not give the thickness. The ice there is sometimes fifteen or twenty feet thick.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for Beauharnois has now asked another question whether it is not true that last spring steamers were delayed at Quebec for ten days. It so happens that the key may be broken, that this ice bridge may be removed either by Providence or the 'Montcalm,' but lake St. Peter is there and it generally freezes over. Lake St. Peter still holds the key and until the ice from lake St. Peter has floated down the St. Lawrence there is not a steamer that will take the chance of going up to Montreal. Everybody knows that back of lake St. Peter you have all the ice that floats down the Ottawa river, all the ice from the upper St. Lawrence, from the Lake of Two Mountains and Lake St. Louis. The key may be broken but as long as lake St. Peter is frozen over you cannot help it.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what I am saying. What is the use of the 'Montcalm' then ?

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for North Toronto twitted the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few minutes ago about the moon and the tide but there are lots of people who live in different parts of Canada who do not know anything about the tide. The tide at Quebec means a difference of from thirteen to nineteen feet. Of course, in the Bay of Fundy it is much greater and I have no doubt my hon. friend knows something about that.

Mr. FOSTER. Seventy feet and it rises so rapidly that cattle and horses feeding on the shores are oftentimes overtaken and drowned.

Mr. TALBOT. There is something very funny about the moon and the tide. The two things coincide and scientific men cannot say whether it is the moon that influences the tide or the tide that influences the moon. The hon. member for North Toronto cannot settle that question, I cannot do it either, but it is a very extraordinary coincidence that these two things go together.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bet on the moon.

Mr. TALBOT. You will bet on the moon? There are people who would not take that chance because then they are under the influence of the moon and when the moon has something to do with them they are called what I would not like to call my hon. friend.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that in any case the problem is too serious to be solved at this time of the night and I move that the committee rise.

Mr. BRODEUR. Carried.

Mr. LEFURGEY. No, the item is not carried. I want to discuss the Prince Edward Island steamers.

Mr. BRODEUR. The item was passed the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. The item was not passed.

Mr. BRODEUR. But it was passed the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING. Whether it was passed or not we are going to adjourn.

Mr. BRODEUR. This item was passed the other day.

Mr. FIELDING. Whether it was passed or not I think we will pass.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr Fielding, House adjourned at eleven p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 27, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I stated the other day that I would make to-day a statement to the House with regard to the question which has occupied its attention for some time last week. I have not to go back upon the position which has been taken by the government with regard to members of the House obtaining original documents. The motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) having been disposed of, it has been observed that the hon. member could not renew his motion except by the unanimous consent of the House. Perhaps the point of order would not have been taken, but I think it is better always to adhere to the rules of the House, and under the circumstances I have asked my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to place upon the table of the House the originals sought for. It has been represented to me that it would be inconvenient to break up the file, therefore I now lay it upon the table of the House for inspection by the hon. member, or other hon. members interested, to be returned by the clerk to the Department of the Interior as soon as it is disposed of.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. TURIFF, M.P.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia.) Before the orders of the day are called, on the 24th inst., the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) made some remarks with reference to myself of a very offensive nature, and I judge they were intended to be offensive. I find them in the 'Hansard' on page 1943 :

> We have another case, the Galway land deal, made by this man known as Brown. When we got to the original papers, we found that the two men in this whole deal were the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Adamson) and the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Everybody knows that, five or ten years ago, every dollar these men owned was the suit of clothes on their backs; and to-day they are travelling around worth a million. One of them was an officer in the Department of the Interior, and is now going around the country to explain one of the greatest scandals ever perpetrated by any Canadian government. And yet the Prime Minister is not willing that we should see original papers because of what those original papers may disclose.

I just want to say that this statement, so far as it refers to myself, is not only offensive but it is absolutely untrue. The statement that I was a pauper five or ten years ago is false, and the statement that I am either a millionaire or parading as a millionaire, is equally false. I just wish to add that if the hon. member for Grenville, or any other member of this House, has any charge to bring forward against me, either as a member of the House or as an official of the government, the rules of the House provide a mode by which that can be done, and if the hon. member chooses to take the responsibility of making a charge, I am quite ready to meet him.

THE JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the very incomplete way in which returns are brought down. I mentioned to him on Friday last that the return of the documents relating to the Japanese treaty was incomplete, and since then he has been good enough to send to me the document, the absence of which I called his attention to. Now that document refers to another document, which has not been brought down, and it is therefore in a certain sense unintelligible, because the document to which it refers is not before the House. I would like to have this document as soon as possible, because the debate is coming on to-morrow, and one is hampered a good deal by the absence of material information. I may be permitted to repeat what I have said before, that sufficient care does not seem to be taken in all cases to make these returns complete ; and further, that when the returns do come down in a complete state, the documents are not arranged in chronological order, at least that is very often my own experience, but there are other cases in regard to which I make no complaint in that respect. But over and over again I have found documents arranged in a very confused manner, which entails unnecessary labour in going over them. It seems to me desirable that greater care should be taken in preparing documents before they are brought down. I suppose they have to be arranged in order for printing in the sessional papers, and it would be better to arrange them properly in the first instance.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With regard to the return in the Japanese matter, it was prepared in my own department, and I think with sufficient accuracy. It is true that there was an order in council of August, 1895, which had been included in it, and which I brought down on Friday, when my hon. friend called my attention to its absence. That order in council refers to a despatch from the Colonial Office which was not brought down. The clerk of the Privy Council Mr. Boudreau did not include it in the return because it is a secret despatch, and he called my attention to this fact. My hon. friend knows that we could not bring down this despatch except with the consent of the imperial authorities. Moreover, I can say to my hon. friend that there is nothing in it that would enlighten the case. I have no objection to giving him private communication of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The order in council which I received on Saturday morning refers to a memorandum of a Mr. Wilkinson. The return does not set forth any information whatever as to who Mr. Wilkinson is, in what capacity he made suggestions, or on whose behalf. That renders it a little difficult to understand the real purport and intention of the order in council. I cannot tell who Mr. Wilkinson is, whether he is an official of the Foreign Office, or an official of the Colonial Office. I would suppose that he must occupy one or other of these positions. I have even gone to the trouble of trying to hunt him up in the Foreign Office Year-book, the Colonial Office Year-book, and other sources of information, but really I think one should not be put to that trouble in order to understand an order in council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know if the despatch to which the order in council is an answer would cover that point or not, but the whole order is covered by this despatch, which is a secret one and, therefore, according to the rule, it could not be brought down, but if my hon. friend thinks he should have any information about it I have no objection whatever to giving it to him privately.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SOUTH ONTARIO PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. CALVERT moved the third reading of Bill (No. 16) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. J. D. REID. This Bill extends the time for building this railway. The charter was first granted in 1887, 20 years ago, and this will be the sixth time of renewing the charter, but during the whole of that time nothing has been done towards building the railway. In the Railway Committee the other day I asked that a clause be inserted in this Bill making it imperative on this company to build at least ten miles per annum until the railway was completed. In the Railway Committee Bills are renewed every session extending charters that were granted years ago; the result is that many of these railroads have not been completed and people in the districts affected are suffering. For that reason, I feel that it is time for the House to take some action and establish rules by which charters will not be renewed more than once or twice without the insertion of some clause providing for the lapsing of the charter unless some work is performed within a certain time. The party promoting this Bill would not undertake that any work would be done, not only this coming year or within two years for which the time is extended, and for this reason I feel that this Bill should not be allowed to go through unless there is inserted some clause ensuring commencement of the work within the coming year.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). In the Railway Committee this question was raised by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) and pretty thoroughly discussed, particularly by those interested and by the people interested in that section of country. There is, of course, something in the hon. member's contention that by repeated renewals of these charters there is a possibility of tying up the country to a particular line of railway not to build the railway, but for the prevention of the construction of other lines.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has this charter crowded out any other railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. As far as I could find out it has not crowded out any other line. The members for the locality were there and the committee discussed it pretty thoroughly and decided that just at present was not a good time to discourage railways even from hanging on to charters, because the procuring of capital was not very easy, and it was considered by the committee that unless there was some very grave reason they would renew charters in order to give a chance, even if a remote chance, for the affording of railway accommodation to the district affected.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). I think that this Bill emphasizes some remarks I made two or three weeks ago in introducing a Bill of mine to amend the Railway Act. What I propose in that Bill is a requirement that within two years of the granting of a charter at least 10 per cent of the road must be built and put in operation. I expect that when the Bill comes before the Railway Committee the different railways will be massed against it and I will have difficulty in getting it through unless I have the assistance of members of the House in that committee. What has taken place to-day shows the ne-

cessity for it, and I hope when the Bill comes before the committee it will receive the hearty support of the House.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company —Mr. Sam. Hughes.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—Mr. Worthington.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company. —Mr. Adamson.

QUESTIONS.

EXPENDITURE ON PRINTING.

Mr. CLAUDE MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. During the last ten years how much money has been expended by years by this government for printing and lithographing done outside of Canada?
2. For what reason was such work done out of Canada?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would ask the hon. member to allow this to stand as a motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the present indebtedness for arrears of interest of the Montreal Turnpike Trust to the Dominion government, upon the bonds of the said Trust, held by the government?
2. At what date was the last payment of interest made to the government by the said Trust?
3. Has any demand been made by the government for said interest? If so, when?
4. Has any report ever been made to the government by said Trust or by the representatives of the government upon the said Trust?
5. Has the government ever caused an audit to be made of the affairs of the said Trust?
6. Has the government ever asked that such audit be made?
7. Is the government aware that it is stated the said Trust has been and is actually collecting from municipalities, upon the Island of Montreal, a portion of the interest yearly accruing upon the said bonds?
8. Is it the intention of the government to relinquish its right to recover upon the said bonds?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. Interest is payable on 1st January and 1st July in each year. On the 1st January, 1908, the arrears of interest amounted to $75,075.
2. 31st December, 1906. On 3rd February, 1897, $5,000 of the principal of the bonds with accrued interest was paid.
3. From time to time demands have been made for payment of interest. The last demand was made on 24th August, 1904.
4, 5, and 6. The Trust furnishes the government an annual statement showing receipts and expenditure for each year. Such statements are audited by their own auditor. Mr. John Fraser, the present Auditor General, made a special examination and report on the affairs of the Trust on the 7th January, 1898.
7 and 8. No.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONTRACTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES.

MR. BOYCE asked :

1. To whom, and when, did the National Transcontinental Railway Commission award contracts for the transportation of supplies on District E, between the following points, namely:—(a) Grassett to Cache 9, (b) Montizambert to New Cache 9 A on Negogami River, (c) Jackfish to Caches 10, 11 A, and 12, (d) Nipigon to Caches 12 A, 13, 14, 15, Ombabika and Wabinosh warehouses and Cache 16, on District F ?
2. What were the distances in each contract, the correct rate and terms ?
3. What amounts have been paid to date on each contract ?
4. Who erected the cache and dwelling house at the line crossing on Kebinakgami River, also the new buildings at line crossing of Negogami River, and the warehouse at Jackfish ?
5. What was the cost of these buildings respectively ?
6. Were tenders invited for above transportation and building contracts ? If not, why not ?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This information is very voluminous, and if my hon. friend will put it in the form of a motion for a return I will be glad to bring it down.

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

ST. PETER'S RESERVE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. On what terms was the title to the St. Peter's reserve, province of Manitoba, extinguished ?

2. When will the patents to the lands on reserve allotted to the Indians who are qualified to receive the same, be issued ?

3. Will agreements of assignments of patents be recognized by the government, and parties protected who hold such agreements of assignments ?

4. When patents are issued will they be distributed through the Indian agent, or will they be deposited by government in registry office for resignation ?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. On the 24th September last the Chippewa, Saulteaux and Cree Indians surrendered the St. Peter's reserve, containing 48,000 acres, to the Crown, in trust, to be disposed of as the government might deem most conducive to their welfare, upon the following conditions :

(a) That all moneys received from the sale should, after deducting the usual proportion or expenses of management, be paid as follows : namely, one-half of said sum to be paid the year following receipt of same, and the balance to be funded and interest paid annually.

(b) That 21,000 acres be granted to members of the band as follows : to the chief 180 acres ; to the ex-chief and each councillor, 120 acres, and to the other members of the band in proportion of about 80 acres to each head of a family of five ; grants to be made also in similar proportions to widows and to unmarried men and women over 21 years of age.

(c) That lists of those entitled to grants shall be made by the chief and councillors and a representative of the Indian Department, with a reference, in case of disagreement, to one of the judges of the Eastern Judicial District of Manitoba, whose decision shall be final.

(d) That in addition to the 21,000 acres as above, 3,000 acres be set aside as hay land for the members of the band.

(e) That a new reserve shall be selected on Lake Winnipeg to the extetnt of 75,000 acres of arable land, not to include more than ten miles of water frontage.

(f) Necessary survey of lands to be patented and lands to be sold to be made as soon after surrender as expedient and patents to issue upon application of the individual Indians after the land is selected and properly designated.

(g) An advance of $5,000 to be made at time of surrender, to be repaid out of first moneys received from sale.

(h) Treaty payments to be continued and also yearly rations at treaty time.

(i) That a reasonable supply of agricultural implements and tools be supplied for use on the new reserve.

(j) Reasonable assistance to be rendered in removing to the new reserve in summer time, in any year within five years from date of surrender.

(k) Reasonable assistance to be rendered in building on the new reserve.

2. Patents will be issued as soon as allotment and survey have been made as provided in the surrender.

3. No.

4. Patents will be issued to the parties entitled in accordance with the practice of the department, through the local Indian agent.

YUKON TELEGRAPH.

Mr. SLOAN—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked :

Have there been representations made to the government regarding the service by the Yukon telegraph to Prince Rupert and other coast points in that vicinity, complaining of inefficiency ? If so, what action is being taken by the government ?

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

1. Yes.

2. The acting superintendent at Vancouver reported to the department that fierce gales raged along the coast on December 1st and 16th, extending north to Hazelton, wrecking the line and burying it for miles under large trees from Aberdeen North. A number of extra linemen were employed and communication between Hazelton and Prince Rupert restored on December 16th. The subject of permanently improving the service is under consideration.

NEW FISHERY CRUISER ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. SLOAN—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked:

1. What steps have been taken to effectively patrol the deep sea fisheries of the Pacific coast?

2. Is fishery cruiser designed for service on the Pacific coast under construction?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. It is proposed to build a new twenty knot sea-going cruiser, properly armed and manned.

2. No, but the plans and specifications are ready and public tenders will be called for very shortly.

SALARIES OF LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. SLOAN—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked :

Has the government increased the salaries of the lighthouse keepers on the Pacific coast? If not, why not?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. No.

2. The matter is under consideration.

EX CHIEF JUSTICE LACOSTE.

Mr. DELISLE—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. What amount does the Dominion of Canada pay annually to Sir Alexander Lacoste,

ex-chief justice of the court of King's bench for the province of Quebec?

2. Is the government aware that the gentleman in question is said to be president of the Conservative party organization in Montreal, and that it is stated he holds forth in the clubs against the present administration?

3. Does the government consider it proper on the part of state pensioners to meddle in politics?

4. If the sensibility of these pensioners is not sufficient to prevent them from interfering in political matters, does the government intend to make up for the deficiency?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. $5,333.33.

2. The government is not in possession of information on this subject.

3. The rules of the House preclude the offering of an opinion in replying to a question.

4. The suggestion seems beyond governmental power.

ST. ANICET WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. How much money has been collected at the St. Anicet wharf, at St. Anicet, P.Q.?

2. What was the expenditure at said wharf?

3. Who is in charge of said wharf and what is his salary or revenue?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. $97.16.

2. $6,988.55 have been expended from 1867-1907.

3. S. Dupuis, wharfinger. His remuneration is twenty-five per cent of the gross collections.

RESERVATION OF VACANT LAND.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Are any vacant lands or sections in the Northwest reserved from entry by the first applicant irrespective of race or nationality other than those reserved for miners?

2. If such reservations exist what are the areas or individual sections reserved, and for what nationality or classes of settlers?

3. Are the agents or other land officials of the government instructed or encouraged in any way to direct certain classes of settlers into any particular districts? If so, into what districts are different classes of settlers directed at the present time?

4. Is it the duty of the land agents to give a complete list of unoccupied sections in any township to any person applying therefor, and to grant entry to the first applicant for a vacant homestead?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. Even numbered sections in townships 40, ranges 3, 4 and 5, and township 41, range 4, all west of the 3rd meridian, reserved for Mennonites by order in council, dated 23rd January, 1895. Even numbered sections in township 41, range 3, west meridian, reserved for Mennonites by order in council, dated the 24th June, 1898.

Odd and even numbered sections in townships 13 and 14, range 12, townships 12, 13 and 14 range 13, east halves of townships 12 and 13 range 14, all west 3rd meridian, reserved for Mennonites by order in council dated the 13th August, 1904.

Odd and even numbered sections in townships 57 and 58 ranges 9 and 10, west 4th meridian, reserved for half-breeds by order in council, dated the 28th December, 1895.

3. Dominion land offcials are not instructed or encouraged to direct settlers to any particular district.

4. It is the duty of a land agent to furnish on application a diagram showing the vacant quarter-sections in any township. It is also the duty of the agent to grant homestead entry to the first eligible applicant, who appears personally before him for the purpose, for a vacant quarter-section.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ENGINE-HOUSE AT TRURO.

Mr. STANSFIELD—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the contract, awarded to Rhodes, Curry & Company, for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway engine-house at Truro been completely executed?

2. What is the total amount paid under said contract?

3. Did said contract cover heating system, water-tank, air compressors, boilers, or electric wiring? If not, were separate contracts awarded for these works, to whom, and at what prices?

4. What is the total sum paid (a) for heating system, water-tank, air compressors and boilers, and (b) for electric wiring?

5. What is the total cost of engine-house including site and all equipment?

6. Of the total amount how much was paid for excavation and refilling?

7. What was the department's estimate of cost of the whole work?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. $162,774.63.

3. No, contract for water tank awarded to E. A. Wallberg, at $4,470, contract for boilers including draft plant, air compressors, hot blast fan system of heating pipes, fitting, &c., to E. A. Wallberg, $24,425; contract for wiring engine house, awarded to J. A. Dunn & Company, $844.

4. (a) $29,785.56, of which amount $890.56 is for additional work in connection with heating system.

(b) $844.

5. $240,871.56

6. $78,401.48.

7. $233,200.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—DEDUCTIONS FOR MEDICAL ATTENDANCE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Is there an order in council regulating the amount that a contractor may deduct from the employees on a public work for medical attendance?
2. If so, what is the amount per month per man?
3. Does this apply to the construction of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway?
4. What deductions are being made, and what have been made for medical attendance from the wages of employees on each of the various portions of the National Transcontinental Railway now under construction?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for the Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes.
2. Fifty cents.
3. Yes.
4. Not known to the government. The responsibility of the government is confined to seeing that medical attendance upon the men, and the sanitation of the camps, be carried out in accordance with the regulations.

BADGLEY ISLAND.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was there a trespass committed on Badgley island, in Lake Huron, on Georgian bay, in the years 1904, 1905 or 1906?
2. Was one T. H. Jackman, of Killarney, alleged to have committed such a trespass?
3. If a trespass was committed by the said Jackman, was any amount collected from him therefor? If so, what was the amount, and when was the same paid?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes; in the winter of 1905.
2. Yes.
3. No; the claim for $613.48 is in the hands of the Department of Justice.

AMOUNT AT CREDIT OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

What was the amount to the credit of New Brunswick in each of the following years: 1867, 1873 and 1883?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The information for every year since the beginning of confederation is set forth in the Public Accounts of 1907, part 1, page 32, a copy of which I will send to the hon. gentleman.

GRANT TO COLD STORAGE COMPANIES.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Clements—asked :

What was the total amount of money granted by the government to cold storage companies during the years 1906 and 1907?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture). The Cold Storage Act, under which these grants are made, did not come into force until March 22, 1907. During that year the government undertook to grant, in accordance with the provisions of the Act, to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, the sum of $37,500. There was paid on account of this grant the sum of $15,000.

ST. JOHN COLD STORAGE COMPANY.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Clements—asked :

1. Who are the stockholders in the St. John Cold Storage Company?
2. What is the amount of stock held by each person?
3. What is the value of the building and plant?
4. What is the amount of aid asked for from the government?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture) :

1 and 2. The government is not in possession of the information asked for.

3. The value as fixed by the Cold Storage Commissioners as the basis for the grant asked for by the company, under the Cold Storage Act, is $125,000, but the company contends that the value exceeds this sum by several thousand dollars.

4. The amount of aid asked for and which the government has undertaken to give is $37,500.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR REMOVAL OF CROPS.

Mr. LAKE : asked :

1. In view of the resolution passed by the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association at Brandon on the 17th of January, as follows: 'That we consider the action of the banks in refusing to advance money this season to farmers on bills of lading is causing considerable loss and hardship among the farmers of this country, inasmuch as they are compelled to sell on street to the elevator companies at prices which, in case of low grade stuff, are equal only to 40 to 60 per cent of the actual value of the same grade on the track, which makes a straight loss to the producer of 30 per cent, in some cases of his whole aggregate receipts from the sale of wheat, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Finance at Ottawa.' What steps does the government propose to take to remedy the conditions complained of in view of their statement that they had made arrangements with such banks as wished to assist in moving the grain?
2. In view of the fact that on the 4th December last the government promised to give full information at an early day what these arrangements were, will the government now make a statement to the House?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As the banks became liable for the moneys advanced by the government, they had to be the judges of the persons to whom loans should be made.

The transactions between the government and the banks in this matter are still open and unfinished, and therefore it has not been deemed expedient to make them public. A measure dealing with the subject will shortly be submitted to the House and information will then be furnished.

STATUS OF CANADA IN NEGOTIATIONS OF IMPERIAL TREATIES.

Mr. THOMPSON asked :

1. What is the status of Canada in the negotiations of imperial treaties with foreign nations with reference to subjects not purely Canadian, but which, directly or indirectly, affect Canada?
2. Is Canada consulted during such negotiations?
3. Does Canada have a representative present during such negotiations?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In this matter, as in many others under the British constitution, changes have taken place from time to time to meet new conditions, as new conditions arise. The rule which has been followed of late years has been that in all treaties with foreign countries with reference to subjects not purely Canadian, but which directly or indirectly affect Canada, the Imperial government has caused a provision to be inserted that the treaty shall not apply to Canada unless and until ratified by the Canadian parliament.

SOURIS HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Has any dredging been done in Souris Harbour, Prince Edward Island, on the east side of the railway wharf, in order to utilize the new block now being built, to connect with said railway wharf ?
2. Was this work included in the original plan of dredging at Souris ? If not, why not ?

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

1. The dredging done last season at Souris was on the southwest side of the railway wharf and will, with the intended work on the northeast side, serve to utilize the new block now being built.
2. All of the dredging done so far was included in the original plan.

JUNIOR JUDGE, ESSEX.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a junior judge in Essex, Ontario, to replace the resignation of Judge E. P. Clement?
2. If so, does the government consider that sufficient work is required in that district for an appointment to be made?

Mr. FIELDING.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes.
2. The question is one for consideration, primarily, by the provincial authorities who are responsible for the administration of justice in the province, including the constitution and maintainance of provincial courts.

WINDSOR FERRY.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is it a fact that the franchise now held by the Detroit, Belle Isle and Windsor Ferry Company expires in October next?
2. If not, when does said franchise expire?
3. When the said franchise expires, is it the intention of the government in the near future to advertise for new tender ?
4. If not, has any arrangement been made with the present company to continue their present franchise?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Expires on the 3rd October, 1908.
2. Answered by the above.
3. If a satisfactory arrangement for a renewal of license cannot soon be made with the present licensees, tenders will be called for.
4. Answered by the above.

PELICAN LAKE CHANNEL.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked :

1. Did the government promise in 1904 to give the opening up of a channel at the southeast end of Pelican lake their attention?
2. What attention has the government given to date to the opening up of a channel at the southeast end of Pelican lake, in Manitoba?

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

1. No.
2. A survey and report were made by the resident engineer of the district with reference to the opening up of a channel, in order to lower the present water level of the lake ; estimated cost of such improvement is $1,973.55. No further action has been taken.

QUAHAUG AND CLAM FISHING.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Are any changes contemplated different from the regulations in force as to quahaug fishing last season, (a) as to season for fishing, (b) as to areas open for fishing, (c) any other changes?
2. State any changes as above as to regulations for the fishing of little-neck clams ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No changes in the existing quahaug fishery regulations are at present contemplated.

2. No changes are at present contemplated in the existing soft shell or little neck clam fishery regulations.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. Uriah Wilson—asked:

1. When and to whom have homestead entries been granted for the N.E. ¼ section 28-15-27 W. 2nd M. ?
2. Were both cultivation and residence duties duly performed by the persons holding the entries ?
3. If permission was given to either of the parties not to fulfil residence duties, at what dates, for what periods, and on what grounds were such permissions given?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. On the 24th November, 1902, to D. Smyth. Cancelled. On the 28th of November, 1905, to J. D. Simpson.
2. Smyth's entry was cancelled in default of the performance of the required homestead duties. Simpson, the present homesteader, claims to have a house, worth $100 ; 15 acres under cultivation ; 40 horses, 12 head of cattle. On the 14th of June, 1907, he notified the department that he was in residence on the south half of section 18-15-27, land owned by himself.
3. No permission was given to either homesteader not to fulfil residence duties.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. C. A. McCOOL moved for :

A copy of all the plans and reports in the possession of the government in connection with the building of the Georgian Bay canal.

He said : Before moving the motion which stands in my name I desire to make a few remarks on the project referred to. The subject is such an important one, I approach it with some misgivings lest I may not do it justice, but even at the risk of partial failure in that respect, I feel that in view of its paramount importance to the whole Dominion I can rely upon the indulgence of both sides of the House in an attempt to give a few reasons why the government should proceed at once with the work of development of the Ottawa and French river waterways, more commonly known as the Georgian Bay ship canal.

Before taking up the question, however, I desire to give a brief historical sketch of what has been done thus far.

In 1614 the illustrious French explorer, Samuel de Champlain ascended the Ottawa river to Mattawa and thence the Mattawa river to Trout lake, across the height of land and down the Lake Nipissing and French river to Georgian bay, this route being followed for nearly two centuries by the Hudson Bay and Northwest trading companies for the transportation of their supplies to the Great Northwest, and in marketing their collections of furs, buffalo skins, &c., from that section.

Work on the Grenville canal was started in 1819 and completed some fifteen years later.

In 1837 the parliament of Upper Canada ordered a survey to determine the practicability of navigation between Ottawa and Lake Huron. In 1840 a masonry lock was built at Ste. Anne to replace a wooden lock constructed some years previously by private enterprise. In 1852 due to the energy of the late John Egan, work was begun upon a canal and locks at the Chats Falls to connect Lake Deschesnes and Chats, but the work was abandoned after the death of Mr. Egan. In 1856 the late Walter Shanly, civil engineer, was commissioned by the united provinces of Upper and lower Canada to make a survey of the proposed route to Georgian bay, but the appropriation for the work becoming exhausted, the survey was stopped before completion, Mr. Shanley's report, however, printed by order of parliament in 1858 being most interesting and favourable to the project based upon a waterway of 10 feet in depth. In 1859 Mr. T. C. Clarke, civil engineer, was employed by the united provinces to complete the survey started by Mr. Shanly, and to ascertain if it were not possible to construct a waterway for vessels of larger size. In his report of this examination published the following year, he gives the distance from Montreal to Lake Huron as 431 miles, 352 miles of which being naturally fit for vessels of 12 feet draught, 79 miles requiring improvements, and of this only 29 miles of actual canal, the total descent from summit level to Montreal being 646 feet. Nearly forty years later Mr. Clarke again reported on the project for the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company, recommending provision for vessels 300 feet long by 45 feet beam, and draught of 14 feet. In 1872 work was begun on the Culbute locks and completed in 1877, there being two wooden locks, but were never used to any extent because of the completion meantime of the extension of the Canada Central Railway to Pembroke, Ontario. In 1879 Mr. E. P. Bender, civil engineer, made an examination of the French river and Lake Nipissing for the Canadian Pacific Railway with the view of its adaptation to 14 feet draught navigation, his report being favourable. In 1899 Mr. A. F. Macleod, civil engineer, made an examination and an exhaustive survey of the summit level for the Department of Railways and Canals, his estimate of the cost of this summit section (21 miles) being $5,950,000.

In 1899 Mr. C. R. Coutlee, C.E., acting for the Canadian Pacific Railway made an examination of the French river and Lake Nipissing, having in view navigation for vessels of twenty-foot draught, his report being also favourable.

In 1900 a very complete survey of the French river and Lake Nipissing section was made by the late Mr. J. W. Fraser, C.E., for the Department of Public Works, providing for twenty-foot navigation; his estimate of the cost being $4,200,000.

In 1902 the late Geo. Y. Wisner, C.E., consulting engineer for the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company, and an eminent authority in both England and the United States, after going over the ground and making a careful study of all maps and surveys previously made, gave his estimate of the cost of a twenty-foot waterway throughout as $80,000,000; and having made a careful study of the commercial possibilities, he was most enthusiastic in its favour, as many present will remember, he having delivered an address to the members of this House at that time in the Railway Committee room.

In 1904 the present survey being made under direction of the Department of Public Works was authorized by parliament; and while we have not yet got the full final report of same, which is promised for February or March of this year, the report of survey and estimates of cost of the French river section laid on the table a couple of days ago is a sufficient guarantee that the work is being done in a most efficient manner, and when the full report is made public it cannot but be relied upon as being the result of most exhaustive surveys and a comprehensive study of all the requirements, as well as a careful estimate of the cost.

In addition to the favourable reports of the eminent engineers mentioned in the short history I have just given you of this great project, it may not be out of place to add that many eminent men of affairs have expressed their appreciation of the importance of this great work, among whom I may mention Sir Wm. Van Horne, Sir Thos. Shaughnessy and Mr. J. J. Hill, all of whom on many occasions have expressed their unbounded confidence in the work.

Mr. KEMP. Where are these expressions of opinion to be found?

Mr. McCOOL. In dozens of newspaper clippings. They are well known to all who have followed the agitation for the construction of this work.

Then we have our premier, Hon. Mr. Haggart, Hon. Mr. Belcourt, Mr. W. J. Poupore, an ex-member of this House, and scores of others who have earnestly laboured for years past in the furtherance of this project. The hon. the leader of the opposition is also on record in this connection, having in a speech at Pembroke in 1906, declared that the government should undertake the work at the earliest possible date. The latest recruit to the ranks, and none the less welcome, because it has not always been with us, is the Toronto 'Globe' which in its editorial columns of November 28th last, in a criticism of the speech from the Throne, points out in no uncertain language the importance of this national highway. I will read the extract:

The proposed Georgian bay and Ottawa canal will no doubt be considered as a part of Canada's transportation development. The Ottawa river is a gift of nature, whose value can scarcely be over-estimated. It seems destined to be as great a national highway as the Mississippi, and its value as a source of electric power will also be an important national asset. Some day this natural highway, if carefully kept free from obstructive control, will be one of the most important free and competitive regulators of railway rates on the continent. Parliament cannot be too fully seized of its coming importance.

I also hold in my hand a recent editorial from the Toronto 'News,' from which I will read a couple of extracts, which confirm the opinions already given, and include the opinion of President Roosevelt on the improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi, which applies with equal force to the Ottawa and French river waterways:

President Roosevelt, in his recent tour down the Mississippi, promised an unqualified support to the project for a deep waterway from the great lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. In his speech at Cairo he said: 'I have always felt that the nation must undertake the improvement of the great highway of the Mississippi; but my observations on this trip have had the effect of making me much more ardent than I was.' He had before this appointed a commission which will report to congress at its coming session. His interest is a recognition of the activity which the inhabitants of the Mississippi valley had already shown in this project.

The article concludes as follows:—

The people of the western states are well acquainted with what Canada is doing in improving its waterways; and they hold that if they are to retain possession of their traffic they must have an improved route of their own. There was a time when the great state of Illinois looked to the St. Lawrence route as an outlet. Now the centre of their interest is changing. It is true that the lakes to gulf proposition is still in the project stage. But it is probable that some action will be taken at the coming session of congress. It is important for us, not only from the standpoint of American traffic, participation in which has always been before us in developing our waterways, but also from the standpoint of retaining our own traffic from the northwest, to determine as soon as possible whether we shall deepen the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence canals or construct the Georgian Bay canal. To dissipate our limited financial resources in attempting both works is futile. As it stands to-day, and as it will be in increasing degree when the Mississippi route is opened, the increasing size and draught of lake carriers doom the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence canals in their present con-

dition to a decreasing proportion of the traffic moving to the seaboard. If we are to stay in the competition a definite policy must soon be adopted.

The following contains one of Mr. J. J. Hills' expressions of opinion on this subject:

Washington, D.C., Dec. 6.—James J. Hill, discussing before the National Rivers and Harbours convention the need of a large waterway from St. Paul to the Gulf of Mexico, said:—

Our neighbour in the north, young and comparatively weak in resources as she is, shames us. Canada has spent in proportion to her population and wealth dollars on her canal system, where we have spent dimes.

Because she has worked to an intelligent national plan she has more to show for a dime than we have for a dollar. Six years ago there was already a 14-foot canal within her own territiory. We still pile up our commerce at Buffalo, because we have no corresponding outlet for Lake Erie to the Atlantic.

I could continue almost indefinitely the list of the eminent public men, and our most successful business men who have placed their opinions on record regarding this great work, so it cannot be considered a new idea, but has merely been held in check up to the present because of the magnitude of the undertaking and not from any lack of confidence in the great benefit it would be to the whole Dominion.

Nature has been kind to Canada in many ways, one of which was the placing of a chain of rivers and lakes from Georgian bay to Montreal, which if improved, would give a direct, cheap, water route from the wheat fields of the west to the Atlantic. There is great need to-day of an outlet for the rapidly increasing lake traffic, and such an outlet can be secured most satisfactorily by the construction through the aforesaid rivers and lakes, of what is known as the Georgian Bay Ship Canal.

The Ottawa and French river route has long been called a canal, but this is a misnomer. It is a 'waterway' made up of 357 miles of open river, 55½ miles of channel requiring improvement, and but 27½ miles of actual canal. From the mouth of French river to Trout lake is a rise of ninety-nine feet and would be made in four locks. From Trout lake to Montreal is a descent of 559 feet, and would be made in twenty-four locks, ten to fifty feet to the lift.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is Trout lake?

Mr. McCOOL. On the head waters of the Mattawa river, within four miles of Lake Nipissing.

The route is as follows:—The French river is entered at Georgian bay and followed for sixty-three miles, arriving at Lake Nipissing; then across this lake to North Bay, a distance of 19¼ miles. From North Bay the shipway would ascend, cross over and descend the summit or height of land, through a chain of lakes, arriving at Parresseux Falls, a distance of 24½ miles. Thence down the Mattawa river 14⅜ miles to the town of Mattawa. At this juncture the Ottawa river is entered, passing Deux Rivières, Roche Capatain and Des Joachims rapids where is entered and followed for 35 miles a magnificent stretch of open and uninterrupted natural channel, known as 'Deep River,' then through the two Allumette Lakes to Paquette's rapids, making a clear run from Des Joachims of 56 miles.

(Or if the Culbute channel is followed a saving in distance is effected of some seven miles.) From Paquette through Lake Coulonge, down the Rocher Fendu to Portage du Fort; then through Chats and Deschesnes lakes, the former 19½ miles, and the latter 34 miles long. Passing through Brewery creek and Hull there is a clear run of 50 miles to Hawkesbury thence to Point Fortune, and on through Lake of Two Mountains, 24 miles, arriving at Ste. Anne, making a total distance on the Ottawa river of 293¾ miles. Leaving Ste. Anne, the St. Lawrence is entered and followed to Montreal, a distance of 24½ miles. Total length of route Georgian bay to Montreal 440 miles.

The total length of the waterway is 440 miles, and the distance from Fort William to Montreal, via the proposed route, will be in round figures 900 miles. However, while this distance to the sea-board seems quite short, and is in reality much shorter than all other routes, time must not be calculated in miles, but in hours, for the reason that speed would not be uniform. Mileage itself is not an absolute factor, but what time will be consumed in covering the distance, is the consideration.

A careful study of the time question, based on speeds of average lake boats, in free and in restricted channels, and at locks, applied to the Georgian Bay Shipway gives the following very gratifying results; Average time of vessels from Fort William to French river harbour on Georgian bay, 435 miles, is about two days, seven hours. From Georgian bay, up the French and down the Ottawa and St. Lawrence, should be made in about two days, fourteen hours; that is allowing ten hours for delay over ordinary schedule for detention at locks and restricted channels, thus giving total time from the head of the lakes to Canada's metropolis as 120 hours, or five days. Now, allow one day for unloading return cargo, and five days for run to Fort William. Whether running up or down river will make little, if any, difference on this route because there are no perceptible currents. Thus a vessel would make the return trip, Fort William to Montreal, allowing time for unloading and loading return cargo, in twelve days.

Of course unloading, loading and clearing at Montreal could not be made in two days under present conditions, however suitable those conditions may be for to-day's business. But with most modern and ample facilities, such as the construction of this shipway would certainly warrant the terminal port having, vessels and cargoes should be successfully handled in that time. The advantage of Georgian bay canal time over the St. Lawrence route is easily seen. On the latter route it takes twenty-one days for the round trip—seven days each way and seven days delay.

These calculations are based upon a 22-foot waterway with a minimum width of channel in improved sections of 250 feet, for canalled sections and 300 feet in open sections, and locks of sufficient capacity to accommodate the largest vessels now engaged in the lake trade, actual provision 650 length 60 foot beam, 21 foot draft. Looking over the list it is seen that the capacity of these vessels range from 4,000 to 8,000 and 10,000 tons, the largest being 500 to 600 feet long, and about 55 feet beam. For the safe navigation of such vessels, less than 22 feet in depth would be useless.

Mr. HAGGART. Where do you get the 22 feet ?

Mr. McCOOL. That is what the present survey calls for. At least, that is the information given.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The present survey is being made 22 feet.

Mr. HAGGART. The canalization has a depth of 22 feet. The depth on the mitre sills of the locks would fix that.

Mr. McCOOL. The intention is to make navigation safe for vessels of 21 feet draught. That is the basis of the present survey.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the length of the vessels ?

Mr. McCOOL. Six hundred and fifty feet.

In answer to the argument occasionally advanced, that a 14 foot waterway would be of sufficient depth to accommodate vessels which would satisfactorily handle the grain traffic, as well as other commodities offering, it may be stated on the highest possible authority that vessels of less draught than 17 to 18 feet cannot, with safety, navigate Lake Superior. Therefore if the waterway is provided, it should be so that vessels now plying between Fort William and Port Arthur to American ports, will instead use the all-Canadian route to Montreal.

The argument is also sometimes set forth by persons opposed to this scheme, that the large lake boats would not use this waterway, preferring the open lake route to the restricted river, and also that accidents would continually occur in the narrow channels, of which naturally there are a few. That such arguments are fallacious actual experience proves. The St. Mary's river up and down which 50,000,000 tons pass annually, is very narrow, with one specially bad turn in it, made all the more so by reason of a treacherous cross-current. This is the Stribbling Point Bend, near Sugar Island, where the largest vessels navigate up and down, dozens at a time, day and night during the whole season, and there has never yet been an accident at this point. The channel is well buoyed, and range lights throughout, thus enabling vessels to navigate at all hours in perfect safety, and so it would be on the restricted parts of the proposed route, with the additional advantage of being sheltered at all seasons. The channel is carefully buoyed, provided with range lights, and the same protection would have to be afforded on the channels of the Georgian bay route. Then there is the additional advantage that this route would be a waterway sheltered throughout, instead of being in an open lake. Another very important point is the fact that it is wholly within Canadian territory, and consequently there would be no danger of international disputes arising regarding national rights. As a matter of fact, its watershed is entirely in Canadian territory, and instead of drawing from international waters it adds to them.

The progress of settlement in Manitoba and the new provinces, as well as British Columbia, has been so rapid in the last decade, and is increasing so steadily, that it must strike every observer, and he must admit that a very serious problem of providing for the transportation of the products of that country will need to be settled before ten years have elapsed. It is true that we have three great transcontinental lines, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Transcontinental operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern, and possibly we will soon have the Great Northern extended to Hudson bay from Winnipeg. But all these lines, as well as the system of waterways on the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, even though they were equipped to the fullest extent, would leave us still without adequate facilities for the transportation of the enormous production of that country, which has in many cases increased from 800 to 1,000 per cent in the last five years. How that is to be provided for is the great question that is before us. As showing the rapidity of the increase of production, I desire to read an extract from the address of the president of the Grain Produce Exchange of Winnipeg, delivered to the members of the exchange, on the 11th September last. I will only read those portions that relate to this subject :

Progress is the law of life in western Canada, and the year now closing is no exception to the rule. In every department of activity the past twelve months have witnessed giant forward strides. The country responds, not satisfactorily but triumphantly, to every test by which we can measure advancement. Wonderful as has been the progress of prairie Canada during the past ten years, bright as is its present prospect, every indication goes to prove that the past and present are but an earnest of what the future has in store. In the development of our vast agricultural and other natural resources those identified with the grain trade must take a keen business interest. Western Canada already ranks as one chief source of the world's wheat supply. As in near future it undoubtedly will become the time when this exchange shall become one of the world's great grain fields, and in the the producing of grain becomes a bigger industry in prairie Canada, the business of handling grain must become correspondingly important. I look forward with confidence to a time when this exchange should become one of the largest and most influential associations of traders in grain to be found either in the old or the new world. That we are approaching this time and with considerable rapidity is evidenced by the fact that last year the newcomers to the Dominion, practically all of whom came to western Canada, and the large proportion of whom are devoting their energies to the tilling of the soil, numbered over a quarter of a million.

The progress made in this direction is borne out by large increase in the areas under crop last season. In 1905 the total area under grain cultivation in western Canada was, as closely as can be estimated, 5,910,000 acres. In 1906 this had grown to the enormous total of 7,830,000, or an increase of about 33 per cent in a single season. The wheat acreage had increased from 4,019,000 acres to 5,013,544 acres. Oats were cultivated on 1,423,000 acres in 1905 as against 2,118,777 acres in 1906. The area devoted to barley had increased from 433,800 in 1905 to 603,485, in 1906, while flax, which in the former year was grown on 34,900 was in the latter cultivated on 93,795. Owing to a backward spring and other natural causes, the increase this season will not be so phenomenal, but viewed in the light of the unusual natural conditions prevailing this year, they are fully as satisfactory. The expectation at the time of the preparation of this address was that western Canada will this year have a total grain crop of about 190,000,000 bushels. The wheat acreage is about 5,010,000, and the anticipated yield, which may be increased or diminished according to weather conditions, is between 80,000,000 and 85,000,000. When this acreage is compared with that of only ten years ago, 1,764,250, and when the 85,000,000 bushels of wheat of this year is placed alongside of the less than 6,500,000 bushels inspected in 1897, the rate at which western Canada is advancing can be better measured and appreciated. The acreage in oats for the season now closing is estimated at 2,375,000, and the yield at 87,500,000 bushels. The barley acreage is estimated at 663,800, and the yield at about 18,500,000. The flax acreage is 105,000, and the estimated yield 1,300,000. In view of the high prices confidently expected to prevail, the financial returns from the present season's crop promise to be the very best with which the west has been favoured.

These substantial increases in acreage are reflected in the amount of grain inspected. The number of bushels inspected at the end of the crop year, August 31, in 1906, was 77,411,060, and for the same period in 1907, was 91,677,970.

It is not necessary to give them.

The conditions of growth and progress in the country as a whole are, as might be expected, reflected in the exchange. It is now two months short of twenty years since the exchange was organized. It started with a membership of 10; to-day, exclusive of associated members, it has 300. And at its organization its memberships were $15; last year, when the remaining 71 seats to fill up the membership were sold, they realized $2,500 each.

I read this as an authoritative statement of the conditions of that country from the viewpoint of a business man. If this be the present production, what will be the production five years hence? It does not require any great stretch of imagination to foresee that it will be doubled or even trebled, and under such circumstances where will we be at with regard to transportation facilities? It is true that we will have the transcontinental, with its easy grades and immense possibilities for cheap and rapid transit for traffic. But let us not forget that this line traverses the great clay belt of new Ontario, containing as it does 16,000,000 acres of just as good wheat land as there is in the Dominion, and this belt also extends into the province of Quebec. This country must be taken into consideration as affording traffic for this road. In addition to the agricultural products to be transported, we have to consider the forest and mineral wealth in which that country abounds. As an example of the possibilities of northern Ontario, I may mention that the portion of the district which I have the honour to represent, the Temiscaming district, when the last census was taken, had a population of 1,306 souls, all north of Widdifield, the township in which North Bay is situated. If a census was taken of that section of the district to-day it would be found that there are over 30,000 people in there; and that is not entirely due to the discovery of immense wealth in silver, cobalt and other minerals found in that district, but is applicable generally to that country, the country is being settled as rapidly as any one could expect. The same thing must apply along the line of the National Transcontinental Railway as soon as it is opened up.

The argument has been advanced in this House that the proposed waterway could not successfully compete with railways in the transportation of heavy freight. The reply of the president of one of the largest railway systems of the United States to an inquiry as to the possibility of reducing the

rate on grain, coal, ore, &c., to about one mill per ton in the near future, was explicitly that there was no probability of a rate of one mill per ton in the near future. The reply of the New York Central to the same inquiry leaves no doubt that that road has no expectation of quoting any such rate. These lines are quoted for the reason that they are probably in a better position to handle freight economically than any other railway lines in America.

Further evidence of what our great railways think of their chances of profitable handling of the export grain trade, either by rail or lake and rail can be found in an examination of Mr. Bosworth, fourth vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in his examination before the Railway Commission last year, and which can be found in the reports of the commission, as follows :

Q. What do you say as to the profits of the business lake and rail?
A. None whatever.
Q. Then why do you do the business?
A. We do not do it.
Q. You do not do any lake and rail business?
A. Not to Montreal for export.
Q. When did you go out of that?
A. It must have been five or six years ago.
Q. What makes the rates from Chicago so low?
A. Competition lake and rail. We do not carry any ex-lake grain for export.

From this it is seen that none of the existing lines of rail can hope to relieve the situation as regards the export grain trade of the Northwest, for, if that were possible, the Canadian Pacific Railway is not without means to enable them to go after the business even though such course meant the building of an additional road for the purpose. Let me ask; if Sir William Van Horne and Sir Thomas Shaughnessy felt that they wanted this trade, why do they by their endorsement of the Ottawa and French river waterways encourage rival means of transportation, with which they cannot hope to compete ?

The Canada Atlantic Railway, now operated by the Grand Trunk Railway system owns several freight vessels on the lakes, at least three-quarters of which are registered as American bottoms, thus virtually admitting that they could not compete for export business from American points via the Canada Atlantic Railway to a Canadian port, as against the rate via Buffalo and New York, this being most significant. A more complete object lesson could not be given of the impossibility of successfully competing by lake and rail, via Montreal, as against Buffalo and New York, than this, for it must be admitted by all that the original owner of the Canada Atlantic Railway made a most determined effort to capture what he could of the grain carrying trade from the west, yet in order to ensure cargo for his vessels he had to register three-fourths of their number as American bottoms, thus disqualifying them for the trade he was so anxious to secure, and this in face of the fact of a very large percentage of our grain from the west being carried by American vessels to American ports.

The history of the lake trade from Chicago, Duluth, Fort William and Port Arthur to Buffalo and other points show a gradual tendency towards cheaper rates. The average per ton mile for 1901 was ·99 mill, in 1902 ·89 mill, in 1903 ·92 mill, in 1904 ·81 mill, in 1905 ·81 mill, in 1906 ·85 and ·84 in 1907. This is for all kinds of freight while the average on wheat during the same period was ·52 mills per ton mile. The freight rates on wheat show the greatest reduction being 1¼ cents per bushel between terminals in 1906 as against 2·3 cents in 1901. These rates between terminals include cost of loading and unloading at terminal points. The average distance for carriage of grain on the Great Lakes may be taken as 800 miles, the bulk being from Chicago and Duluth to Buffalo, 940 miles. This gives us a rate per ton mile for lake carriage of grain of ·46 mill, which may be taken as a liberal estimate of the cost of lake transportation. The lowest possible rail rate per ton mile under most favourable conditions, the lowest which according to high authority can be looked forward to, is 2½ mills per ton mile or over five times the present rate by water. This minimum estimated rail rate has never yet been reached, the nearest approach to it being in 1905, when grain was carried by the railroads of New York at a loss in an attempt to demonstrate that the improvement and development of water routes was unnecessary. With existing conditions in Canada it is doubtful if such low rates may be expected by Canadian roads between the lake ports and the sea-board. It must be remembered that cheap coal can be had all along the American lines from the lakes to the Atlantic, whereas on Canadian railroads the fuel for the engines has to be transported to points where needed from the eastern terminals.

As a further evidence of the economical use of waterways even under adverse circumstances, let us compare the rates on wheat between Chicago and New York : Via all water 6·059 cents per bushel ; lake and rail 7·128 ; all rail 12·76 cents per bushel. And surely it cannot be said that the railways between those points are less well equipped than are our railways here. But for the purposes of argument, let me take the lowest possible rate on wheat per bushel via lake and rail from Chicago to the sea-board which would be 4·7 cents. A liberal estimate of the cost via the Ottawa waterway would be 1½ cents per bushel. Now, assuming the total export grain, in-

cluding flour from the northwestern United States and Canada, to be 200,000,000 bushels per annum, and that of this quantity 100,000,000 bushels were transported by way of the Ottawa and French river waterways, a saving would be effected in the way of freight of $3,200,000. I look upon this as a very reasonable estimate of the situation, and one that is almost sure to follow the opening up of this means of communication.

As to competition with the railways, when the United States government decided to take over and complete the Panama canal a commission was appointed to make a careful inquiry throughout the country with a view of ascertaining what effect water transportation would have on the rail carriers. The commission were particular to consult some of the highest traffic officials connected with the prominent railways, and the consensus of opinion was that water transportation tended in every instance to assist in the development of traffic which would necessarily have to be transported by rail.

Mr. J. T. Harahan, president of the Illinois Central railroad and the Yazoo and Mississippi Valley railroad, embracing upwards of 5,600 miles, extending from Omaha in the west with connections at St. Paul and Minneapolis on the north, touching the Great Lakes at Chicago and continuing down the Mississippi Valley to New Orleans, this system coming in direct competition with water transportation, in an address delivered before the Deep Waterway convention at Memphis, Tenn., on October 4 last, said :

We do not fear wholesome competition which the development of our waterways would offer, but on the contrary, we anticipate that the additional traffic created thereby would vastly increase our tonnage and therefore our revenues.

The utility of water transportation consists in the carrying of low classes of freight at slow speeds and at low rates, leaving to the rail lines the more important traffic, which of necessity requires greater and punctual dispatch and therefore better rate, and leaves the latter free to handle more promptly its share of the traffic.

This being the opinion of such an eminent railway man with regard to the navigation of the Mississippi, it therefore will be nothing short of criminal on our part if we continue the condition which shuts us out from the advantages which we have at our very door.

I have here in 'Industrial Canada,' of January, the report of an address delivered by Mr. John Pullen, Assistant Freight Traffic Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, before the Railway Club a short time ago in which he expressed similar views. The article is too long to read but I will read the comments on it made by the manager of the transportation department of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Mr. James E. Walsh, formerly with the Canada Atlantic Railway, and who is as well qualified to speak on transportation as any man in this Dominion. These are his comments on the speech of Mr. Pullen :

THE TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM.

It is with a feeling of satisfaction that every one interested in freight rates views the rapid development of competing lines of railways, for competition means lower rates. Mr. John Pullen, the assistant freight traffic manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, recently gave the Canadian Railway Club a very interesting talk on 'The Work of the Freight Traffic Department,' during which he mentioned what he said were a few of the factors entering into freight rate construction. Distance is one and, to the uninitiated, it would seem that the rate should increase with the distance. Such is not necessarily the case however. On the contrary distance has often to be eliminated as the result of competition, either of water or of a rival rail line. If, he pointed out, there be two or more railways between two given points, the railway having the longer route must, of necessity, carry its freight between these two points at as low rate as its rival which may be fortunate enough to have a much shorter line.

So much for the good effect of competition amongst railways, but the most important statement made by Mr. Pullen in his address had regard to the great advantages, from the shipper's standpoint, of water transportation. If, he said, a railway parallels navigable waterways then its rate must, of necessity, be kept down at the lowest possible figure, otherwise all the traffic would be attracted to the water route. This leaves no doubt, if there had been any before, of the desirability of developing to the fullest possible extent every mile of waterway that is or that can be made navigable. The money which has been spent on the St. Lawrence canals has been well invested. The people are getting a larger return from it than shows on the balance sheet, for it is not only freight that passes up and down by boat that benefits by it, but also every pound of freight carried on the railways between points which enjoy the alternate advantage of the water route.

Rival railways reduce rates merely to a common basis fixed by the shorter line, but a navigable waterway cuts them down to the lowest possible figure at which commodities can be moved from one point to another. That the great advantage of water transportation is well understood and fully appreciated by our shippers, is evidenced every season by the mad rush to catch the last boat with shipments. The farmers of the west, too, strain every point to get their grain to the lake ports before the season closes, in order that it may reach the seaboard at the smallest possible cost.

As commercial and industrial progress is, in a large measure, dependent upon cheap transportation, it is surely the part of wisdom to make the most of our opportunities in that direction. No other country in the world pos-

sesses such great natural advantages in this respect as Canada, but we are not making the most of our unequalled opportunities. No other country has equalled ours in its liberality to railway promoters; but we show a reluctance to aid in canal projects that is hard to understand. We point with reasonable pride to the St. Lawrence route, but we cannot afford to become so lost in admiration of what has already been done, as to forget that, after all, we have really only made a beginning.

That eminent railway magnate, James J. Hill, than whom there is no more competent authority on transportation problems, has stated that the secret of low freight rates lies in canal development. This emphasizes the statement of Mr. Pullen, whose official position with one of our great trunk lines entitles him to speak with authority, to the effect that railway freight rates are figured out under the menace of water charges, when there is an alternate water route, with the result that railway rates are, to use his words, kept down to the lowest possible figure. With this fact before us, can we longer question the wisdom of a liberal policy of canal development? For over half a century there has been a canal project before the people of Canada, which, if carried into effect, would shorten the distance between Chicago and Liverpool in the neighbourhood of one thousand miles. Some of the most eminent engineers have examined this project carefully and pronounced it undertaking the work. During this period thousands of miles of government aided railways have been constructed, all of which were needed, and possibly furnished a reasonable excuse for our neglect of other national transportation projects. The time has now arrived, however, when we can afford to call a halt in further railway development on the magnificent scale to which we have become accustomed and turn our attention to the development of water routes. The people of this country have been generous to the railways, and they owe us a lot in return for what we have done for them. They could have no grievance if we now let them shift for themselves, and turned our attention and our money to the development of water routes which will be the property of the nation and its best guarantee of fair and reasonable treatment in the matter of transportation charges.

That, I look upon as a very strong argument in favour of this project, and coming from such a source, I think it should be fully considered. Our railways have not made any great progress towards taking care of the increasing business of the country, and as a result of the lack of transportation facilities large quantities of Canadian breadstuffs are being forced to the markets by American channels. It may be here stated that shipments going by United States ports, say to Liverpool, are not always credited as Canadian products, especially is this the case after the close of navigation.

The total shipments of wheat from Fort William and Port Arthur during 1906 were 44,376,343 bushels, distributed as follows:—

	Bushels.
To Buffalo and other United States ports in United States vessels	12,398,002
To Buffalo and other United States ports in United States vessels	4,055,903
To Kingston, Montreal and Prescott	10,221,396
To Thorold and Port Stanley	855,878
To Georgian bay and Lake Huron ports	16,847,164
	44,376,343

It will be noted that the shipments to Buffalo equalled those to Georgian bay and Lake Huron ports. Of the 31,978,341 bushels carried in Canadian vessels to various points 10,221,396 bushels were consigned to Kingston, Prescott and Montreal; 16,451,907 bushels in all went direct to United States ports. Of the shipments to Georgian bay and Lake Huron ports a considerable portion was for local consumption in transit in Ontario.

Shipments of wheat from Port William and Port Arthur in 1905 were, in Canadian vessels, 29,762,910 bushels, and, in United States vessels, 11,218,882 bushels, 10,493,823 of the latter going to Buffalo. 7,826,781 bushels shipped in Canadian vessels went to Kingston and Montreal showing quite an increase in the shipments by the all-water route in 1906.

The receipts in 1906 at the port of Montreal of wheat were 16,790,651 bushels as against 15,316,821 in 1905, an increase of only 1,653,830 bushels, so that there was a decrease by rail. In former years the exports have been greater. For instance:

	Receipts.	Shipments.
1903	19,546,739	16,055,004
1902	20,177,624	17,394,886
1901	15,884,058	13,626,071

Flour, port of Montreal to all points, including Newfoundland:

	Barrels.
1906	1,727,826
1905	1,842,240
1904	1,897,987

The receipts and shipments in 1906 were not greater than in 1902 and 1903, when there was apparently much better inland transportation facilities to keep the business in Canadian channels.

There is no doubt as to the inability of the railways to take care of the export grain trade, and with the increased demand for cars and facilities to take care of the industrial and manufacturing interests very little can be expected in the near future, unless some change is made which is not now apparent. It will be interesting to note what the actual shipments of Canadian breadstuffs via leading United States ports are. During 1906 there were shipped via these

ports 24,159,240 bushels of grain of which 22,150,590 bushels were wheat, distributed as follows :—

	Bushels.
New York	4,877,367
Boston	9,216,086
Portland	6,289,461
Philadelphia	960,436
Baltimore	807,271

Flour, 536,899 barrels.

In 1905 the total shipments of grain via the same ports were 12,119,637 bushels, of which 10,795,346 were wheat flour shipments, 428,000 barrels.

It will be observed that the port of Montreal has not increased to any marked extent, in fact is doing less business than in 1903, notwithstanding the enormous increase in the vessel tonnage.

With the increased mileage of railways, population and agricultural areas in the west, how do we expect to take care of the agricultural products ? As an illustration, there were 14,154 land entries from January 1 to June 30 last year, which computed at 160 acres, the minimum quantity would comprise 2,264,640 acres. The railways are rapidly increasing their mileage with the view of serving these new areas, but in all cases the objective point or eastern terminus in so far as the transportation of grain is concerned is Fort William or Port Arthur.

What is being done to take the grain from these points ? It is only necessary to glance back over the last two years in order to realize the enormous waste of money there has been in getting the crop of the Northwest to the market owing to the lack of foresight on the part of those who of all others should be interested in the building up and welfare of the country.

What the railways have done to help the situation and take care of the enormous increase in traffic, which they must have foreseen, will be best shown by looking over the increase on mileage and equipment since 1903 :

Year.	Miles in Operation.	Locomotives of all kinds.	Freight cars including box, cattle, refrigerator, flat, coal and dump.
1903	18,988	2,587	80,252
1904	19,431	2,768	83,562
1905	20,487	2,906	86,296
1906	21,353	2,931	90,404

The equipment ordered by the principal railways for delivery in 1907 consisted of :

(a) Locomotives of all kinds including switchers and passenger, 356.

(b) Cars of all kinds which might be available for carriage of freight, 15,678. This includes flat, platform and ballast cars, which at certain seasons of the year are used by the railways for construction and ballasting purposes.

In submitting these figures it is fair to state that the traction power of the locomotive and the capacity of the cars have been greatly increased, and while it is satisfactory to note the improvements which are being made in the facilities to take care of the business offering, it is still quite obvious that the equipment is not being added to as rapidly as would seem to be required by the steadily increasing mileage under operation, which on June 30 last was 21,819 with 5,000 new miles under construction. Whilst it is stated that some 15,000 additional cars will be added to the equipment available for freight carriage, quite a large percentage of these are not available at all times, but are used for the companies' business almost exclusively. Furthermore there is an annual depreciation in the stock which would materially reduce the amount of equipment available. The question has been in the last few years not what rates can we get, but what accommodation. One thing is certain, that whatever reduction is made in the transporting of agricultural products must eventually find its way to the pocket of the farmer. The forces of competition may be relied upon to regulate this.

The building up of the American northwest contiguous to our own was largely the result of water transportation formerly almost exclusively via eastern Atlantic ports. Now owing to changes in the agricultural areas new routes have been opened via the Gulf of Mexico. The intercourse between the United States and Canada in the west is growing steadily, due in a great measure to transportation problems becoming common to both countries. United States lines are being built and projected into our Northwest. Charters are being granted with the object of connecting with United States lines and diverting to the United States trade which belongs to Canadian channels. Conditions are more or less sympathetic, and if the people of the Northwest are forced to look to the United States for assistance to enable them to market their crop, it is fair to assume they cannot object to these same lines reaching out for traffic west and north bound. We speak of Canada for Canadians, but in no way can this be more easily secured than by the development of the cheapest system of transportation, thus binding all parts of the Dominion together. It doubtless is true that there is no sentiment in business, but I firmly believe that if means can be provided whereby the output of the Northwest can be put on the world's market as cheaply by Canadian channels

as by any other possible routes, Canadians will join in striving to build up that which the foundation was laid for, 40 years ago, when confederation became a fact, and the first step taken towards Canadian nationhood.

It is hardly necessary for me to call attention to the fact, which is already well known to almost every member of this House, of the immense water-powers that are at present lying dormant along the route, and which if this work were carried out, would necessarily be developed by reason of the improvements. I am satisfied that I am safely within the mark when I venture the statement that at least 800,000 horse-power can be developed in this way, which, when utilized, would without doubt pay the interest account resulting from the expenditure in connection with the whole project, and leave a handsome balance over. At the low valuation of $10 per horse-power per annum, this would add $8,000,000 per annum to the wealth of the country, which capitalized at 3 per cent, would mean $266,666,667, besides furnishing cheap power for the establishment of pulp, paper, flour and sawmills, ore production works and other industries all along the route.

Why continue allowing such a great gift of nature as the Ottawa river undoubtedly is, to remain unused except for floating of logs to the mills at Chaudière Falls, which could be much more profitably manufactured nearer the source of supply if the product were given cheap transportation to tidewater; and, instead of piling up fire traps around and within this city in the shape of lumber piles, establish flour mills and other manufactories, including ore reduction works, the latter being especially desirable since it has been demonstrated that the smelting of iron ore by electricity is a complete success. We have immense riches in iron ore, which up to the present time have not been possible of development because of sulphur and titanium being found in connection therewith, but which when treated by electrical process are not considered objectionable.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend said that electrical smelting of iron ore had been demonstrated? Has the process gone so far that it is absolutely certain that it is commercially successful?

Mr. McCOOL. Perhaps I should qualify that. There are no large reduction works started, but a small plant is at present being built at Hull. The process has been tried at Jersey City, and I am assured by the very best authority that it is a complete success in every way. The experiment that was made at Sault Ste. Marie could hardly be so regarded, because too great a quantity of power was required to do the smelting. But a different process is now used, by which the iron ore can be treated at the mouth of the pit at far less cost than by any other known process. Though I am not sufficiently familiar with the matter to be able to give facts and figures, I think that electrical smelting of iron or any other ore may be accepted as an established fact.

Again take our Cobalt ores, and what do we find? Only a very small percentage of the product of that great mining camp is smelted and refined in Canada, and as a rule the American refiners only pay for the silver contents, while the nickel, cobalt, arsenic and other associated ore contents would justify the expense of mining for them alone. It is undoubtedly true that refineries, to do this kind of work, are at present in course of construction at three or four points in Canada, two of them being in the district which I have the honour to represent; but handicapped as they will be by expensive fuel supply it is doubtful if they will do very much better for the miners than they are now getting.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has the hon. gentleman investigated this new electrical smelting process?

Mr. McCOOL. To some extent.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not referred to in Dr. Haanels' report?

Mr. McCOOL. No.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the new electrical process called?

Mr. McCOOL. It is a different system of setting the carbon.

Mr. HAGGART. Has it any name?

Mr. McCOOL. It has a name, but I cannot recall it at the moment.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it an improvement on that recommended by Dr. Haanel?

Mr. McCOOL. It is not at all the same. The great trouble with Dr. Haanel's process, as was stated to me by five or six experts, was that while it did the work satisfactorily, it took such an enormous quantity of electrical power that it was not a commercial possibility. To give an idea of the extent of the mining operations at Cobalt, I will read the following from the 'Haileyburian' of January 10, 1908:—

A Review of the Cobalt Shipments.

A review of the Cobalt shipments since the camp commenced to have any output of silver is most interesting. In the year 1904 the value of the ore shipped was $136,217, and the shipments turned the scale at 158 tons. In 1905 a big increase was shown, for 2,144 tons valued at $1,473,196 were sent out. In 1906. 5,129 tons were mined and marketed of a value of about $3,900,000, and in the year

1907, 14,040 tons, of a value in the neighbourhood of $9,500,000 were shipped. The output for 1907 is about three times that of 1906, six times that of 1905 and ninety times that of 1904. This shows an enormous increase, and what is more is that there is every probability that the present year will still show an increase for more mines are approaching the shipping stage, while those which are well established are constantly making fresh discoveries.

A great impetus would be given to our mining industries if we had such means of transportation as would justify us in developing cheap electrical power, for then we would be in a position to do all this work of smelting in our own country. At present very little of it is done in Canada. There is one smelter at Sudbury, which handles a small quantity of ore, but it could not begin to deal with the quantity of ore that can be turned out.

Our forests in Ontario and Quebec, even where the pine timber has been cut, contain an inexhaustible supply of spruce, hemlock, balsam and the various hardwoods, all of which would be made available and contribute to the building up of the commerce of the country. These products cannot be handled at present because the means of handling them are not available. We have to get cheap transportation in order to compete with other countries.

It is fair to assume, therefore, that whilst the development of the waterway would mean the doing away with the towing of logs on the Ottawa river it will prove of undoubted value to the limit owners and manufacturers of lumber generally.

Then again the development of our coal deposits in Nova Scotia would be immensely benefited by the opening of this waterway which would enable them to compete successfully with the American collieries at all points tributary to the great lakes and furnish return freights for vessels engaged in the grain trade. In this connection I cannot do better than read an extract taken from 'Industrial Canada' of last May, and contributed by Mr. Jas. E. Walsh, manager of the transportation branch of the Manufacturers' Association, than whom I know of no person better qualified to give an opinion on any matter connected with transportation :

In an article on Canada's Transportation Problem, which appeared in the April issue of 'Industrial Canada,' the vital influence of cheap transportation on the material welfare of the country was shown. Efforts are now being made to divert trade from Western Canada over United States roads. The true solution, it was pointed out, lay in opening up new routes in this country, which would supply an adequate service at cheaper rates. From this arose the discussion of the advantages of water routes, and particularly the possibilities of the proposed canal via French river and the Ottawa.

The United States Deep Waterways Commission of 1896, speaking of the different routes to the Atlantic sea-board and the Georgian bay route says the Ottawa route is a short independent line which may have great value for future development, but its consideration is not now justified. It is the shortest through route between terminals, and is unquestionably adapted to navigation of considerable capacity.

The 'Engineering News,' March 5, 1902, said editorially : 'From an engineering point of view, disregarding for the moment political boundaries, there can be no doubt that the Ottawa route is by far the best for a deep waterway from the upper lakes to the sea. We respectfully submit to the New York Barge Canal promoters the question how their barge canal could hope to compete with such a route. Indeed we may make the question a broader one, and ask how any route to the sea-board which requires transhipment could possibly compete with a route which takes freight on board a lake steamer at upper lake ports and delivers it at tide water without breaking bulk ?

The Route Direct.

As previously stated, a glance at the map will show the geographical position of the waterway, and the attractions it offers to the United States Northwest; among others the fact that the northern route is cooler, and therefore, there is less danger of heating in transit, which difficulty prevails via the southern routes. In the latter case a guarantee is required of the quality of the grain after the first of April. It will not only afford facilities for the grain traffic, but also for the carriage of meats in refrigerator ships to any port in the world. The following table shows the mileage advantage of the route.

To	Galveston.	New O.	Duluth	N.Y.
Kansas City.. ..	804:5	932	612	1,335
Omaha..	895:5	1,070	521	1,402
Sioux City..		1,258	422	1,422
St. Paul..		1,269	160	1,332
Minneapolis..		1,279	150	1,322

Distances Duluth to Montreal, via French river (Georgian bay route) 997 miles ; Montreal to Liverpool, via Belle Isle, 2,470 miles through; Kansas City to Liverpool, 4,379 miles, as against Kansas City to Galveston, 804·5 ; Galveston to Liverpool, 4,874, through 5,678 miles, saving by the northern route of 1,299 miles, and a saving of 1,038 miles over the route via New Orleans. Kansas City and the other points above named are used for comparison as they are the centres of agricultural production in the American northwest at the present time. The Omaha Grain Exchange, in its annual report for 1905, referring to the publishing of through rates from Omaha to Liverpool, via the southern routes, says : 'The grain is thus permitted to go through without breaking bulk except at the seaport, and without shrinkage and the taking of tolls at intermediate ports. This means the bringing of foreign markets to our very doors, whereby we obtain the highest prices possible. The result of this condition is worth ten million dollars yearly to the grain producers of Nebraska.'

A comparison of distances from upper lake ports is given :

	Miles.
From Chicago to New York, lake and rail, via Buffalo..	1,389
From Chicago to Montreal, lake and rail, via Canadian routes..	906
From Chicago to Montreal, via Georgian bay route..	905
From Fort William to Montreal, via Georgian bay route..	882
From Fort William to Montreal, via St. Lawrence..	1,296
From Duluth to Montreal..	997

Advantage in favour of the proposed waterway, Fort William to Montreal, 414 miles to Liverpool, as against the Buffalo route, 1,198 miles.

The saving in distance from Chicago to Liverpool is 1,254 miles, and from Duluth 1,213 miles.

The distance from Winnipeg to Montreal, all rail, is 1,306 miles via Fort William, and the Georgian bay route 1,309 miles.

It will be seen that Montreal would be nearer Duluth than Buffalo is, and Chicago and Buffalo and Chicago and Montreal equidistant.

Saving in Cost.

Having thus given an idea of the advantage in regard to distances, we may now consider the question of traffic and the saving to be effected. The matter of tonnage is a foregone conclusion, and need not be here discussed. It is only necessary to refer to the returns of the Soo canals. On the matter of rates it is apparent that the short line mileage afforded by the route would enable it, not only to compete, but to control the rates from the territory above mentioned in the United States, and materially reduce the rates on grain from the Canadian Northwest.

Very little of the grain of the Northwest finds its way to the sea-board all rail. In no year has it exceeded two million bushels. At present the bulk of it is taken to Fort William, Port Arthur and Duluth, thence by water ports on the Georgian bay or Buffalo, and rail from there to the sea-board. A certain quantity has, especially during the past few years, owing partly to the congestion at lower lake ports, gone by all the water routes via the Welland and St. Lawrence canals to Montreal, which, however, necessitated a transfer en route either at Port Colborne or Kingston, more or less shrinkage and extra charge for elevation, all of which adds to the cost of transportation.

The saving in the cost of transport by the proposed waterway can be best illustrated by taking as a basis the rates that prevail via Buffalo, showing the same in detail; that is to say, the proportion earned by the lake steamers and that of the lines east of Buffalo. For the years, 1895 to 1904 inclusive, the average rate via Erie canal, Buffalo to New York, on wheat was 3.15 cents per bushel. The rail rate has varied from 3.4 in 1898 to 4 cents in 1904. These years are quoted from the fact that it may be taken that conditions were normal. The average lake rate on wheat for the five years, 1900 to 1904, was 1.56 a bushel, making the average through-rate for five years from the head of the lakes to the sea-board, lake and canal, 4·71 cents per bushel. The average cost for receiving, weighing and discharging, ocean vessel trimming and floating elevator at Buffalo and New York, is 2 cents per bushel, making a total cost of 6·71 per bushel to take a bushel of wheat from Fort William and put it on board ship in New York harbour.

What governs rates.

Existing routes to Montreal, all water or lake and rail, are practically governed by the rates that prevail via Buffalo. The rate from Duluth to New York via Buffalo is 6·71 cents per bushel. Allowing for the same rate per mile by the Georgian bay route, with the addition for delays, &c., the cost from Duluth to Montreal would be 2·62 cents per bushel. That is, the latter route provides for putting the grain on board vessel at the sea-board for 4·09 cents per bushel less than by Buffalo.

As to the grain trade of the Canadian Northwest the average rate on wheat has been from 6 to 7 cents per bushel, from the elevator at the head of the lake to vessel at the sea-board. The average since 1905 has, no doubt, been somewhat higher than this, as very little of any grain was carried from Fort William to Georgian bay or Lake Huron ports at less than 2½ cents per bushel. In fact, charters were made as high as 6 cents per bushel, with no accommodation east of the lakes to take care of the business. The published lake and rail route in 1905 and 1906, Fort William to Montreal, was 81 cents per bushel.

As to the possibility of the lake and rail lines via Georgian bay becoming a greater factor in the grain carrying trade of the Northwest, a division of a rate of 6 cents would mean that the earning for the rail haul round Georgian bay would not exceed 3 mills per ton per mile, which is not considered profitable, especially as the lines could not expect to handle any great amount of westbound traffic; in fact, some of the lines have declined to handle ex-lake grain for export at going rates. So that there is very little likelihood of any material reduction in rates even with improved facilities. Even if it were possible to carry grain at 2½ mills per ton per mile, when there are no return loads, inadequacy of terminals would block and delay the business. The time of a steamer in transit from Fort William to Montreal via the Ottawa route should not exceed five days, equal to average time on cargoes via the shortest lake and rail route.

The saving in transhipment and elevator charges by this route will go largely to pay the cost of transportation proper, and with control of terminals, including elevators at lake ports and the sea-board, the rate will, no doubt, be lower than quoted.

The tonnage of vessels and trade on the upper lakes is largely in the hands of United States steamship owners. This applies as well to Canadian lake ports, and will continue so long as steamers with a capacity of from 8,000 to 12,000 tons can be used, as compared with the much smaller vessel of Canadian build, which is necessary owing to our lack of facilities. The working expenses of the large steamer are very little more than a vessel of a quarter or half its size. Therefore, not only

will benefit be derived from the cheapening of rates on the exports and imports of the west, but shipping ports at the seaboard commensurate with the trade of the country will be built up.

Source of electrical power.

The transportation of grain from the northwest is not by any means the only factor entering into this project. It will make possible the development of a region of immense mineral and forest wealth, which absolutely requires cheap transportation, and which is not now accessible. It is estimated that there is from 1,250,000 to 2,000,000 electric horse-power along the route awaiting development, which when utilized in manufacturing, milling, &c., will add millions of dollars to the national wealth. There are large deposits of iron ore, and vast areas of pulpwood contiguous to the line of waterway, which commodities are now entering largely into the commerce of the country, and for which there is a ready market. The chief item of importance in the west-bound tonnage would be lumber, cement and coal from Nova Scotia.

Distribution of Canadian coal.

Very little of the latter finds its way into Ontario. The cheapness of American coal at mines and the short haul has practically shut out Canadian coal. No change can be expected in this situation except through improved transportation facilities. The Nova Scotia shippers state that they would be able to compete provided there were facilities to allow a class of colliers in the Sydney-Montreal trade to proceed to the lake cities without breaking bulk. At the present time Ontario contributes between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000 annually to coal duties. It, therefore, might be well to consider the economy of appropriating a portion of this to approved facilities to secure coal from our own coal fields, and become practically independent of the United States for our supply. Coal can be delivered as advantageously to interior points in Ontario from the line of the Georgian bay route as from the St. Lawrence, Lake Erie, or Ontario. As an illustration: the average lake route on coal from Lake Erie ports to Lake Huron and Georgian bay ports is 35 cents per ton. The average rate to upper lake ports is 40 cents per ton. The average rail rate from the mines to say Cleveland is 78 cents per ton, making a through rate of $1.13 and $1.18, respectively. The average rail haul from the mines to the lake front is 140 miles, Cleveland to Fort William about 800 miles, total 940 miles. Sydney to Fort William is 1,697 miles. Taking the lake rate, Cleveland to Fort William as a basis the rate Sydney to Fort William would be about 85 cents per ton as against a rate of $1.18 from the United States mines. The rate to Sault Ste. Marie and intermediate ports would be proportionately lower. There is a difference of 33 cents per ton in the rate of freight to Fort William, to this add the duty of 53 cents per ton, making 85 cents per ton in favour of the home product.

As to the effect of the proposed waterway on Georgian bay ports. It will relieve the lines via Georgian bay of a class of traffic which it is claimed cannot be handled economically by rail east, and the elevators at bay ports will be available for the local and milling in transit interests throughout Ontario.

Harbour improvements at these ports will tend more to the advantage and building up of Ontario. Ontario is the manufacturing centre of Canada and should continue so, and should supply the wants of the Northwest. The development of her ports will give the benefit of water carriage. On the other hand the farmer in the Northwest who wants the output of the factory in the Northwest will be enabled to market his crop to the best possible advantage, and financially it will draw together the eastern and western ports of the Dominion and offer the chief factor in its prosperity, namely, 'cheap transportation.'

In conclusion it might be said that one of the objections offered to this route has been shortness of the season. This is hardly worthy of consideration, as it will be noted that Lake Nipissing, the most northerly portion of the route is 20 miles south of Sault Ste. Marie.

Now, if in addition to the increase of our own trade, we add the further shipments from the western states that would naturally be attracted to this route by reason of cheap transportation to the seaboard, it is practically impossible to arrive at the enormous volume of additional traffic which must be secured.

Since 1881 the traffic through the Sault canals has about doubled every six years, and last year as previously stated, reached the grand total of over 50,000,000 tons.

With a waterway from the upper lake cities to ocean navigation at Montreal, of only about the same distance as to Buffalo, and even completed to New York by way of Lake Champlain and the Hudson river, at least 100 miles shorter than any other proposed from the lakes to that city, there can be no question that with transportation rate of less than one per cent per ton per mile of the rate necessary on railroads the volume of traffic must exceed eight million tons annually.

I would like to read a report from the 'Globe' with regard to this line, being a despatch from Montreal of January 22.

Montreal, January 22.—Mr. C. E. W. Smith of New York, representative of a syndicate of American capitalists who have taken up the project of the construction of a ship canal from New York to Montreal by way of the Hudson river, Lake Champlain, and the Richelieu, with the necessary canal adjuncts to the St. Lawrence, states in an interview to-day that the project is now well on the way towards accomplishment. The whole of the capital required for the completion of the great waterway is forthcoming. There had been a little delay in the preparations owing to the tightness of money, but as financial conditions were now easier he anticipated no further difficulties in the way of the execution of the project. Work at the southern end of Lake Champlain, which would cost something like $30,000,000, was now in progress. That at the Canadian end would be

much less costly—probably not more than $7,000,000—but there was in connection with it an electric project which would have far reaching effect, that would involve a few additional millions, but he was not prepared to discuss that, further than to say that it was proposed to construct a large dam near St. John's, fed from the Richelieu river at a point where they could get a fall of seventy-four feet.

While a number of Canadians with whom I have discussed the project, said Mr. Smith, have evidenced a very warm interest in it, as it will mean a great deal to Montreal's progress to have continuous navigation for large vessels extending all the way from New York to this port, and entering the St. Lawrence near Longueuil, the money required will come from the south.

That, I think, is an additional argument, if such were needed, in favour of the building of this waterway.

It may be said that the figures I have given for transportation rates by water cannot be borne out by actual experience. Let me point out to you that barges plying on the Mississippi between Pittsburg and New Orleans carry coal a distance of 1,970 miles for the extremely low rate of 71 cents per ton, notwithstanding the difficulties to be contended with because of navigation on the Mississippi being very shallow. When this is considered, I think it may well be taken for granted that wheat can be profitably carried from Fort William or Port Arthur to Montreal via the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal system for 1½ cents per bushel.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. gentleman remember that he stated a moment ago that the prevailing rate from Fort William to Georgian bay ports was 2½ cents a bushel ?

Mr. McCOOL. I gave you the conditions as they are. It is not what is done but what can profitably be done and the ship owners in the trade must be making enormous profits—and I understand they are.

Mr. BENNETT. You have not seen the boats tied up this summer ?

Mr. McCOOL. The boats would not be tied up if the Georgian bay canal was constructed.

Mr. BENNETT. They have been coming down light from Fort William after taking coal up at 25 cents a ton.

Mr. McCOOL. Possibly because they were Canadian bottoms and could not handle the grain to Buffalo.

Mr. BENNETT. They could have taken it to Buffalo.

Mr. McCOOL. I am not prepared to answer that question. I am only giving the facts, taking the time and the cost of running the boat and the cost at which the work could be done at a reasonable profit. While I have stated 1½ cents, it is argued by men who have given this matter close study that it can be done for probably 1¼ cents.

Comparisons with the Erie canal system are hardly fair for the reason that it is well known that conditions there are entirely dissimilar. The Erie canal has been notoriously neglected and mismanaged for years until it was almost impossible to navigate it at all. Notwithstanding this it still supplies evidence in favour of water transportation in that the rate on wheat by water from Buffalo to New York is 4·24 as against 4.95 by rail, and amply justifies the people of the United States in having made an appropriation of $100,000,000 for its deepening to 14 feet and other improvements of the system, thus demonstrating their confidence in the future of transportation by water even under difficulties such as exist there. It must also be borne in mind that the American government have appropriated the necessary money required to build, and are at present building, a third lock or canal at Sault Ste. Marie at an estimated cost of $12,000,000, and this notwithstanding the fact that they already have two canals at that point.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you the dimensions of the new lock ? Is there to be greater depth of water on the mitre sill ?

Mr. McCOOL. I have not, but the minister says 25 feet.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand it is to be only one foot deeper, 23 feet.

An hon. MEMBER. Twenty-three feet six inches.

Mr. McCOOL. From what I can gather I do not think there is any intention of using vessels of any greater depth than 21 feet ; but sometimes they find that they have to drag through as it is. Of course there is always the inducement to load a little heavier than they should, and it is in order that there should be no possible detention that the depth has been increased. It is well to remember that during the year 1906, American vessels carried 95 per cent of the total freight passing through the Soo canal ; and it does seem necessary that some effort should be put forth by our government to at least get a reasonable share of this business.

I now make a final appeal to the government and the members of this House to lose no more time in starting this great work. As previously stated the final reports of surveys and estimates of the cost

of the entire scheme will be ready before the close of the session—at least so we are assured by the departmental officers—and in good time to make provision in the supplementary estimates for the necessary funds. It has been suggested that another commission should be appointed to investigate the commercial possibilities of the scheme. Surely this is not necessary with conditions so plain to all and after having spent $500,000 on surveys. If a commission to investigate the commercial side of it were needed, in my opinion it should have been appointed in the first place and not after having spent so much money on the surveys and estimates in connection with it. If the present stringency in the money markets of the world does not justify the undertaking of the whole work at once, then by all means let us make a start on the French river end, which will give connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway at North Bay, from which point, with the exception of the first six miles, there should be down grade to Montreal. Six miles east of North Bay you strike the headwaters of the Mattawa which empties into the Ottawa, and of course if the Canadian Pacific Railway grades between that point and Montreal are not all that they should be, it is only a matter of betterment—and they are not without the means of doing it. Connection can also be made at Callender with the Grand Trunk Railway at Callender station on Lake Nipissing, where there is as fine a natural harbour as is to be found in the country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Roughly speaking, what proportion of the cost would be required to build the canal to Callender?

Mr. McCOOL. $13,700,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. $13,000,000 would put navigation at Callender?

Mr. McCOOL. Yes, and provide terminal facilities. The distance from Callender via the Canada Atlantic from Scotia Junction is only a few miles further from Montreal than Depot Harbour, and cuts off the heavy grades between that point and Scotia Junction.

The easier grades from North Bay and Callender as compared with Georgian bay points would justify the development of the French river and Lake Nipissing section even if nothing further was done. I do not, however, want to be understood as suggesting the abandonment of the remaining section from North Bay to Montreal, but let us make a start on this section and the other will follow. The interim reportof Mr. A. St. Laurent, assistant chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, which was supplied the House a couple of days ago, leaves no room to doubt the urgency of starting at once the construction of this section, which, as pointed out in the report, will take five years to construct on account of the large quantities of rock excavation both dry and sub-marine. It cannot be contended that we have not sufficient data as to the cost of the proposed work, the surveys and estimates having been most carefully made by competent engineers, based upon labour conditions as they were last year; so, if any change should require to be made in the estimates it can only be in the way of reduction in cost, because of cheaper labour.

The estimated cost of this section is placed at $13,700,589, and includes an expenditure at North Bay of $1,493,361 for docks and other equipments at that place for taking care of the grain and other commodities to be transhipped to the railways.

While the amount named seems a large sum of money, it must be borne in mind that it is not an expenditure for any one section, but in reality is creating another Georgian port as well as a link in what must eventually prove to be the great freight rate regulator between the heads of the great lakes and the sea-board.

I desire to call special attention to that portion of the interim report previously mentioned, dealing with the water-powers which will be developed along the French river, and which, when utilized, should go a long way towards payment of the interest charges on the total expenditure on this section.

This has been a live subject for more than fifty years and any further postponement will be not only a great disappointment to those of us who have always looked foward to the completion of the Georgian bay ship canal, but will as well be a direct set back to our aspirations towards the control of the bulk of the traffic between the great lakes and the Atlantic which nature has placed within our grasp.

I trust, therefore, that immediate action will be taken by the government to start this important work, and I am positive that when completed the only criticism that can be offered will be the expression of surprise at this great undertaking not having been grappled with years ago.

Mr. G. V. WHITE (North Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the very excellent speech which the hon. member (Mr. McCool) has given to us. He has given to the House many interesting facts concerning the proposed Georgian bay canal. Last session when the question of general transportation was before the House, I presented a few reason why, in my opinion, this great work should be undertaken. To-day I propose to preface my remarks with a few statistics regarding some of the great canal systems of the world. First, Sir, let me read a short extract from a report of United States Consul General Bittinger to the State

Department, dated March 21, 1901, regarding the waterways of Canada. He says :

Canada, in earlier days, was styled 'a wooden country,' because of her vast forest areas, but the same term might as truthfully have been applied to the United States a century ago. One feature of Canada that might be used in a national descriptive title is her waterways, which are unrivalled in length as also in service to commerce.

In view of these remarks and when we consider that the water area of the Dominion covers approximately 126,000 square miles, I think I am justified in saying, that we do not fully appreciate the great resources which we possess in our natural waterways.

The Dominion government has, since confederation, expended approximately $72,000,000 upon the construction and improvement of our waterways, which expenditure is made up as follows :

Cost of construction and enlargement of canals 1868-1906 and before Confederation.

Cost of construction, $39,728,801 ; cost of enlargement, $51,118,078; total cost, $90,846,879.

Expenditure—1868-1906 and before Confederation.

Capital, $90,846,879; income, $4,324,658; staff, $9,901,481; repairs, $7,864,260.

This makes a grand total of $112,937,278. Of this amount $20,692,244 was expended before confederation, $4,173,921 by the imperial government and $16,518,233 by the provincial government interested, leaving an amount of $71,552,880 for the expenditure of the Dominion government since confederation. The total revenue up to 1806 from the canals was $13,513,583. Now, Sir, I think this amount of $72,000,000 odd is comparatively small when we take into consideration some of the other canals to which I will refer later on. The canal system of Canada, taking into account the St. Lawrence and great lakes route, which is probably the principal route, has a depth of 14 feet and a mileage of 73§ miles. Let me give you a few figures concerning the Welland canal, as it may be taken as an example of our Canadian canal system. The total cost of construction to the 30th June, 1904, was $25,985,643. Of this amount $222,220 was contributed by the imperial government, $7,416,020 by the provincial government prior to confederation, leaving a balance of $18,347,403 as the amount expended since confederation. Of this last amount $795,735 represents renewals chargeable to income. This canal was opened in 1829 and was completed for 8-foot navigation in 1847. It was decided in 1871 to enlarge the canals of the St. Lawrence river system in order to afford a depth of 12 feet, but before this was completed it was decided to provide a minimum depth of 14 feet on the sills and all the locks were made 45 feet in width.

The locks of 270 feet in length are intended to pass lake steamers of 2,000 tons capacity. I will not cite to the House the figures which give the traffic through the Canadian canals for the years 1887 and 1903, these figures show an enormous increase in a period of sixteen years :

SUMMARY Statement of the Traffic through the Canadian Canals 1887 and 1903.

Year.	Total No. of Vessels.	Total Tonnage.	Passengers.	Freight.	Tolls.
			No.	Tons.	
1887	22,874	3,414,631	82,914	2,870,516	303,035
	18,991*				
	3,883§				
1903	30,462	9,448,307	236,823	9,213,817	325,166
	23,767*				
	6,695§				

33% increase in No. of Vessels.
176% " " Total tonnage.
185% " " Passengers.
227% " " Tons of freight.
*Canadian. §American.

The following figures contain some interesting statistics concerning the traffic through the United States, St. Mary's Falls canal and the Sault St. Mary's canal for the seasons 1902-3.

TRAFFIC through the United States St. Mary's Falls Canal and the Canadian Sault Ste. Marie Canal for the Seasons of 1902 and 1903.

	TRAFFIC FOR 1902.		TRAFFIC FOR 1903.	
	United States Canal.	Canadian Canal.	United States Canal.	Canadian Canal.
Vessels..... No.	17,588	5,071	14,243	4,353
Tonnage freight.....Net tons	31,232,795	4,728,351	29,172,252	5,502,185
Passengers..... No.	22,778	36,599	23,156	32,019
Coal, hard.....Net tons.	284,986	24,962	1,038,935	115,070
Coal, soft..... "	3,973,448	529,082	4,918,176	870,452
Total of Coal.....	4,258,434	554,044	5,957,111	985,522
Flour..... Brls.	6,072,295	2,837,945	4,319,821	2,773,559
Wheat..... Bush.	48,835,062	27,895,903	29,181,901	32,202,651
Grain, excluding wheat..... "	21,650,609	6,090,213	75,990,232	6,105,414
Manufactured and Pig Iron.....Net tons.	154,666	43,486	121, 658	71,609
Lumber.....Ft. B.M.	1,028,848,000	62,623,000	958,850,000	45,342,000
Iron ore.....Net tons.	21,796,348	2,481,207	18,978,425	2,676,473

This table does not include several items such as salt, copper, silver ore, building stone and unclassified freights.

It will be noticed that in some of these items there has been a falling off in the traffic through the American canal, but in almost every case there has been an increase of traffic through the Canadian canal.

I wish now to give some statistics regarding some of the world's greatest ship canals, and I shall first take the Suez canal which is considered the most important example of a ship canal. The total length of this canal is 90 miles, about 60 miles of which is through shallow lakes. It is interesting to note that the number of vessels passing through the Suez canal annually does not equal the number passing through the canals connecting Lake Superior with the chain of great lakes at the south. The total excavation of the Suez canal amounted to 80,000,000 cubic yards under the original plan which gave a depth of 25 feet, but in 1895 the canal was enlarged to 31 feet depth bottom width, 108 feet, and surface width 420 feet, making the total excavation 100,000,000 cubic yards. The material excavated was principally sand, but in some cases strata of solid rock from 2 to 3 feet in thickness were met with. The total cost of the Suez canal was $100,000,000. The annual cost of maintenance and operation is somewhat high on account of the large amount of dredging which necessarily has to be done every year because of the drifting sand. The revenue of the canal, however, is apparently large in proportion to its cost. The report of the company for 1903 gives the net profit for the year at 65,579,347 francs, and the total amount distributed amongst the shareholders was 64,565,634 francs, or $12,461,167, or over 12 per cent on the estimated cost of $100,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Has my hon. friend the rate per ton on freight by the Suez canal?

Mr. WHITE. I am sorry to say that I have not. I take from the report of the Deep Waterways Commission, issued in January, 1897, the following comment on the Suez canal:

In 1869 occurred the opening of the Suez canal which brought the east into competition with western civilization by reducing a voyage of 6 to 8 months to 30 days, making it necessary to readjust ancient systems of distribution. A part of the effect of this rearrangement of the world's commerce upon the business of this country may be seen in the reductions of the freights upon grain about 75 per cent. The magnitude of commercial change or disturbance in reduction of value may be estimated from the fact that five years after the opening, the trade of India with foreign countries had so increased in volume as to employ an increase of 350,000 tons of steam shipping, an equivalent of 500,000 tons of sail.

Let us look for a moment at another canal —the Manchester ship canal. This canal has a total length of 35½ miles. Its dimensions are as follows: minimum width at the bottom, 120 feet; average width at water level, 175 feet, although in places the width is extended to 230 feet; minimum depth, 26 feet. The time required for navigating the canal is from 5 to 8 hours. The total excavation

was 45,000,000 cubic yards, one-fourth of the material being sandstone. The total cost was $75,000,000.

I have some figures which I have taken from the report of the Department of Commerce and Labour of the United States, giving the annual average rates on wheat by lake and canal by lake and rail, and by all rail and the rates on flour by rail, from Chicago to New York; also the rates by steamship from New York to Liverpool. These figures cover the years from 1884 to 1904, but I will give only those for the years 1884, 1894 and 1904. The average rate in 1884 on wheat, by lake and canal, was 6·31 cents per bushel; by lake and rail, 9·95 cents; by all-rail 13·125 cents; from New York to Liverpool, 7 cents. On flour, the average rate per barrel, from Chicago to New York, all rail, was 45·53 cents. In 1894 the average rate on wheat by lake and canal was 4·44 cents; by lake and rail, 7 cents; by all-rail, 12·8 cents; from Chicago Liverpool, 2 cents. On flour, from Chicago to New York, the rate by all-rail was 42·93 cents. In 1904 the rate on wheat by lake and canal was 4·71 cents; by lake and rail, 5·02 cents; by all-rail, 11·11 cents from New York to Liverpool, 2·25 cents. This shows a remarkable decrease in the rates for canal and lake transportation.

Now, the Georgian bay canal is, in the estimation of many people one of the greatest national projects which has been proposed in Canada for a great many years. It is no new project, for we find that as far back as 1854 some work was done on the Culbute canal, which is on the route of the Georgian bay canal. My hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) has pointed out a great many of the advantages which will accrue from the construction of this canal, and to a few of these I wish to refer. For example. Let us take two steamers leaving Chicago for the sea-board, one going by way of the Georgian bay canal, and the other by way of the great lakes and Buffalo. These steamers would run together as far as Sault Ste. Marie, and thence one goes by the Georgian bay canal, while the other continues down through the great lakes. Now, the distance from Chicago to Buffalo is approximately 900 miles, and the distance from Chicago to French river is 475 miles; so that when one ship is at the entrance of French river, the other is within 425 miles of its destination. Allowing for detention at the locks, we find that one vessel would be practically within fifty miles of Ottawa at the time the other had reached its destination at Buffalo. Now, assuming the rate from Chicago to Buffalo to be 1¼ cents a bushel, the cost to Ottawa or near Ottawa would be 1¼ cents a bushel. For the remaining 170 miles to Montreal, which it would take about 24 hours to cover, the rate would be approximately ¼ cent a bushel. Therefore grain could be delivered at Montreal, exclusive of course of canal tolls, for approximately 1½ cents a bushel. From Buffalo to the sea-board the cost is at least 3¼ cents a bushel. Therefore grain can be delivered at the sea-board at Montreal for 3 cents a bushel less than it can be taken to the Atlantic ports of the United States.

Now, Sir, I have looked very carefully into the report which was laid on the table of the House the other day. In that report the engineer has given some facts in very concise form regarding some of the advantages which this route affords. I am sorry to say that the report only gives us the approximate cost of the route as far as Lake Nipissing; but if the canal is to be built at all, I think it is the duty of the government to build the entire route. The approximate cost to North Bay, including the improvements there, for a depth of 22 feet is $13,700,589. The total number of locks on this route from Georgian bay to Montreal, according to the report, is twenty-seven, which is, I think, the number on the Welland canal.

As regards distances, I find that there is a very large saving by this route. From Fort William to Montreal, via the Georgian bay canal, the distance is 934 miles. From Fort William, via the Lake Erie and St. Lawrence canals, the distance is 1,216 miles, or a difference in favour of the proposed Georgian bay route over the other of 282 miles.

From Fort William to New York, via the Buffalo and Erie canal, the distance is 1,358 miles, showing a difference in favour of the Georgian bay canal of 424 miles.

From Fort William to Liverpool, via the Georgian bay canal route, the distance is 4,123 miles and via New York 4,929 miles, showing a difference of 806 miles in favour of the Georgian bay canal.

Another thing which has been pointed out is the fact that the time saved in making passages between the terminal points is a very important factor. We find in connection with this proposed route which will require only an artificial canalization of about 27·5 miles, that the time saved will be very great. In fact, the report claims for it advantages over all other existing routes in this respect.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out some of the advantages of this route as shown by the report which was laid on the table the other day. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) has pointed out that the total length of this waterway would be 440 miles; length of canal, including locks, 27·5 miles; length of improved channels, 55·5 miles; leaving a length of navigation of 357 miles. This means that about 81 per cent of the

route is navigable, and will not require any artificial excavation whatever. It has also been shown that there is a considerable saving in time by this route. We find that there is a saving of two days as compared with the St. Lawrence route, which in my opinion would have some effect on transportation rates. Then it has also been shown that the geographical position gives another advantage. This route would be entirely within Canadian waters, and would be fed entirely by Canadian waters. It has also been shown that for transportation of perishable goods this route would be more favourable, on account of the latitude in which it will run. With regard to the water-powers, the report shows that between Georgian bay and Lake Nipissing there would be available about 25,000 horse-power. But this is an infinitesimal figure compared with the immense water-power which would be available between the height of land and the mouth of the Ottawa river, where it has been stated that there is anywhere between 500,000 and 1,000,000 horse-power available.

Now one of the objections which has been raised to this route is that the season of navigation would be considerably shorter than by the great lakes. But I find that the engineer has given some figures which go to show that there may possibly be a difference of two days in the date of the closing of this route compared with other routes. He points out, however, that by the use of a couple of steel-clad tugs it will be possible to keep Lake Nipissing open for several days after it would otherwise be closed by the ice. We find with regard to the Montreal harbour that the average date of opening, for the last ten years, has been April 27; the average date of closing for the same period, November 28; the length of the navigation season therefore would be 216 days. Local navigation generally closes about ten or fifteen days later. At Sault Ste. Marie we find the average date of opening is April 25; average date of closing. December 5; average length of navigation season, 224 days. In the French river harbour, the average date of opening is April 21; average date of closing, December 1; average length of navigation season, 224 days, exactly the same as at the Sault. At North Bay, the average date of opening is April 27; average date of closing varies from November 20 to December 1, leaving an average navigation season of from 208 to 219 days. The period of navigation for the rest of the route would be similar to that of North Bay. I know that our mills along the Ottawa, during the last two seasons, have been able to keep running up to the 1st of December.

This project has been before the country for a great many years. The present administration has been in power some twelve years, but we have not yet had any definite announcement as to the policy the present government intends to adopt regarding this important undertaking. I have here a letter which was written to the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier by the late Mr. Tarte. This letter is dated Ottawa, 22nd January, 1902, and was written a short time before Mr. Tarte resigned from the government. He explained his policy regarding transportation generally, having given considerable attention to the French river route. I will read what he says regarding this route:

I have often advocated before you the importance of the adoption of a policy by which the government would improve, without any delay, that splendid waterway, the French river, which flows from Lake Nipissing into the Georgian bay.

Then he gives a comparison of the distances:

	Miles.
Fort William to Buffalo	750
Fort William to North Bay	473
Difference in favour of North Bay.	277
Duluth to Buffalo	857
Duluth to North Bay	575
Difference in favour of North Bay.	283
Milwaukee to Buffalo	716
Milwaukee to North Bay	463
Difference in favour of North Bay.	253
Chicago to Buffalo	733
Chicago to North Bay	520
Difference in favour of North Bay.	213

That comparison would be sufficient, it sems to me, to impress upon the mind of any sound business man the immense advantages of that splendid route.

As you are aware, I made it a point to go over the waterway during the last summer in company with a party of engineers, and of Mr. C. A. McCool, M.P.

I am, to-day, in a position to lay on the council table a complete survey and plans of the work to be executed in the French river to make it a great thoroughfare, twenty feet deep all through.

The French river is essentially a navigable river. Its waters are deep. There are only, here and there, a few obstacles to overcome. There are no engineering difficulties in the way.

I make bold to say that, within two years, the Department of the Public Works could carry out the improvements necessary to make the French river a waterway navigable to the largest ships on the lakes. The cost of the improvements would be, I think, inside of five million dollars.

Lake Nipissing is to-day connected with Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

It is connected with Toronto by the Grand Trunk Railway.

The distance between North Bay and Montreal is 317 miles on a down grade, which makes it possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to do what the New York Central does for Buffalo and New York, viz.: to carry immense freight trains behind their locomotives.

It goes without saying that as soon as the government has decided to improve the French river, the Canadian Pacific Railway would place themselves in a position to handle the additional quantity of traffic that will flow in that direction.

I have no doubt that the Grand Trunk would do the same thing in improving their line between Calender and Toronto.

Now, not only will our Canadian trade from the northwest be directed through that route, but it is beyond question that we will also receive a large traffic from Duluth, Chicago, Milwaukee and other American centres of trade.

Trade has no love. It follows the best and the cheapest ways.

It will be necessary, of course, to have on the lakes a greater number of Canadian bottoms. I have in my possession letters from navigation companies to the effect that they are prepared to supply an additional number of Canadian ships.

Our policy in declining to allow American ships to navigate into Canadian waters has greatly stimulated the ship-building industry.

Moreover, there is not the slightest doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway would themselves build a new fleet of boats to grapple with the new state of affairs created by the improvement of the French river.

Lake Nipissing would become a great depot not only for grain but for merchandise of all kinds seking an outlet to European markets.

Toronto, Montreal, Three Rivers, Qubec, in the summer months, St. John, Halifax, in the winter months, would derive incalculable benefits from the improvement of the route I am now suggesting.

I do not know any better means of procuring cheap transportation than the carying out of that enterprise.

I know that there are people who say: let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company improve the French river. I do not think that a more unsound argument has ever been advanced.

It is the duty of the Canadian government to improve our Canadian waters, and, I will add, to remain in full possession and control of those.

It would be just as well to hand over to a private corporation our system of canals, or the St. Lawrence river, than to give control of the French river to private capitalists.

The Canadian people have a right to expect that the government will keep the waterways in their hands, so as to regulate the rates for all time, in the interest of the whole community.

A government can always build railways to compete against other railways.

A government cannot build rivers and waterways.

Speaking for myself, I say without hesitation, that I will never consent to encourage in any way a policy by which private individuals would get hold of such national waterways as the French river and the Ottawa river. I feel that we have made a mistake in granting a charter to private individuals, but, as without our financial co-operation, those people cannot do anything, there is no great harm done so far.

The improvements of the French river, between Georgian bay and Lake Nipissing, would be the first link of a great waterway between Georgian bay and the waters of the St. Lawrence, at Montreal.

Let us by all means have the courage of beginning that work without delay.

It is being contended that we should stand by our Canadian system of canals. There is trade for all the avenues that lead to the St. Lawrence—trade for canals, trade for the French river, trade for all the ports of the Georgian bay and on the lakes.

Nearly the whole of the trade goes to-day through American ports and through American railways.

Let us equip our harbours, our rivers, our railways, so as to not only keep our own trade, but to divert American trade from American centres which are tributaries of our own country, on account of our geographical position and natural advantages.

In conclusion Mr. Tarte said :

My advice, then, to you, my dear Mr. Premier, is that we should go ahead and not lose any more time in completing what I take the liberty to call our national organization as far as transportation is concerned.

I think that twenty million dollars, wisely spent, would achieve that great end.

Twenty million dollars represent, after all, but six hundred thousand dollars a year.

How many millions and millions would the improvement that I suggest bring to the Canadian people every year?

Why, the settlers in Manitoba and in the northwest alone would benefit much more than the interest on the money we should spend.

Any one who has the knowledge of the country fails to understand why we have not carried out, long ago, the policy that I am suggesting to-day.

From a party standpoint, I have no hesitation in saying that it would be the most popular policy that any government could have ever adopted.

From a national standpoint, such a policy seems to me an urgent necesity—viz., a duty that we are bound to perform.

Our American neighbours are making tremendous efforts to monopolize the control of the trade of this continent on land, on the lakes, and on the high seas.

If we do not act just now, we will fairly be open to the accusation of not having understood the situation, or of having neglected to defend the great interest that the electorate have entrusted to us.

Believe me,

Truly yours,

(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Now, Sir, Mr. Tarte, according to this letter was entirely in favour of government ownership. I have here an extract from a speech made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on the 15th April, 1903. The right hon. gentleman spoke to a motion introduced by Mr. Thomas Murray, late member for Pontiac, and similar to the motion of my hon. friend the member for Nipissing, now before the House. He said in part :

We are all aware that new methods of communication have been found, but nevertheless we know that undoubtedly one of the easiest and cheapest routes would probably be the

canalizing of the Ottawa river. Whenever a company is prepared to approach the government asking for what I would call reasonable assistance, I think the government would be prepared to hear the application favourably and ask parliament for that reasonable assistance. But if my hon. friend Mr. Murray) expects that the government should assume such a gigantic work, I am not prepared to say that that subject has yet received such consideration as to enable me to answer in the affirmative. I do not think that at this moment the country is prepared to expect that the government should ask parliament to undertake this work out of its own resources. I rather think that the opinion is that it had better be left in the hands of private enterprise, &c., &c.

It is quite evident from this that the right hon. First Minister is in favour of building this great waterway by private enterprise. However, I hope that, before this debate is concluded, we will have an expression from him in regard to the policy which our government intends to adopt. Although the present administration has been in power for some twelve years, up to 1904, practically nothing was done in regard to this great work. On the eve of the general election, or about six weeks prior to the election, the government sent out a party of surveyors to line the Ottawa river from Mattawa to Pembroke and possibly between other points. These men were sent out to make a thorough survey of this route. They continued the work, I think, during the next season and then it was stopped. But we had a by-election in North Renfrew in 1906 and a few weeks before the by-election a number of men camped in front of the town and some one made inquiries as to what they were doing there.

They said they were surveying for the Georgian Bay ship canal, but a day or so after the election they disappeared and we have not seen or heard anything of them since. I would urge the government to take this matter up and to announce their policy upon it to the country. I have here an editorial from the Toronto 'Globe,' one of the government organs, which is worthy of attention. The 'Globe' on November 7, says editorially:—

The Georgian Bay Canal.

Information comes from Ottawa to the effect that the Georgian Bay Canal Company will apply at the coming session of parliament for legislation granting an extension of time for the commencement and completion of the canal system between the Georgian bay and Montreal. It may be proper enough to grant this extension if there is any reasonable prospect of the work being carried through by the company that now holds the franchise. If there is no such prospect, then it is better to refuse the extension and leave the course clear for some other arrangement to be made. If the canal is to be constructed at all, it can serve no useful purpose to keep it dangling as it has done for these many years.

The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) referred to the fact that the deputy Minister of Railways and Canals has advocated the appointment of a commission to look into the feasibility of this route. I endorse what my hon. friend said, that if the government intend to appoint a commission they should have done that somewhat earlier, before undertaking the surveys and examinations that have been made.

The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) speaking at a Liberal convention in my constituency a few weeks ago referred in glowing terms to this Georgian bay route, and I hope that we will hear from him to-night.

It is to be regretted that such delay has occurred in the preparation of the final report upon this project. Last session on several occasions I asked the government when it would be presented. At first I was told it would not be brought down until the end of last January. Then on February 22, I was informed that the minister had not inquired lately regarding this report, but would let me know later on. On March 11 I received a letter from the acting minister to the effect that the report would probably be ready before the end of last session, but possibly not until May. On April 25, I again asked when the final report would be down and Mr. Fisher answered:

I hoped that they would be finished before the close of the session, but I am afraid now that they will not be finished before the end of June or July 1. There has been an enormous amount of work involved in working out the details.

I now find that the final report will not be down until the latter part of February or the first of March. When it is presented I am sure that it will contain facts which will convince the members of this House that this is a work which will have to be constructed within a very short time. From the statistics regarding this great waterway which I have been able to present to the House to-day it will be seen that this Georgian Bay ship canal when completed, will be one of the greatest waterways on the American continent. It is the duty of the government, in my opinion, to commence its construction at the earliest possible moment, no halfway measures should be adopted and if the government undertake to construct the canal they should construct it in its entirety.

I feel that I need not apologize to the House for detaining them with the details of such an important project. It is a matter of the utmost importance and it is my earnest hope that within a very short time this canal will be constructed from the mouth of the French river to Montreal.

Mr. R. J. WATSON (Parry Sound.) I was pleased indeed to hear the mover of this resolution (Mr. McCool) so elaborately des-

cribe this route. I am sure he must have devoted a great deal of study and thought to the preparation of the mass of facts and figures which he presented to the House this afternoon. I listened attentively to my hon. friend who last spoke (Mr. White) who also presented valuable information with reference to this great waterway. However, I take some exception to the last speaker's introduction of politics into the discussion of this project. While in one sense this is a political question, I do not think that politics should be considered in the discussion of this great waterway. I may say that we have had election after election in our country since and before this survey was commenced but I have not heard one word on the hustings or anywhere else about the Georgian bay canal as a political matter and it is strange to me if it has been brought into the political arena in his county.

The marvellous era of prosperity experienced by the Dominion during the last ten years has shown to the world that Canada is to be reckoned with seriously when comparing the progress of countries, and if the same wisdom and foresight is shown in the growing spirit, as has characterized the rule of the present administration, it would indeed be difficult to predict the bounds of our future development.

By a successful immigration policy the Liberal government has brought to our shores the proper class of labour with which to develop the vacant lands of the west; our immense timber areas are being drawn upon and are giving forth wealth; our great mineral resources are being aroused and utilized, and concurrently the opportunities of Canada as a manufacturing country are becoming known. This increased population and increased production—this phenomenal business activity—has very naturally necessitated increased transportation facilities, and it may truthfully be said that the question of transportation has assumed proportions of great magnitude.

Much has been done to date in the matter of furnishing adequate means wherewith to meet the demand, and at the present time in many parts of the country miles and miles of railway lines are being constructed —prominent among them the National Transcontinental—yet experience has surely demonstrated most conclusively that though worked, yes and overworked, railways cannot satisfactorily meet the requirements of a fast growing and ambitious young Dominion. Therefore, the solution of the transportation problem is not to be found in the railways alone, but in the railways and waterways together. Hence the reason of the present very timely discussion urging the development of the greatest natural waterway in the world, commonly called the Georgian Bay ship canal, which when completed would give to Canada a transportation route wholly within Canadian territory, to a Canadian port, from which would be marketed the products of our own west and also a portion of the products of the American west.

The mover of the resolution has traced the history of the different examinations, surveys and reports made intermittently of the Georgian bay and Ottawa river route; he has reminded the House that its construction has been a live question for half a century, and he also described in detail the location, route and distance of the project. Its feasibility from an engineering standpoint cannot be questioned. Some of the brightest minds in the engineering profession have long ago pronounced it entirely feasible, and from the interim reports to be found in the Public Works annual blue book, as well as the lengthy article foreshadowing the publication of the final report of the present survey, which appeared in an Ottawa paper, there can be no doubt that the matter now simply depends on the attitude of the government, and on their decision the realization or frustration of the hopes of those truly interested in securing for Canada the key to the transportation problem.

In the discussion of the merits of the Georgian bay ship canal, it must at the outset be distinctly understood that the question is not a local one, but one of national importance. The great benefit its construction will be to the Georgian bay and Parry Sound district, or the French river and Ottawa valley, or the lower St. Lawrence and Montreal, must not prejudice the opinion of those constituencies not so favourably situated, because criticisms offered on the grounds that benefits will accrue to only a certain portion of the country would be criticism not fairly considered. Nor must the waterway be thought of as a mere 'canal' to be compared with, for instance, the Welland. Instead the Georgian bay ship canal, as proposed, would be a national highway to accommodate large lake freighters, boats of from 4,000 to 10,000 tons, carrying the products of the Northwest to the Atlantic via the shortest and cheapest route. It would tend to increase interprovincial trade, make possible the development of our mineral and other resources by cheap carrying of coal from the eastern mines, create new manufacturing and distributing centres and add to the traffic seeking transportation of railways. With the advantages in distance, in time and in rates, pointed out by the hon. member for Nipissing, the proposed waterway would be assured of an enormous traffic, measured only by our shipping interests and those of our southern neighbours. It is sometimes said that the Georgian bay canal scheme has been before the public for many years and nothing has come of it, but the same can be said of many great enterprises which have finally. After many years of agitation, been taken up and carried to completion. The Panama canal is one example.

After years of talk, delay and some work, the United States government have earnestly grappled the problem and are carrying it to completion, as I earnestly hope this government will in the immediate future undertake and carry to a successful finish the construction of the Georgian bay canal. But in regard to the question having been before the public for a long time, it is well to remember that eminent men on both sides of politics, and in the commercial world, have either advocated or expressed their belief in the importance of the waterway. The late Alexander Mackenzie once said :

I am perfectly satisfied that the Ottawa valley presents the greatest facilities of any route upon the continent for the transportation of the products of the Northwest to the Atlantic ocean.

Sir John A. Macdonald expressed this opinion :

The Ottawa ship canal and the Pacific railway must be constructed, and no voice would be raised against the great natural work, which would open the western states and colonies to the seaboard.

In 1898 a special committee of the Senate made an important investigation during which Sir William Van Horne spoke most favourably, also Messrs. Shanley, Bell and Clarke, the three last engineers prominent in the profession; also Mr. S. A. Thompson, of Duluth, at that time one of the greatest authorities upon waterways in America; also Mr. Ormond Higman, chief Dominion electrician, who gave expert evidence on the power development. Mr. H. K. Wickstead, C.E., who had been over the work and studied it fully, spoke most eulogistically of the scheme. That this gentleman is still of the same opinion is seen by some recent utterances of his. Mr. Redford, another well known engineer, lately declared that the construction of this canal would mean a great saving to every western wheat grower. The late Hon. Mr. Tarte was always an earnest advocate of the waterway, having personally, when Minister of Public Works, made a trip in company with his engineers over the whole route. The present honoured leader of the government has always spoken of the Georgian bay ship canal as one of his fondest hopes and even at the recent colonial conference in England he said that Canada had to build this great work. Different members of the cabinet on several occasions, when expressing personal opinions, have roused enthusiastic cheers from their hearers by referring to the possibility of the early construction of the French river and Ottawa waterway. Many members of the opposition, among them the leader, have given utterance to favourable opinion toward the project. The newspapers of the country from end to end never cease urging the government to commence the work. Recognized leaders of transportation companies wonder why no move is made in this direction; Mr. James J. Hill, truly a master mind on transportation, said not very long ago that the greatest boon from a commercial standpoint that could be conferred upon the Dominion would be the consummation of the much-talked of Georgian bay canal. Mr. Hill said :

Nature did about all she could for you when she pierced the continent with the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa and the lakes, and to utilize this great boon you must do your share. If you did that you would soon have a continuous waterway, from Quebec or Montreal to the head of lake Superior. With that great enterprise consummated you would send all your wheat from the head of Superior to Quebec for 3 cents per bushel. With a six or seven cent rate from the prairies to the lakes the cost of transporting your grain to Liverpool and other British ports would be reduced to a minimum.

All the foregoing I submit without comment, for comment is surely unnecessary in the face of so many convincing facts to show the great mass of public opinion favourable to the construction of this project. The Georgian Bay ship canal about 440 miles in length itself would be the shortest possible route from the head of the lakes, that is both American and Canadian ports, to the Atlantic seaboard. Without entering a detailed statement of comparison of distances in round figures the proposed route would be some 280 miles shorter than via the St. Lawrence, besides eliminating the wearisome and expensive transport. Port Colborne, some 420 miles, is the distance in favour of the proposed route over the Buffalo and Erie canal, besides avoiding the transfer at Buffalo, also expensive and the cause of much delay. Via the proposed waterway a boat will make the journey from the head of navigation to Montreal without a single delay or transfer of cargo in 5 days and the return trip in 5 days. Allowing time at terminals for discharge, loading and clearing, the round trip should be made in 12 or 15 days, effecting a very great saving in time over existing routes. What is more, no other route can ever expect to equal this speed.

Thus we have two most important advantages in favour of the proposed waterway. Rates are the next consideration. Canada cannot compete with the United States under existing conditions, and so does not receive even a fair share of the freight business. In the matter of wheat 130,000,000 bushels went by Buffalo last year. Season after season the grain crop of the Canadian Northwest is growing, having doubled in the five years 1900-1905. It is generally believed that in the near future the yield will total 200,000,000 bushels in wheat. This, with the other grains, also increasing their yield with great rapidity, will mean an enormous crop to

handle. To export it via an all-Canadian route through a Canadian port, and to capture a large portion of the American yield, is what the Georgian bay ship canal will accomplish by furnishing the lowest possible rates.

The rate for the past five years on wheat from upper lake ports via Buffalo to the Atlantic was about 6·71 cents per bushel, including all elevator and transfer charges. Bushel after bushel of Canadian wheat went from Fort William and Port Arthur at this rate through the American channel. We lost the profits of carriage and in many cases our products lost their distinctive national character, which after all is their chief claim to excellence.

What rate can the Georgian bay and Ottawa river route through the port of Montreal quote ? This waterway will carry grain for the low rate of 2·62 cents per bushel from upper lake points to Montreal ; this rate of course to include detention and elevating at sea-board. The rate for transportation alone would be the exceedingly low figure of 1·50 cents per bushel. Basing the charge at 2·60 cents gives a gratifying difference in favour of the proposed route over the American of 4·09 cents per bushel. When it is considered that American shippers say that if the Buffalo rate is beaten by ¼ of a cent per bushel, traffic would follow, the amount of business in store for the Canadian route, and incidentally the port of Montreal, is easily imagined.

The facts and figures of the money expended and the money earned in the annual movement of the wheat crop are too well known and surely appreciated by this House to require any elaborate explanations or quotations to impress upon our minds the magnitude of the proposition, and what great effect the securance of its transportation must mean. Trade will seek the shortest and cheapest route, a reduction of ¼ of a cent per bushel effecting large deviations. Therefore what counter argument can be offered, what protest can be raised, against the immediate development of a route which will give a reduction of 4·09 cents per bushel over existing lines? No argument can be advanced except a specious one, no protest can be raised except the empty opposition of persons bespeaking the imaginary advantages of some local scheme.

Then, taking as accepted the assurity of the wheat transportation, there is to be considered the local and return traffic the construction of this waterway through the French, Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers must naturally create. While definite statistics cannot be stated it is certain the waterway would make possible the establishment of new and flourishing industries along its entire route, which industries would furnish large quantities of freight to be transported east and west. The many magnificent water-powers will create a cheap and abundant supply of power.

An important point here suggests itself, that is, the benefit the waterway will be to the railways which must carry to its harbours and docks products from inland. There is no doubt many staple commodities manufactured or sold by the merchants of the eastern and central parts of Canada would be shipped to the farmer in the west via the proposed route, and carrying these to the boats must furnish business to the railways. This also must mean the development of ports and the growth of important towns along the whole route.

A district rich in mineral wealth, but now lying idle, would be opened and settled, and by cheap transportation of coal from the mines of Nova Scotia the smelting of iron ore would be made possible. Canada on account of its illimitable resources is bound to become one of the greatest, if not the greatest metallurgical country in the world, and the construction of this waterway is one of the ways in which expansion of the iron industry will be made possible. Then, too, it would reduce the price of domestic coal throughout Ontario and Quebec, by allowing the cheap importation of Nova Scotia coal, and so rid a long-suffering people from the monopolistic influence of strong American corporations.

The Ottawa valley and French river districts have ever been renowned for their abundance of forest wealth ; so this phase of development, which the water-way would materially help, I need but mention. The pulp industry, now becoming so important, would find tributary to the proposed route the very finest and most suitable material. The quality of pulp now manufactured in Canada is of a very high order, but the quantity is small. In the proposed canal we have the means of expanding and making of importance in the markets of the world, a profitable Canadian product. I have travelled over this route about fifteen times, from the mouth of the French river to Lake Nipissing, during the fifteen years that I have been in that country. Pulpwood forests extend for miles back from that river, so that on a rough estimate I will venture to say that we have some 200,000,000 cords of spruce wood tributary to this water-way. This gives some idea of what a great advantage it would be in that respect alone.

Thus we see that the construction of the Georgian bay ship canal can be productive of nothing but enormous benefit to Canada. In a short time it is expected that the report of the thorough and comprehensive engineering survey under the direction of the Public Works Department will be presented to the government, and I suppose to this House. Occasionally, of late, the press has given the probable estimate of the cost, but this is mere guesswork. Un-

til the report is completed and made public, authentic figures are not possible; therefore to discuss in detail an estimate of exact cost would be unsatisfactory. The cost will be in the millions of dollars.

Immediately upon the presentation of the report giving estimate of cost, so that contracts can be let, the government should undertake the work. With regard to another commission being appointed, the only commission I would ask this House to consider is one I will deal with a little later on.

However, if His Majesty's advisers do not feel that the whole proposition can just at present be undertaken, by all means, make a start on the upper end, and construct that portion giving direct water communication from upper lake ports via the Georgian bay and French river to Callender or North Bay, there making connection with the rail routes to Montreal. The water route would be an all-Canadian one, connecting with a Canadian railroad to a Canadian port of export. At Callender there is one of the finest natural harbours in the world. It is situated on the line of the Grand Trunk Railway, about seven miles south of North Bay; it is a promising little town, with large lumber mills and other industries. The harbour has a depth of about thirty feet all over and is about a mile wide. I am a little surprised that the harbour of Callender is not mentioned in the report which has been brought down. I have traversed this river fifteen or sixteen times from the mouth of Georgian bay to Lake Nipissing. I am quite familiar with it and I have gathered some information with regard to French river harbour from which this great waterway will start. This section of the proposed canal originates on French river harbour on the north shore of the Georgian bay. This harbour is formed by one of the several indications peculiar to the rocky formation of the Georgian bay. It has an average width of 500 feet with a depth of about 30 feet except at some points where islands or pinnacles of rock rise out which would require to be moved to allow of deep water navigation.

Mr. HAGGART. What did you say the depth was ?

Mr. WATSON. Thirty feet. I must say that without any exception this French river harbour is perhaps one of the best harbours on the Georgian bay except Parry Sound. It is sheltered from gales and high winds, is easy of access for craft entering the canal, and is perfectly safe for from five to six miles out in the bay. About three miles from the mouth of the French river are the Rustard islands which protect the harbour from heavy winds which otherwise would have full sweep across the lake. The channel from outside the Bustard islands is well protected by range lights.

Mr. BRODEUR. How many islands are there ?

Mr. WATSON. About fifteen or sixteen near Bustard island. During the season of navigation large vessels such as the 'City of Midland,' drawing from 12 to 15 feet call at the mouth of the French river, and their officers tell me it is one of the best stopping places along that route. The French river from its source at Lake Nipissing to its outlet on the Georgian bay passes through a rocky country and its course is a succession of wide and deep expansions, and narrow stretches, often dividing it into several branches. It reaches the waters of the Georgian bay by three main branches, the western, the eastern, and the middle outlets. Leaving French river harbour, at about one and a half miles from its mouth, the route selected follows the middle branch of the river as far as the eastern end of Ox lake, a distance of about seven miles. From there the canal line leaves the main French river to follow the Pickerel river for a distance of 17½ miles. I might say that there is a projected railway line which we hope will be built in the near future running from Burk's Falls to Cantiss island across the Pickerel river just at this particular place, and you can easily see what an advantage it would be to have the canal in connection with this railway. The distance from the Georgian bay to open water on Lake Nipissing by the route above described is 63 miles and the distance across Lake Nipissing is about 18 miles, the total distance from the Georgian bay to North Bay being therefore 81 miles. Should the government see its way clear to commence the upper end of this great waterway it could be shortened very materially by making the terminus at Callender instead of North Bay. I do not take any objection to the terminus being at North Bay, but when you have a natural harbour such as Callender within easy access of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when you would, according to the estimate, save $1,000,000 by making the terminus at Callender you can easily see what an advantage it would be. Callender and North Bay are only some seven miles apart; the Canadian Pacific Railway runs within four and a half miles of Callender and the Grand Trunk passes through the town. Leaving French river harbour the main breaks in the waterway occur at Les Dalles rapids, Horse Shoe falls, Five Mile rapids and Chaudière falls. Between these waters there are some wide and deep navigable stretches but narrows between high rocky walls with sharp turns occasionally occur necessitating heavy work of widening and rectification for large navigation. To render this section of the proposed waterway navigable for boats drawing 19 to 20

feet, it is proposed to create three reaches by means of locks and dams giving a channel 22 feet deep throughout and from 250 to 300 feet in width. Ascending from the Georgian bay the first lock will be below Les Dalles rapids about one mile from the mouth of the harbour, with a lift of 22 feet. The next lock will be 37 miles further up the river at the foot of the Five Mile rapids with a lift of 24 feet. The third lock will be located 13½ miles above the Chaudière falls, also with a lift of 24 feet, making a total amount of 70 feet from the Georgian bay. What I want to point out is that in building this section there are only three locks or three lifts to contend with in the whole 81 miles. I notice by looking at the report that to build a harbour with docks from the shore out into the lake at North Bay, would mean an expense of over a million dollars. The report says that on account of the shallowness of the water at the port of North Bay, you have to dredge and deepen out some two miles before ships can land there, and, by making the terminus at Callender, as I have already described, you would save one million dollars. I know there are a great many hon. gentlemen who want to speak on this question and I do not wish to take up much more of your time, but I would like to say a word in regard to the building of this water-way. It is a project of great national importance. I will not say that I am not locally interested in this project, because the French river runs through the district of Parry Sound which I have the honour to represent. But if the government are not inclined to undertake the whole route at once, I would urge them strongly to commence and build the upper part of it. Now, comparing the rates of this special proposition with Buffalo we have the following :—

Upper lake ports of Buffalo, the rate is 1¼ cents per bushel on wheat, and from Buffalo to the Atlantic, 3½ cents per bushel, making the total rate exclusive of elevating, of 4¾ cents per bushel. The rate from the lake ports to Calender would be 1¾ cents per bushel, and railway haulage thence to Montreal, 2½ cents per bushel : total 3¾ cents per bushel. This is also exclusive of elevating. So we have a reduction of 1 cent per bushel. In making this comparison the lowest rates for wheat known on the lakes are used. But taking, for instance, 1906, when the rate went as high as 2½ cents per bushel between Chicago and Buffalo, the advantage in favour of the Georgian bay and French river to Callender is more easily appreciated.

However I mention this as but a final appeal and not as the main proposition now under discussion, which can be considered only as one of national importance, and even of imperial value. I do not need to say very much about the lower end of this route, because I am not very familiar with it. But I think it can undoubtedly be shown that the lower end of the route can be more easily constructed than the upper end. I consider this waterway is one of national importance as a highway connecting the widely separated portions of the Dominion of Canada, and opening up profitable commercial and industrial operations. It is the link, the necessary link, in the shortest and cheapest possible highway between the abundant wheat fields of our glorious Canadian Northwest and the attractive markets of Great Britain.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I have been twelve years a member of this House of Commons, and every year this great project has been the subject of debate. It seems to me that we owe a good deal to the hon. gentlemen who have debated this question for the instruction which they have given us, and perhaps in some cases the conversions they have made. For fear this debate might be considered as one affecting the Ottawa valley alone, I would like, as a representative of the far east, to speak my mind upon the question, and I shall endeavour not to weary the House by speaking at length. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this question is not merely local, affecting this part of Canada alone, but it is one of the greatest national questions now before the country. The question of transportation is always important, and in Canada that question goes to the very root of our national life. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in this country, largely for one purpose, the carrying of Canadian goods through Canadian channels. For this purpose among others we built the Canadian Pacific Railway; in fact this has been one of the chief purposes of all the great transportation schemes of this country; it is one of the chief purposes in the construction of this proposed Georgian bay canal. I am not going to weary the House to-night by quoting at length opinions in reference to this matter, because I consider that the speech of the hon. member for Nipissing, this afternoon has given this House and this country so much information, and given it with so many details that it is unnecessary for me to go into this question very minutely. I would like however to quote the remarks of a few eminent men whose opinions will be considered of value by this House. Sir John A. Macdonald, before the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, used the following language :—

The Ottawa ship canal and the Canadian Pacific Railway must be constructed.

He put the Ottawa ship canal even before the Canadian Pacific Railway, and stated on his authority as Prime Minister of Canada that the Ottawa ship canal must be constructed. Then we find Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, belonging to the other side of politics, saying :

I am perfectly satisfied that the Ottawa valley presents the greatest facilities of any

route on this continent for the transportation of the products of the northwest to the Atlantic ocean.

We have had President Roosevelt quoted here to-day in regard to the betterment of the canal systems in the United States, and his remarks must possess great interest to the people of Canada at the present time. Sir William Van Horne, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in discussing this question of the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal before a committee of this House, used the following language :

I am of opinion that the construction of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian bay canal will benefit the commerce of the Dominion generally. Anything done to lessen the cost of transportation between Manitoba and the northwest and the seaboard must have unquestionably a beneficial effect. The trade of this canal would chiefly be in grains, food products and mineral and other products; and the water-power it would afford would result in the establishment of important industries all along its course in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. This canal would greatly increase the trade of Montreal, Quebec and other Canadian seaports. It would also develop local resources by the utilization of the water-powers it would afford. And, by cheapening transportation, this canal would have a good effect on the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it would create more traffic than it could take.

Mr. Walter Stanley, a very distinguished engineer testifying before a committee of the House of Commons, endorsed the project and stated :

Six-sevenths of the trade of western Canada was passing out through United States channels, while we only retained one-seventh. This condition could be reversed.

Curtis Clark, ex-president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, in writing a letter to a gentleman of Ottawa whose name will always be connected with this great project, and whose perseverance and industry we all admire, I mean Mr. McLeod Stewart, after endorsing the project generally, spoke of the waterways, and went on to say :

I say as an engineer that there is no place in any other civilized country, even Niagara not excepted, where there is such an amount of water-power available for electrical purposes as here, and it can be used over and over again.

These are the opinions of men distinguished in Canadian public life in transportation companies and engineering works. The United States Deep Waterways Commission investigation in 1896, refer to this system of inland navigation as the shortest route between terminals.

The 'Engineering News,' one of the most distinguished engineering periodicals in the world, says :

From an engineering point of view, disregarding for the moment political boundaries, there can be no doubt that the Ottawa route is by far the best for a deep waterway from the upper lakes to the sea. We respectfully submit to the New York barge canal promoters the question how their barge canal could hope to compete. Indeed we may take the question as a broader one and ask how any route to the sea which requires transhipment could possibly compete with a route which takes freight on board a steamer at upper lake ports and delivers it at tide water without breaking bulk.

These are eminent opinions from eminent authorities.

There are a number of reasons why in my humble opinion this great work should be undertaken.

1. It will be the shortest water route to the sea.

2. It will need less canalling than any other route which is being considered to-day. According to the latest reports it will need only from 27 to 29 miles of canal work. The St. Lawrence waterway contains 71 miles of canal and in the Erie waterway there are 351 miles of canal.

3. It would be the quickest route. The Erie route takes 192 hours, the St. Lawrence 138 hours, as compared with 103 hours on the Ottawa and Georgian bay.

4. It would be the safest route; it would be landlocked all the way and would be an absolutely all-Canadian route.

5. It is the best route from a climatic standpoint. It has been urged against this route that it runs through a country with an exceedingly cold winter climate. The fact of the cold winter can be well offset by the climate in summer. If perishable goods were sent out by, say the Mississippi route, in summer they would be destroyed whereas they would go through this canal and reach the English markets in good condition.

6. It would carry Canadian trade through Canadian channels. I am sure some of us must have been surprised this afternoon when my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) gave us the figures of the amount of wheat produced in Canada which is shipped through United States ports. I was surprised when he said that last year over 24,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain was shipped out through American ports as against 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 through the port of Montreal ; that through Boston alone over 9,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain were shipped to the old country; that through Portland there was shipped 6,249,461 bushels and considerable quantities through New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore. While these great quantities of Canadian grain were passing through American ports many Canadian ports were for the time idle.

7. My seventh reason—and to me, living in Nova Scotia, this is a very important

one—is the fact that it will open up the coal markets of Ontario and perhaps the west, and to this phase of the subject I propose to devote a little time. We have in Nova Scotia coal deposits, estimated away up into the hundreds of millions of tons, estimated as a billion tons of marketable coal, and yet up to the present time we have not got our output much above the 5,000,000 tons mark per year. This is a paltry amount compared with the output of Pennsylvania. Why does this condition of affairs exist? I am sure the answer will come to me by those who know the facts that our market is limited, that we are confined within a small circle. On one side we are up against the American tariff and on the other side we look out towards the broad Atlantic with prohibitive freight rates; while on this side at the city of Montreal, the door of navigation is locked to us and we cannot get into the province of Ontario, the great market for coal in the Dominion of Canada. So long as our market is thus limited, so long will the output of coal in Nova Scotia be maintained at a comparatively small figure, and so long must the present duty on American coal be maintained.

We have in that province only two hopes for an outside market; one is the United States market, which does not look as if it were going to be opened to us, and the other is the market of this great province of Ontario—and this is the more welcome market to the Canadians who are handling the coal trade. We can and do send coal into the city of Montreal by water from Cape Breton. We are not only able to compete with American coal in Montreal, but to control the market in that city, but there we are stopped because there our vessels stop, and anything that will open navigation so than our steamers can get up not only to the city of Montreal, but on to the west, would tend to increase the market for our coal and is bound to make the coal industry in the province of Nova Scotia much more important.

There is consumed in this province probably 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 tons per year, or equal to all that is raised in Nova Scotia, and yet of this amount we sell but a paltry few hundred tons. The province of Ontario to-day, patriotic as it is, is using only coal mined in United States collieries, raised by United States miners.

The claim I make is that if this canal were constructed to the depth proposed, Nova Scotia coal would be delivered as advantageously to interior points in Ontario by it as American coal can be taken to those points from Lake Erie and other United States ports and I propose to prove that. The average lake rate on coal from Lake Erie ports to Lake Huron and Georgian bay ports to-day is 35 cents per ton; the average rate to Lake Superior points is 40 cents per ton. The average rail rate from the mines in Pennsylvania to, say, Cleveland, 140 miles, is 78 cents per ton, making a through rate from the colliery to Lake Huron and Georgian bay ports and other markets further west of $1.13 and $1.18 per ton respectively. From Cleveland to Fort William by water is a distance of 800 miles and the freight rate for that distance is 40 cents per ton. From Sydney to Fort William by the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal route would be 1,697 miles. Apply the same rate per ton, according to the number of miles, from Sydney to Fort William as is given to-day from Cleveland to Fort William and you will find that coal can be placed in Fort William from Sydney at a rate of 85 cents per ton as against $1.18 from United States mines, or a difference, Mr. Speaker, in favour of Nova Scotia coal of 33 cents per ton. Now, some one may say that a rate of 85 cents is ridiculous. Perhaps it is, but if it is ridiculous then the rate between Cleveland and Fort William to-day is ridiculous. Then, if you consider that 85 cents is too small a rate make it a dollar a ton and still you can bring coal raised from the ground and dumped into the vessels, without any rail haul, from Sydney to Fort William for 18 cents a ton less than at the present time it is conveyed from the mines of Pennsylvania via the lake ports of Fort William. And, mark you, on top of this advantage of 18 cents a ton which we have on the dollar rate, there is a duty of 53 cents per ton which would give the Nova Scotia mines a preference in the markets of the western lakes of 18 cents plus 53 cents, making 71 cents in all over American coal. But the probabilities are that it could put coal into the western ports by this canal and thus enlarge our market the demand for the province of Ontario would be made in all probability to cut the duty on coal in half. If you cut the duty on coal in half you would save to the people of this province half the interest on the capital cost of the Georgian bay canal route in duty alone. The province of Ontario to-day is paying from $2,500,000 to $3,000,000 per year in duty on coal. If it could be made possible by the construction of this Ottawa and Georgian bay canal route to cut that amount in half you are saving from $1,250,000 to $1,500,000 per year to the province of Ontario, and that will more than half pay the interest upon the whole cost of this great work through the French river and down to the city of Montreal.

I know, of course, that there may be and would be undoubtedly some toll charges on the canal, but we must remember that we would carry that coal from Sydney to Fort William without breaking bulk, whereas coal brought from the United States mines has to be taken out of the cars at Cleveland, or at some other lake port, and put into the ship, that it has to be transhipped, whereas we would not have to break

bulk during the whole voyage from Sydney.

If we had such a service between Sydney and Fort William, for instance, and intervening ports, it would mean return cargoes, which would be beneficial to us in the maritime provinces, particularly in Sydney. It would mean return cargoes of iron ore which is needed, which is useful, to the great steel works at Sydney and North Sydney. It would mean that in Nova Scotia we could have established large flour mills for the grinding of wheat into flour for the consumption of our people, because we could bring the wheat direct in return cargoes from Fort William to Sydney.

For these reasons I, for one, representing a constituency in the far east, am in favour of this project if it can be completed for a reasonable amount. I am in favour of it as a whole, and I do not think we should undertake the French river section only. I do not believe in doing a great national work by piecemeal. It is a project which is big and should be undertaken in the interest of the whole Dominion at large. It will be beneficial to all parts of the country, it will make trade easier between different parts of Canada, it will be one more link in the chain which binds this country together, it will mean an increased interchange of trade between Ontario and the maritime provinces. It will mean, to my mind a work which will be beneficial to all parts of Canada, and particularly so to the province of Ontario and the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. GERALD H. BRABAZON (Pontiac). Mr. Speaker, I have followed with close attention and with deep interest in the discussions which have taken place from time to time while I have had the honour of a seat in this House on the all important question of transportation, and in view of the splendid array of facts and figures which has been presented to the House this afternoon by my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) I am more firmly convinced than ever that the only practicable solution of the question of transportation is the opening up of this great waterway that has been provided in the interior of our country from the great lakes to Montreal. This scheme has been before the country for upwards of half a century and there has never been any great objection to it that I am aware of. Indeed, in the first place, it was very favourably looked upon as a possible means of diverting the trade of the great lakes from New York to Montreal, and no reason obtained for it then that does not with ten fold force, obtain now owing to the rapid increase of population and production in the great Canadian west, and if the millions of acres of fertile agricultural lands of that country which still remain to be ploughed fulfil the prophecy which has been made for them, then I think I might say without hesitation that even if the Grand Trunk Pacific were an accomplished fact and if we had another transcontinenal railway to assist the splendid system of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern and all the other channels of transportation, yet we would in all probability fall short of the required transportation facilities to adequately handle the enormous and ever increasing traffic between the two great sections of our country. But, with the magnificent natural facilities we possess we should be able to improve our transportation system to such an extent as to prevent any of our Northwest harvest which leaves Fort William and Port Arthur for the sea-board from being transhipped at Buffalo, or some other American port, to be sent over an American line to New York. What every patriotic Canadian hopes for is that Canadian products may be carried through Canadian channels to Canadian seaports and that whatever profit there is to be obtained from exporting them to foreign markets may be secured to this country.

Now, Sir, to accomplish this much to the desired end, we want the shortest and cheapest water route and this we have at our very door in the French and Ottawa river route with its chain of rivers and lakes forming a great natural waterway from the Georgian bay to Montreal which is admittedly the best and shortest route from the great lakes to the Atlantic and which is practically without the disadvantage inherent to an artificial canal. The immense advantage of this waterway over all others as a freight carrier from the great lakes to the Atlantic has been pointed out time and again. It is a well known fact that traffic will follow the lines of least resistance, and trade seeking the cheapest route would naturally flow through this channel, and none will deny that the reduction of freight rates which would undoubtedly follow the construction of this waterway would result in increasing the price of wheat to the farmers of the Northwest. The late Hon. Mr. Tarte, who was one of the most progressive ministers of the Liberal administration, had unbounded faith in this waterway, and he urged upon the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the strongest possible way the necessity of pushing the work to completion with the least possible delay. It is sometimes said that the day of canals is over and that waterways cannot any longer compete with railroads. But let me quote some striking evidence to controvert that proposition, which was brought forward at a meeting of the British Chambers of Commerce, and which shows the vast superiority of facilities afforded by canals for inland transportation in continental European countries :

No less than $90,000,000 of Prussia's public funds have been expended during twenty-three years in canalizing rivers and in cutting

canals from the large rivers to the great cities. A further expenditure of $70,000,000 on the same object is projected. As it is, Germany possesses almost nine thousand miles of navigable inland waters. France, in the seven years following the war with Germany, devoted nearly $50,000,000, and has since allotted nearly $50,000,000 more, to the construction of canals free from tolls. Extensions contemplating an additional sum of $110,000,000 are contemplated. There are now in France three thousand miles of canals and upwards of seven thousand miles of navigable rivers, many of which have been canalized. The extent to which the Hollander profits from his innumerable canals is well known. Less familiar is the fact that Belgium also is applying many millions of dollars to the development of a system of inland water transportation. Austria is about to construct four canals, aggregating 1,040 miles in length, to link the Oder, Elbe, Dniester and Danube. Italy has under way in her northern provinces a network of canals which will have a collective length of 2,122 miles.

This should be sufficient proof that the day of canals is yet only in its infancy. I might also quote what was said by Mr. J. J. Hill, who is looked upon as one of the foremost transportation authorities in this country. In a speech delivered some time ago before the Merchant's Club of Chicago, Mr. Hill said :

Canada has already one transcontinental railway system. Others will soon be added. It has a system of waterways which is justly its pride. On this it has spent nearly $100,000,000. The St. Lawrence canal system furnishes 43 miles of artificial channel to re-inforce river and lake. The Welland canal completes the chain. The most ambitious project, and one in which every lake city has a stake, is the proposed canal from Lake Huron to the St. Lawrence river direct. Engineers have examined the scheme and pronounced it feasible. This ship canal would extend from Georgian bay by way of Lake Nipissing and the Mattawa and Ottawa rivers, reducing the distance from Georgian bay to Montreal to 430 miles. This is nearly 300 miles less than the present route by way of Lake Erie and the St. Lawrence river.

What would it mean to Chicago were such a canal constructed with a depth of 20 feet, as planned, so that vessels could load at your docks and sail direct for Montreal or Quebec, bringing ocean-going ships practically as near the upper lakes and the west as Buffalo is now.

Your packing-house products could be loaded in Chicago on specially constructed ships, and sent direct to any ocean port in the world. Your grain could be delivered at Montreal or Quebec for little more than it now costs to Buffalo. Can any practical mind fail to grasp the vast possibilities waiting upon harmonious action upon both sides of this boundary line which worries and taxes commerce now, but which will not for ever defeat or impede it?

To-day's Toronto 'Globe' has an interesting article on this question, which contains many truths and which I may be permitted to put on record :

The interim report of the Georgian bay canal survey emphasizes the great value of this entirely Canadian highway from the lakes to tidewater. Nature has been generous in the construction of this route, and its long stretches of navigable water are among the Dominion's most valuable assets. These stretches are a sufficient depth for the largest vessels on the upper lakes, and once they are connected by canal construction there will be a water route from Port Arthur and Fort William to Montreal no more circuitous than the average route by rail on this continent. the chief advantage of a water highway is that it must always remain open to free competition and thus effectually regulate railway rates. When the crowding of freight forces rates up the tramp vessels come from all parts of the world, not only relieving the congestion, but preventing any disorganization of trade by unexpected loss or delay. It is for this reason that canals should always be kept open as public highways. The public gain by them as by the ordinary roads.

A privately-owned canal would become a monopoly as certainly as did the first railways established as privately-owned highways. The members of a canal company could also organize a ship company and could make fees so high that the ships would be unprofitable. All their profits would be obtained through the canal, and there would be no competition from other ships. That is one of many devices by which a privately-owned canal could get rid of the valuable feature of perpetually competitive transportation. The Dominion has done well in promoting and perfecting inland water transportation, and it would not do to introduce politically deleterious influences by creating competitive private and public waterways. But the great value of these navigable water stretches prevents the possibility of their ever passing out of the hands of the Dominion. It is estimated that the French river section will cost about $13,700,000. That is, roughly estimated, about one year's federal surplus. The connecting links on the two sections would involve 27.5 miles of canals and 55.5 miles of river improvement. These with the existing 357 miles of navigable water would complete the shortest route to the ocean. Another feature of immense value is the water-power to be developed by canal construction. This will be conveniently distributed at various points, and may be used to work an auxiliary railway as well as for general industrial development. With this highway, as with many deposits of mineral wealth and areas of agricultural land, we are only awakening to an appreciation of the value of our heritage.

But there is something above and beyond all this to be said in favour of this route. The Ottawa valley possesses untold wealth in natural resources, inexhaustible forests, abundant mineral deposits, splendid agricultural lands, and mighty water-powers. The Ottawa is preeminently a river of water-powers, so that the enormous possibilities of traffic from local sources alone can scarcely be overestimated, and should go a

long way towards justifying the necessary expenditure for the construction of this canal. To give us a slight idea of what we might expect from local traffic I might be permitted to say a word about the county of Pontiac which I have the honour to represent. Pontiac is one of the largest counties in the Dominion of Canada; it has a front extending along the Ottawa river for upwards of 300 miles from a short distance above the capital to the head of Lake Temiskaming and from there the Ottawa river lies entirely within the boundaries of the county to its source at the height of land, every foot of that territory being rich in natural resources.

Within four miles of the Chats falls we have the Bristol iron mines, estimated to contain upwards of 30,000,000 tons of Bessemer ore. John Birkenbine, an eminent mining engineer of the United States reported on this deposit some years ago and stated that it was ample to justify the erection of a smelter, and that in his opinion, Ottawa would be the best place at which to build one, as ores could be easily centred there.

A short distance further up the Ottawa we come to Portage du Fort, where there is serpentine, iron ore and magnificent building stone, a block of which forms the corner stone of this building. Then we come to the rich Galena mines on the Calumet island, within a few miles of the Grand Calumet falls, in the neighbourhood of which numerous mineral discoveries have been made.

And so it is all along the route until we come to the Timiskaming, where there are some of the finest agricultural lands in Canada; and here we have a large settlement of hardy, intelligent people, who with indomitable pluck went in there a few years ago and have built for themselves happy and prosperous homes and thriving villages, with buildings and other improvements that would compare favourably with any portion of the older provinces. In the Timiskaming country gold and silver has been discovered as in the Cobalt country, and there are also some of the richest and most extensive iron deposits in Canada.

I have no doubt that when this canal is built and in operation, Lake Timiskaming, through which runs the Ottawa river, will be utilized and improved and become a feeder to the main line of the canal.

Many mines have been discovered in the country, some of which have been worked and developed to a certain extent, beyond which it was impossible to go without better transportation facilities, so work had to be abandoned.

It has been said on good authority that the province of Quebec possessed one-fifth of the entire water-power of the whole North American continent. If this be so then I have no hesitation in saying that Pontiac county possesses one-fourth of the water-power of the province of Quebec.

All this, with the extensive lumbering operations which are carried on in the county will go to show what might be expected in the way of traffic from Pontiac alone were it given this open waterway.

Although Pontiac is rich in all that stands for greatness, I regret to say the county is poor in railway facilities, having only the Pontiac Pacific Junction branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, running for a few miles through the eastern end to Waltham, for which the people of the county are paying an enormous railway tax, and a short branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the foot of Lake Timiskaming to Kippewa. Both these lines appear to be stuck fast and cannot move further. But I fervently hope the day is not far distant when the former will be pushed through to a western connection with the main line of the C.P.R., and that the latter may also be hastened to a junction with the G. T. Pacific. So you see, Mr. Speaker, the construction of the canal is a matter of the most vital importance to Pontiac.

Pulpwood alone should furnish an immense quantity of traffic. A British authority says all Canada wants is enterprise and capital to develop the greatest pulp producing country in the world. European countries import over half a million tons of pulp annually. American paper companies cut pulpwood in Canada, pay government dues and stumpage, and haul the wood to the railways, transport it by rail to their mills in the United States, and then sell the finished product in Great Britain, a condition of affairs which, I believe, in the best interests of Canada, should not exist. Canadian spruce constitutes the most important supply of raw material in the world, and there is no part of Canada better adapted to the production and manufacture of pulp and paper than the valley of the Ottawa if given this waterway. The opening of the canal will practically afford unlimited water-power and cheap transportation. A dozen mills of the largest size can be favourably located both as to water-power and shipping facilities on the upper Ottawa river, and will be able by their position to compete on favourable terms with the old country, and the United States as well as in the home market. From North Bay alone the shipments run up to about 10,000 cars annually, and cost from $2.75 to $3.25 a cord for transportation. Now, the saving resultant from shipping this by water should be not less than $2 per cord. Sturgeon Falls is a shipping point for from 4,000 to 5,000 square miles of territory on which the pulpwood will run 400 cords to the mile. Twenty thousand square miles is a low estimate of the spruce territory of the Ottawa valley and the north country tributary to this waterway. As from fifteen to twenty years suffice for the recuperation of the forest after cutting—over 1,000,000 tons a year could

be shipped out of this territory perpetually.

It has already been pointed out that the opening of this waterway should give a great impetus to the transportation of Nova Scotia coal to the interior. Nova Scotia coal vessels could ascend this waterway to the main shipping points where they could load with lumber, pulp and other products as return cargo. Indeed the opening up of the canal should give, as a new field for Nova Scotia coal the entire Ottawa valley. Besides the consumption in cities and towns and for manufacturing purposes, an important item will be the supply of the railroads. The opening up of this great country to the northward of the Ottawa is certain to create new demand along this line; and already the mileage of railroads which can be supplied to advantage from points along the Ottawa river is extensive.

The laying down of cheap coal at Ottawa will also open a possibility of profitably operating local smelters to handle the iron ores of the district. With this navigation route once an established fact, the hum of industry will be heard on every hand; every village and hamlet along its shores will then become a manufacturing centre, a thriving town or city, and the valley of the Ottawa will in very truth be the worship of the Dominion. A considerable passenger traffic, both local and tourist, cannot fail to develop from the outset because, as a summer resort, the upper Ottawa offers attractions second to none on the American continent. The scenery is simply magnificent. Its lakes and rivers teem with fish and the whole country abounds in game of all sorts. The influx of visitors to the lake district has only begun and is increasing rapidly from year to year, and, no doubt in the near future, if the canal were in operation, this district would surpass any portion of the Dominion as a tourist and sportsman's paradise.

Much as this great question means to Canada, as a whole, it means more to the people of the great west, because, once in operation, it certainly would give cheaper freight rates, and the farmers of the Northwest would consequently make a greater profit on their wheat. I venture to say, Sir, that never since its inception, has this scheme excited so much interest in the public mind as it does at present. No doubt this is due to the fact that the government has for several years been expending large sums of money on a resurvey of the route for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not the project is practicable and also for the purpose of procuring reliable data upon which to base estimates for such a work as would be approximately accurate. And now that the surveys have been completed, plans and profiles prepared, and that the government are in possession of all the information necessary to show that the route is feasible, certainly the country will expect the government to proceed with the work without any undue loss of time.

Another reason why the country is more exercised about this matter than at any other time is because the government have not yet made any pronouncement as to its policy with regard to this project. I hope to hear from the Minister of Public Works, or some other member of the government, a declaration as to what the government intend doing. At the same time, I hope that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will give us some information to explain the difference in the cost, as estimated by the late Mr. Tarte, when Minister of Public Works—his estimate was $5,000,000—and the estimate now of $13,700,000 for the construction of that part of the scheme from Georgian bay to Nipissing.

Our greatest statesmen have always recognized the importance of this splendid waterway and looked upon its construction as a national project which ought to be undertaken in the best interests of the country. Many of our foremost transportation experts have expressed the opinion that our transportation system will never be complete until this waterway is developed and utilized. Some of the most eminent engineers of the day have declared their opinion that this waterway is by far the best and cheapest route from the great lakes to the Atlantic. Many senators and members of parliament have pinned their faith to this enterprise. Indeed, hon. gentlemen, irrespective of party, have, in the most eloquent speeches, both on the floor of this House and elsewhere, advocated the construction of this canal in the strongest possible manner. And I am proud to say that none did more to keep the project alive and permanently before the public than my friend, Mr. W. J. Poupore, ex-member for Pontiac, when in a famous speech he brought the question before the House in 1898—a speech which not only attracted the attention of the press of this country, but of the old country and the United States as well. On that occasion he was ably supported by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who has ever been a strong advocate of the Georgian bay canal, and many other gentlemen among them the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) who has now gone to his reward above—not to heaven but to the Senate. And it goes without saying that the name of Macleod Stewart will go down on his country's scroll of fame as one of those who did perhaps more than anybody else to keep this great undertaking before the country.

With great national harbours at the head of Lake Superior and on the Georgian bay and at Montreal and Quebec, equipped with all modern appliances and machinery for

handling cargo, and with the Georgian bay canal an established fact, we would then not only be in a position to control all the commerce of our own country, but would be certain to capture a great deal of trade from our neighbours to the south.

I wish to say in conclusion that I sincerely hope the government will undertake the work in its entirety as a great national enterprise and that they will not do it by piecemeal. Public opinion is ripe for its construction, the people of Canada look upon it now as the best possible means of solving the transportation question, and when we consider how it may enhance the brilliant future of this country, we must be convinced that no time should be lost in going on with it. I trust therefore that the government will start the work of construction at once and push it vigorously to completion, so that in the near future another page may be added to Canadian history, recording the opening up of this great national artery of transportation—a page no less bright than that on which is written the story of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. J. B. T. CARON (Ottawa). As I seconded the motion made this afternoon by my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) I wish to say a few words on the subject, and endeavour to impress on the House and the government the necessity of proceeding with this work without further delay. Allow me at the outset to make a brief reference to the importance of canals in general as a means of transportation. Before the construction of railways the importance of canals as freight and passenger carriers was recognized by all civilized nations. But between 1825 and 1870 there was a great infatuation for the construction of railways, which at that time were a new thing, and the canals saw their tonnage diminishing rapidly. The speed of railways being far greater than that obtained on water-ways, railway transportation obtained a monoply of public attention, and the railway companies, which were naturally alive to their own interest, got control of most of the canals and allowed them to deteriorate and in many instances go to ruin. Moreover, the canals did not seem to realize the position they were in, and by maintaining the former rate of tolls they allowed the railways to get absolute control of the traffic. About 1870 the general public, and shippers in particular, realized that the railways had failed to give them the lower rates which they had expected; that, in fact, instead of giving cheaper rates, the railways were charging higher than the waterways. This state of affairs forced the economists of all countries to look to the water routes for a solution of the problem and this led to a canal improving era, and contrary to the predictions of the pessimists the rates were not only reduced considerably but the supplementary traffic created by the opening of new routes so benefited the railway companies that the House ceased to oppose the construction of canals even on routes parallel to their lines. There is no better example of this than the New York Central which runs through its entire length along the Erie canal and has all the traffic that it could desire. The canal has built twelve cities or towns along its course, and the New York Central draws the traffic from those cities. It has been noticed that in the localities deprived of waterways the public has been practically held up by the railway companies. Whenever the canals have come into competition with railroads they have proved better controllers of rates than all the legislative bodies, and to quote a distinguished authority :

> If the Erie canal did not carry one ton of freight it would be well worth keeping it up simply as a regulator of railway rates.

Since the canals have started to develop in 1870 they have managed to reduce their rates 80 per cent, whilst the railroads have only reduced theirs 50 per cent. The best the railroads can do now is to transport freight at one-half or one-third of a cent per ton per mile; whilst the big carriers on water-ways can carry freight at less than one-tenth of a cent per ton per mile. We see, therefore, the great advantage of a water-way over a railway. The Georgian bay ship canal, which we are discussing now, is by no means a new route. It is a proposed water-way connecting the great lakes with Montreal by way of French river, Lake Nipissing, Trout lake, Talon lake, the Mattawa and the Ottawa rivers. My hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) has given us this afternoon the history of the canal scheme, so it is not necessary for me to go into that part of the question. But since Samuel de Champlain paddled up the Ottawa river and down the French river to Lake Huron in 1614, this route has been known to all travellers and pioneers. It has been the only route by which the fur trade of the Northwest has been conducted, all the furs have come down that way to Montreal and Quebec, whence they were shipped to Europe. During the last century various projects have been set on foot for the construction of this canal. More especially since 1852, different engineers have been employed to report upon the feasibility of the canal at different times. Mr. Walter Shanly, T. C. Clarke, E. P. Bender, C. R. Coutlee, D. F McLeod and George Y. Wisner were commissioned, either by the government or by private companies, to examine and report on the feasibility of this project. Although these gentlemen have all reported that the project was feasible, nevertheless it has not been proceeded with because the general public were not convinced of its necessity. In the fall of 1904 the Minister of Public Works instructed

Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, an engineer in the employ of the government, to make a complete and extensive survey of the whole route. I understand the government have a report to the effect that the surveys are completed now, and there will shortly be laid before the House the plans and estimate of the cost of this canal, with all the data relating to its construction. It is estimated that the cost will be a little under one hundred million dollars, which it is thought will suffice to construct a 22-foot waterway from the Georgian bay to Montreal, including the cost of putting in appliances for operating the locks and for lighting.

Now many hon. members of this House have considered this as an enormous sum to be spent by Canada. But when we consider that the St. Lawrence channel, which is only a 14-foot channel, has cost the country in round figures $73,000,000 with the improvements, we can see at once that the greater importance of the Georgian bay canal would justify the government of Canada in spending the proposed sum on its construction. All the engineers charged to report on this project have declared that it is feasible. The present board of engineers who has charge of the project, of which Mr. St. Laurent is the chief engineer, have solved the great difficulty there was in regard to the supply of water at the summit level. The original proposition was to raise Lake Nipissing 25 feet to the level of Trout lake; this would have flooded a very large area of land which to-day, since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has become too valuable to acquire. The next proposition was to lower Trout lake to the level of Lake Nipissing, but this would have meant a cutting at the summit of five miles long with a maximum depth of 50 feet

The new solution consists in the raising of the Talon lake to the Trout lake level and diverting the Amable du Fond river (which at present time flows northward, draining into the Mattawa) and directing it by means of a flume and a tunnel into the summit level, thus giving a large surplus of water for the central supply. I believe the water will be sufficient to carry 10,000,000 tons of freight per annum through the canals.

The object of the Ottawa route is to pass large lake vessels from Fort William to Montreal, a distance of 932 miles at economic speed with safety. The largest vessels now on the lakes are between 500 and 600 feet long, and 56 feet beam. One has been built 60 feet beam, but this is the limit so far. There are nearly 600 vessels between 300 feet and 600 feet long. Cargoes of over 10,000 tons are carried and cargoes of 4,000 to 8,000 tons are common. It will be necessary to have a water-way deep enough to allow vessels of this type which are now plying on the great lakes, with their cargoes, to start from Fort William and pass through to Montreal, a seaport, without breaking bulk, thereby saving much time and expense and carrying a great deal more than could be done by the existing St. Lawrence barge canal.

In comparing the distance from Fort William to lower ports, a matter which was gone into somewhat fully by Mr. McCool, it is estimated that the round trip by the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal could be made in fifteen days, so that two trips per month could be made by each boat. A 10,000 ton vessel may be estimated as costing $400 per day for fuel, wages, repairs, delays, interest and profit; thus one round trip would cost $6,000. A boat carrying down 10,000 tons and returning with only a one-third cargo would have moved 13,300 tons for $6,000, or at the rate of less than 50 cents per ton (1½ cents per bushel).

My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) explained to the House a few minutes ago that these boats could carry back return cargoes of Nova Scotia coal, which I believe, despite the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) is just as good as American coal. With Cape Breton coal as a return cargo, there would be a full 10,000 ton load on the return trip, and the vessel would have moved 20,000 tons for $6,000, or at the rate of 30 cents per ton. Even at this price the profit to the transportation company would be large. The economic benefits to be derived from cheap steam coal delivered along the route can hardly be over estimated.

Quotations have been made this afternoon from the American 'Engineering News' showing the superiority of this project. I have here a clipping from the American 'Engineering News' of March, 1902. I need not read it as it has been already placed before the House, but I find in the same journal of the 23rd January, 1908, only last week, a strong argument in favour of the Georgian bay route. It is contained in a report of the Hon. Frederick C. Stevens, Superintendent of Public Works, to the legislature, in which he laid bare the slow rate of progress on the New York 1,000 ton barge canal and declared that the enterprise would be obsolete before its completion. After dealing in extenso with the New York project, Mr. Stevens says:

At the inception of the barge canal the purpose was to restore to New York state the traffic which had been taken away as the result of a better system of Canadian canals. The barge canal may be suited to compete with the present type of Canadian canals, but the Dominion government has foreseen the need of a different type and has undertaken to supply it in the so-called Ottawa-Georgian bay route. Surveys have been completed, and plans and estimates of the cost for a 21-foot ship canal have been prepared,

connecting Georgian bay with the St. Lawrence river by way of Ottawa and Mattawa rivers. The Dominion parliament is expected to make an appropriation for the construction of this canal during its present session.

I hope that this is true.

The Ottawa-Georgian bay canal is planned to provide the shortest outlet by water for the grain, forest and mining products of the great northwest, and it is potent to us whether with that route for shipment once open commerce can be changed so as to take the route through the lower lakes and across the state of New York, particularly such commerce as is bound for European ports. Commerce, history tells us, when once lost is difficult to restore.

Canada in the race for commerce, must be dealt with as a rival. The simplicity of the Ottawa-Georgian bay route, from the standpoint of construction, as viewed by engineers, taken in conjunction with the methods which that government applies to the solution of any project looking to enhancing the glory of the Dominion, threaten, if they do not fully in sure, the completion of this waterway before the barge canal, under the present system of construction, can be completed.

Commerce once lost under such conditions, if not for ever lost, would be hard to regain. Not only New York, but the whole nation, is interested in retaining supremacy in this regard.

This I think shows that at least some of our neighbours are quite alive to the question of transportation, and are averse to allowing the Canadian government to construct this canal before they have themselves constructed a 22-foot waterway to replace the Erie canal, which is at present only 9 feet in depth.

In his remarks endorsing this project the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) stated that it would be a great advantage to the people of Nova Scotia, that the coal from their collieries could be transported by this route to Ontario. I submit that this would be just as great an advantage to the people of Ontario from another point of view. The place occupied by iron and steel in the industrial world has not been over estimated. The fact that the present reserves, though undoubtedly large, are being exhausted has caused great uneasiness to the scientific world and has forced men of initiative to look for fresh sources of supply. According to Mr. E. C. Eckel, of the United States Geological Survey, the mines of the Lake Superior district are being drawn upon at a rate which will exhaust them in 1950. On the other hand Canada possesses large deposits of iron ore which have been allowed to remain untouched just for want of cheap transportation connecting our coal mines with our iron deposits, and as we cannot carry on any process of smelting or refining ore without the aid of coal we have been unable to develop this industry as we would like to have done. Dr. P. L. T. Heroult, technical director of the French Metallurgical Society, who has immense works at La Praz, said, in an interview some months ago, that in ten years Canada would become a great metallurgical country with a larger iron industry than any other country in the world, that it would be the same with iron as it has been with wheat, because we would be able to produce iron here more cheaply than in any other country. In the province of Quebec there are large and valuable deposits of magnetic ore contiguous to this water way. One of the most valuable deposits is near Hull, where an ore assaying from 64 per cent to 68 per cent is found.

With all this mineral wealth we cannot begin to supply the home demand for iron and steel. Take, for instance, the exports of goods manufactured from steel in Canada; in 1904 we find that we exported $1,991,821 and that we imported during the same period $41,152,789 of goods manufactured out of steel showing that notwithstanding our immense mineral resources we had to import into our country, for the want of such cheap transportation as would bring our iron ore deposits into touch with our coal deposits, this immense quantity of manufactured goods. There is no doubt that as soon as this new route is provided smelters and refineries will be built all along its course and they will start to treat all sorts of ore and ship the finished products direct to the European markets. The damming up of the Ottawa river at the foot of Long Rapids would concentrate the power at one given point and thus save the construction of very costly penstocks. The power which has been placed by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Brabazon at 500,000 horse-power has been placed by engineers who are quite conversant with this subject at nearly 3,000,000 horse-power. The Americans, as I stated a few moments ago, have realized the danger in the inability of the railway companies to handle the present traffic as is shown by President Roosevelt's address to the newly appointed waterway commission in which he says :

> It is common knowledge that the railroads of the United States are no longer able to move crops and the manufactures rapidly enough to secure the prompt transaction of the business of the nation, and there is small prospect of immediate relief. Representative railroad men point out that the products of the northern interior states have doubled in ten years, while the railroad facilities have increased but one-eighth and there is no reason to doubt whether any development of the railroads possible in the near future will suffice to keep transportation abreast of production. There appears to be but one complete remedy, the development of the complementary system of transportation by water.

Not later than last December 2,000 delegates, representing 32 different states, at-

tended the convention of the National River and Harbour Congress. The net result of this convention was the adoption of resolutions recommending an expenditure by the government of $50,000,000 a year for the improvement of waterways. But this congestion of traffic mentioned in President Roosevelt's address has also been felt in Canada; in fact, on the first of August, 1907, there were 6,000,000 bushels of the 1906 crop left in the elevators at Fort William which shows that the railways and the present facilities for transportation by water are quite inadequate to move the present crop of the Northwest. The crop of 1906 was about 90,000,000 bushels and conservative estimates place the probable 1910 crop at 200,000,000 bushels; therefore, with the Canadian Pacific double tracked to Fort William, with the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk running to their full capacity, it will be impossible to move the crop even if the fleet of grain carriers be doubled, and the only solution would be in the saving of time by a new waterway to the sea-board.

New York state had decided to deepen the Erie canal to from 9 feet to 14 feet at a cost of $100,000,000, but American business men and shippers, being convinced that the Canadian government will build the Georgian bay canal, are moving heaven and earth to induce Congress to take up the enlargement of this canal as a national enterprise and to deepen it at once to 21 feet. In fact, it is now a question as to who shall give first an outlet to the traffic, for it is well known that when commerce is once settled in a certain channel it is hard to divert, except for some immediate, substantial and permanent benefit. A profitable part of the carrying trade of a territory whose material progress has been unprecedented, will be the reward of the country that will first give to commerce a lake to ocean waterway deep enough to meet the requirements of the traffic. Therefore, I would urge the government of Canada to take the matter into its very serious consideration as I would urge the members of the House to study the question, not looking at it, as some hon. members may be inclined to do, from the narrow provincial point of view, but to consider it from the patriotic standpoint and to make of it a national question.

Let us approach this project, not from the point of view of the advantage to the country contiguous to the canal, but let us approach it with the idea that it is a work for the general advantage of Canada, and a work which will confer material wealth not only on the Ottawa Valley and the Georgian bay districts, but on every district in every province of the Dominion. The nation that will achieve a great future must be prepared to anticipate the needs and demands which increasing trade and growing prosperity will require of it. The nation that merely provides for the necessities of the immediate present, is to a certain extent retrograde; it simply gambles on securing fortune. No sudden measure; no measure not well thought out in a broad and generous spirit can secure to a nation the full extent of the possibilities within its reach. A country like Canada with as vast natural resources must have adequate waterways, free harbours, and commodious terminals to accommodate increased trade if it desires to retain that trade. It is as true of a nation as of an individual that 'to him that hath shall be given.' If we want to make of Canada the great nation that we all hope it will be, it remains with our own effort to increase to the greatest possible extent our transportation facilities, and, Sir, I submit that no more important work towards this end is before the statesmen and the people of Canada to-day, than the building of the Georgian bay canal.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). At this late hour I do not purpose detaining the House at any great length, but I do not feel that I should allow this occasion to pass without adding a word in favour of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool). On different occasions I have had the advantage of urging upon the government the advisability of constructing what is now known as the Ottawa, Montreal and Georgian bay canal. To-day the House and the country have been treated to able speeches in advocacy of this project, and I venture to think that more has been done in the last few hours to urge upon the government the construction of this great canal than has been done since I have had the honour of a seat here. Last session the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) delivered a speech on the transportation question to which I listened with a great deal of pleasure, a speech which I afterwards read in 'Hansard,' and I may say that that speech contained a great deal of valuable information. Of course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) was speaking more on behalf of the port of Midland than upon the general question of transportation, and this he might be pardoned for, but perhaps I may be permitted to say that his speech contained some inconsistencies. He commenced by saying: that while during the last ten years every private corporation had been reaching out for the increasing business of the country, the government had practically stood still and had done nothing to improve our transportation facilities. He continued to say, that it could not be said that the government had not had due notice from all quarters as to the necessity for action, because on all sides we had evidences of prosperity. In that statement I take issue with the hon. gentleman, because it is only the truth to say that a great deal has been done by the present government for the improvement

of the transportation facilities of Canada. The government has spent great sums of money in improving the St. Lawrence channel to the ocean; the government has been improving year after year the Intercolonial Railway and in spite of the great expenses made on that road it has placed it on a paying basis; the government has undertaken the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific; it has improved our canal system; it has encouraged and aided in the construction of all the great railways of the country, and it is at present studying the question in a practical way of direct water communication from the Georgian bay to the Atlantic ocean. It is therefore, I think, unfair to say that the government has done nothing to improve our transportation facilities. I will not say that more cannot be done; more can be done and more will be done; and in the study of the question of the Georgian bay canal a great deal will be accomplished. I will not say that this government will at once be able to complete the means of transportation, but I do say that the government has done and will do more to provide increased transportation facilities in Canada. The hon. member for East Simcoe in another part of his speech ('Hansard' page 1170) said:

We should not consider the stretch of Ottawa river canal navigation because the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk are reaching out for a system by way of the Georgian bay, and private capital is being expended and will require assistance from this government to help these railways to develop that situation.

In that I think the hon. gentleman is inconsistent. He says in one part of his speech that the government is not coping with the transportation business of the country, and in another part of his speech he says the government should not undertake the construction of this great project because it might affect in some way the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. In answer to that I would like to quote some words of Sir Wm. Van Horne, spoken before the special committee of the Senate of Canada appointed to study the feasibility and advantages which may arise from the construction of a canal joining the waters of Lake Huron to those of the St. Lawrence via the Ottawa river. I have the French version of Sir Wm. Van Horne's remarks here, and I quote:

(Translation.) As a result of the building of that canal, important industries would spring up along its course. I am of opinion that the building of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian bay canal would have the effect of developing the trade of Canada. Whatever tends to diminish the cost of transportation must undoubtedly have a beneficial effect. Such a canal would build up traffic for Montreal, Quebec and other sea-ports. It would develop local rescources and even have a good effect on the Canadian Pacific Railway, seeing that it would create more traffic for that railway than it would divert from it.

The wood pulp and lumbering industries would be benefited by that canal, and that new waterway would also render available the mineral wealth of the Ottawa valley.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Ottawa, Montreal and Georgian bay canal will not only develop the resources of the Ottawa valley, but it will have the effect of benefiting the entire Dominion because it will facilitate and cheapen the transport of grain from the west to eastern Canada. The great question now before us is as to how best to transport the grain of the Northwest to the sea-board and then across the Atlantic to the markets of the world. One of the great difficulties in the way of cheap transportation of grain is the breaking of bulk, and by the construction of the Georgian bay canal we will have the advantage of being able to transport direct from Port Arthur and Fort William to the sea-board without transshipping cargo. That is a great argument in favour of this waterway. Let me read to you, Mr. Speaker, what the Deep Waterways Commission reported in January, 1897. Amongst other things it said:

At Buffalo bulk has to be broken, the grain elevated and transferred to cars or canal boats, and the same thing, with equal expenses, is repeated at New York. The lake freight from the farthest shore of Lake Superior and of Lake Michigan to Buffalo is from 1 to 1½ cents a bushel, the ocean freight from sea-board to Europe, 3 cents. The whole cost, however, from Chicago or Duluth to Europe is from 9 to 10 cents. Therefore, more than half the cost goes to railway or canal freights, commissions and elevator charges, to which must be added the item of waste. It costs twice as much to carry a barrel of flour from Duluth to New York as it does from New York to Europe, though the latter distance is twice as great as the former.

The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), in dealing with this question last session, failed to explain to the House the difference in cost of the carrying of grain from the lake ports direct to the sea-board, and thus forgot what was most important in the consideration of the transportation question.

The enormous advantage of such a canal is evident by a glance at the map. Supposing two steamers of the largest class to leave Chicago, they will run together till a little past Sault Ste. Marie or the Strait of Mackinaw. They then part company, one going to Buffalo and the other to Montreal via Georgian bay. The distance between Chicago and Buffalo is 900 miles; between Chicago and French river 475 miles, so that when the one ship arrives on the entrance to navigation the other has still 425 miles to its destination. Allowing for detention at 34 locks, we find that the vessel on

its way to Montreal will have got to within 50 miles of Ottawa and 170 miles of Montreal when the other has arrived at Buffalo.

This means that for the same expenditure of time and cost required for one ship to reach Buffalo the other will nearly reach Ottawa. Assuming the rate to Buffalo to be 1¼ cents per bushel, the cost to near Ottawa will be 1¼ cents also. For the remaining 170 miles and 16 locks to reach Montreal, or 24 hours, ¼ of a cent will be ample addition.

The grain, therefore, can be delivered at Montreal, exclusive of course of any toll, for 1½ cents, and it is not possible to question such a conclusion.

I wish to say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I am strongly in favour of a free canal. I am also in favour of the canal being built at once from one end of the line to the other. I do not believe in the canal being built in sections; I think we ought to undertake at once the construction of the whole system. The expenditure would not be burdensome, in view of the great prosperity of Canada and its great public revenue at the present time. Our population is constantly increasing. The immigration into the northwestern part of the Dominion alone during the eleven months ending December 1, is as follows: to Manitoba, 44,114; to Saskatchewan, 31,304; to Alberta, 30,944; and to British Columbia, 29,139; making a total immigration into the northwestern provinces and British Columbia of 135,501. This means a greater development of the Northwest, and consequently a greater production of grain and a corresponding necessity for facilitating the transportation of that grain to the sea-board.

We have on all sides evidences of the immense advantages of this canal. We have evidences of confidence in the project. Last year a report of the Royal Commission on Transportation was laid on the table of this House, and in that report we find the commissioner making this statement:

> Your commission unhesitatingly affirm their belief in the desirability of a thorough waterway from the head of Lake Superior to ocean navigation, to aid in the carriage of the grain and the regulation of rates of a standard not less than that above set forth, so that the largest vessels navigating the great lakes can continue their voyage to ocean navigation or as near thereto as possible. But in view of the fact that the government has undertaken the survey of a proposed route by way of the French river to Lake Nipissing and thence by way of the Ottawa river to Montreal, and as the feasibility of this route from a commercial as well as an engineering point of view, and if feasible its cost, has not yet been ascertained, and further in view of the fact that the government has also undertaken the survey of the Welland canal and its vicinity, looking to its possible enlargement and diversion, your commission do not see their way clear to any recommendation as to route, but would recommend that, in case the Ottawa river scheme because of want of feasibility from a commercial or engineering point of view, or on account of its cost or for other reason be not adopted, then the Welland canal be enlarged and deepened to the standard of the Sault Ste. Marie canal, with a view of enabling vessels of the largest size to continue their voyage to Kingston or Prescott, thus bringing their cargo to within say 180 miles or less of Montreal before discharging same.

If the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal is feasible, and I think the report laid on the table a few days ago and all the other reports we have had on this subject show that it is feasible, then I do not think that any great expenditure should be made on our local canals, but the credit of Canada should rather be engaged for the construction of this great canal. Let me refer for a moment to the movement of grain and flour during the season of 1906:

	Bushels.
Passed through 'Soo' canals. . .	168,653,588
Received at Buffalo.	177,492,229
" at New York by all routes.	119,632,720
Received at New York by Canal.	12,000,000
Exports from Atlantic sea-board (including Montreal, to Europe, &c.).	245,000,000
Exports from Montreal.	25,927,492

Now, I think that this government, in building the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal, will ensure not only the carrying of all the grain of our Northwest from the lake ports, but also the carrying of grain to Buffalo from Duluth and Chicago. Transportation on the lakes shows a gradual tendency towards cheaper rates. The average rate per ton mile in 1901 was .89 mill, in 1902, .89 mill, in 1904 .81 mill, in 1905 .85 mill, and in 1906 .84 mill.

The total net freight passing through the 'Soo' canal during the year 1906—51,751,080 tons—shows an increase of over 7,500,000 tons over the previous year. The lake traffic is steadily increasing and tonnage as shown by reports doubling itself every six years, the traffic of 1906 being more than double that of 1900, as shown by the statement of commerce at the 'Soo' canals. In the year 1900 the traffic passing these canals amounted to only 25,643,073 tons. This great increase will undoubtedly continue, and it is therefore difficult to even rashly estimate the magnitude of the traffic six years hence.

The traffic passing the 'Soo' canals during the season of 1907 amounted to 58,217,214 tons, an increase of nearly 6,500,000 tons over that of 1906. Rates of carriage remained about the same.

The lake freights on grain show the greatest reduction, the rate being 1·6 cents per bushel between terminals in 1906, as against 1·9 cents in 1902 and 2·3 cents in 1901. These rates between terminals include cost of loading and unloading at terminal points. The average distance for carriage of grain on the great lakes may be taken as 800 miles, the bulk being from

Chicago and Duluth to Buffalo, 891 and 990 miles respectively. This gives us a rate per ton mile for lake carriage of grain of .6 mill, which may be taken as a liberal estimate of the cost of lake transportation.

The lowest possible rail rate per ton under most favourable conditions, the lowest which according to high authority can be looked forward to, is 2½ mills per ton, or over four times the present rate by water. This minimum estimated rail rate has never yet been reached, the nearest approach to it being in 1901 when grain was carried by the railroads in New York state at a loss in an attempt to demonstrate that the improvement and development of water routes was unnecessary. With existing conditions in Canada it is doubtful whether such low rates may be expected on Canadian roads between lake ports and the seaboard. It must be remembered that cheap coal can be had all along the lines from the lakes to the Atlantic in the United States, whereas on the Canadian railroads the fuel for the engines has to be transported to points where needed from the eastern terminals as the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has pointed out, that the construction of the Georgian bay canal would mean a great deal to the coal of Nova Scotia, it would be useless for me to dwell upon this point at present. But I would say that the building of this canal would mean a great deal for the lumber industry of Canada. The lumber industry of the Ottawa district represents in pine alone an annual freight of not less than 2,000,000 tons of sawn lumber. Under present conditions all, except what is carried through the Ottawa and Champlain canals, has to be hauled by rail, the rail charges on lumber from western Ontario to Montreal being heavy. The opening of this waterway would mean cheap transportation, and open to the lumber trade of the Ottawa valley the important market of the great lakes region. The importance of that market may be judged from the fact that nine lake ports alone received in 1896 over 2,270,000 tons of sawn lumber.

My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Caron) very aptly pointed out that within easy reach of Ottawa city we have great possibilities in iron ore. In the county I have the honour to represent, there is a great deal of iron ore, but it does not pay to develop it on account of the heavy cost of rail carriage. If, however, we had this canal, which would pass directly in front of the city of Hull, we would be able to develop all this iron ore and the trade of Ottawa valley would be greatly increased. This canal would also furnish facilities for developing our water-powers, of which there are a great many along its route. It is impossible to overestimate the benefits that would accrue from this utilizing of electrical energy. At every fall of water great factories could be established, and instead of having to bring our minerals elsewhere to be smelted, we could supply electricity by means of these water-powers direct to the mines themselves. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Caron) well said that this was a great national question and that the construction of this canal would do a great deal towards building up Canada as a nation. I wish, therefore, to urge on the government as strongly as I can the immediate construction of this canal, and the making of it also a free canal.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). As the hour is late and this is a most important question, and as there are a considerable number of speakers who desire to discuss it, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate on the understanding that it will be resumed at a later date.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What business tomorrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Supply, with the understanding that opportunity will be afforded for a discussion on the Japanese question, in accordance with previous agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman make any statement regarding the arrangement for supplying seed grain?

Mr. FIELDING. I observed an announcement in the press which is entirely unauthorized and incorrect. The matter is engaging our attention, but has not reached the point when we can say anything definite. At an early day, however, I hope to be able to place the matter before the House. No conclusion has yet been reached as to the details, but the general question is now engaging our attention.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1907-1908.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Conside ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques- Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ADAMSON, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1732 (i) ; in Com., 4996 (iii) ; on Senate Amts., 10511 (iv).

Northern Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 231 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8583 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, of, &c., Com. of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2276 (ii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4401 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 ; Section of House of Commons Act (read) 5955 (iii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1843 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 80) 1° m., 1671 (i) ; 2° m., 5228 (iii).

—— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7890 (iv), 11753 (vi) ; in Com., 11812, 11840, (amt.) 11846, 11927 (vi) ; in Com., 12939 (vii) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13254 (vii).

Immigration Agent A. G. McDonald, Payments *re* Placing of Immigrants (M. for cor.*) 4773 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12402 (vii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7231 ; on M. for 3°, 7222 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9498 (v).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11998 (vi).

Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9969 ; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians, Ont and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213 ; (tidal services) 3215 ; (wrecks) 3202 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, customs) 7163 ; (Halifax, military) 7144 ; (Shelburne) 7177 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7680 ; (Kincardine) 7699 ; (Kingston gun shed) 7701 ; (London military) 7708 ; (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 1498 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 12092 (vii) ; (Point Edward) 5713 ; (Stanley island pier) 5722 (iii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10544 (vi).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).

Albert Development Co., Control of Coal Lands (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

All-Red Line, Mr. White's Duties in England (Ques.) 694 (i).

Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature (Ques.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Census Map, Publishing of (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re* (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5469 (iii).

—— Agency of M. McKenzie and J. H. Moss, Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Name and Address of Agents *re* Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).

Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3434 (ii).

Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v.)

—— Royalty Fees, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 3232, 3480 (ii).

—— Purchase Price, &c., on Section 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

—— sold, or assigned, &c., since March, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

—— Sale of through J. W. Bettes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6242 (iv).

—— sold by P. E. Lessard (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— Sale by McGivern & Hayden (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

—— in Section 13, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B. —*Con.*

Coal Mining Privileges in Sections 11, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c. (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Customs Frauds, in Montreal, Complaints *re* Compromises (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers (M. for ret.) 1132; (reply) 1196; Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Documents, Original, Examination of by Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775, 1806 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11817; (amt.) 11821 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11137; in Com., 11189, 11423 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 10761 (vi).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1408 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying benefit of Minimum Tariff, &c. (M. for ret.) 851 (i).

—— Correction of Question *re* Sir Charles Tupper's Expenses, 1424 (i).

—— Favoured Nation Clause; and Foreign Powers, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

—— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

Fishing Privileges granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

—— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c. (Ques.) 6398 (iv).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

G. T. P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G. T. P. Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ques.) 238 (i).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension *re* Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 8381 (v).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c. (Ques.) 364, 568 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ques.) 3429 (ii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Land Grants to Rys., Selection, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4766 (iii).
See 'Rys.', &c.
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).
McGuire, ex-chief Justice, Superannuation of, &c. (Ques.) 10514 (vi).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi).
Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ques.) 9271 (v).
——— Amounts and Names of Cos. (Ques.) 9271 (v).
Railway Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).
See 'Lands.'
Ry. Subsidies in Land, Areas for 1892-6 (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4662 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ques.) 4763 (iii).
——— (M.) for Papers, 5210 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ques.) 238 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 207 *re* Fishing Leases (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9538 (v).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9996 (v).
Marine (ice breakers) 1895 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dominion arsenal) 7434; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7424; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station B) 7419; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Nicolet) 7428; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11693 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686; (Madawaska) 11696 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Lake Ainslie) 11228; (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Margaree) 11229; (Middle River) 11229; (New Glasgow) 11257; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Parker's Cove) 11258; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Porter's lake) 11260; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268; (Pugwash) 11280; (Round Hill) 11281; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).
Taché, J. C., Emplmt. in Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 8189 (iv).
Timber Berths, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2269 (ii).
Timber Berths, 1046, &c., Original Applications (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
——— No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ques.) 364 (i).
——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).
——— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Timber Lands, Sale or Lease subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3580 (ii).
Timber Leases, *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8711 (v).
Timber Licenses in Man. and N. W. Ters., Renewals, &c., Total Areas, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).
Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N. W. T. during 1896-7 (Ques.) 2396 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of Ques. of Priv., *re* Mr. Turriff's Charges, 2309 (ii).
Timber Permits to Settlers *re* cutting, in Twp. 39, Range 11 (Ques.) 11495 (vi).
Water-power Privileges in Alberta, &c., Sale or Leases (Ques.) 8378 (v).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10535 (vi).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *Lambton, East.*
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).
Address, The, 335, 366; (amt.) 380; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 103) 505 (i).
Advertisement for Tenders, for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4735 (iii).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5205 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District, 5787 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

Bayfield, &c., Ret., Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
See 'Docks,' &c.

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204 (iii).

Budget, The, 6046; (M.) to adjn. deb., 6054; rsmd., 6062 (iii).

Campaign Literature, sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6196 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

——— Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette,' 13081 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5124 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11371 (vi).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9168 (v).

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1, 1908 (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Officers at Niagara, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).
See 'Bayfield,' 'Grand Bend.'

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, 1878 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8645 (v); in Com., 12971 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Dowling, Mr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).
See 'German.

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4585 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3605, 3637 (ii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c., (Ques.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

German Development Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 689 (i).

Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896-1908 (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Geological Survey Yacht, Use of (Ques.) 11231 (vi).

Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur (Ques.) 8892 (v).

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

G. T. R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12062 (vii).

G. T. P., Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9025 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10375 (vi).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B., &c. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. for Sup., 11022 (vi).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13127 (vii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

——— Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Concrete Pipe, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

—— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4428 (iii).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re* (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

'Lady Evelyn' Str., Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
See 'Rimouski.'

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Mail Matters, Fradulent Weighing, Inspection of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).

Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Montreal Post Office, Extra Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9113 (v).

Newspapers, Postal Arrangements, &c.(Ques.) 6460 (iv).

North East Harobur Wharf, Total Length (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10850 (vi).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 3885 (ii).

—— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

—— (remarks) 3040 (ii).

Postal Note Business, Commission, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 9279 (v).

Postal Rates on N. S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy (Ques.) 352 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).

—— Improvements in, &c. (Ques.) 8891 (v).

—— Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
See 'Rimouski.'

Postal Service Printing, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Postal Service Return, Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10705 (vi).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height of Span (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4969 (iii).

—— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).
See 'Documents.'

Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of Str. 'Lady Evelyn,' &c. (Ques.) 7727 (iv).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 8612 (v).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction (Ques.) 8890 (v).
See 'Bayfield,' &c.

Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8891 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3786 (ii); in Com., 12622 (vii).

South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for five years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 671 (i); (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi); (census, &c.) 674 (i); (exhibitions) 10577 (vi); (fumigating stations) 12879; (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12894 (vii); (seed branch) 5500 (iii); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623; Mines (salaries) 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 651 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227 (v).

Geological Survey (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 5762 (iii); Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12748

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039; (aids to navigation) 5040, 5774; (Thunder Bay Ice-breaker) 5041 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson bay patrol) 4030, 4133 (ii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5749 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942; (wrecks) 3149, 3209 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9094; (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10875 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886, 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7135 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 7711; (North Bay) 7712, 7812; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Sarnia) 7829 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (lighting) 11011 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lévis) 7295 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8586; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John) 12020 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways (extra clerks) 10343 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii), (supplies) 10193 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10375 (vi).

AVERY, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5123 (iii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymnt. as Returning Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7251 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2489, 2662 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Accountants, Emplymt. and Payment by Dept. of Justice (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°* of Bill, 4867 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

B. C., Appeal Court (B. 165) prop. Res. 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1° m., 8466 (v); 2°*, in Com., 10863 (vi).

——— M. to withdraw Res., 7992 (iv).

Badgley Island, Trespass of T. H. Jackman, Claims *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ans.) 842 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 6054 (iii); in Com., 6520 (iv).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P.O. Addresses (Ans) 9715 (v).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3467 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12909 (vii).

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Interpretation of Criminal Code (remarks) 9027 (v).

——— Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ans.) 10016

C. P. R. Taxation Cases, on Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Cigarette and Tobacco Restraint Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments to *re* Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence *re* District (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).

See '*Marine.*'

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgage) Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 12919; on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

See '*Ry. Act.*'

Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835 (iv), 11755; in Com., 11796, 11827 (vi), 12919; 3° m., 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13238; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 13255; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— (B. 115) Adjnd. debate, 11707 (vi).

Doukhobors, Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7624 (iv).

Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Accepting Appmt. (Ans.) 4768, 5084 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5486 (iii).

Essex County Junior Judgeship, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4576 (iii); in Com., 8401 (v).

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, Apptmt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., &c., 899 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

—— Qualifications *re* Apptmt. (Ans) 2390 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 1861 (i).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel for Purchase of Sussex St. Property (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

—— Payments *re* Legal Services, &c., (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary, (Ans.) 510 (i).

Govt. Officials as Political Partisans at Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

See 'St. Vincent de Paul.'

G. T. P., Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

—— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).

—— Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

—— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

Japanese Immigration Acts, Disallowance of (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

Judges Salaries in Man. and Ont. (B. 206) prop. Res., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1° m., 12554; in Com., 13048 (vii).

Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar (Ans.) 842 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents (B. 190) 1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399 (vii).

Kun, Agnes B., Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).

—— Letter laid on Table, 9710 (v).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

—— for Govt. in P.E.I., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

Lord's Day Act Violations at Ottawa, *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 696 (i).

McGuire, ex-Chief Justice, Superannuation of (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in giving Judgments (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Man. Appeal Act: *See* 'Winding-up Act.'

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

—— Counsel Fees (Ans.) 8838 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Letter of Instruction to Mr. Watson laid on Table, 7621 (iv).

See 'Civil Service.'

Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Opinions of Dept. of Justice, on M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 12553 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. (B. 210) 1° m., 12650; 2° m., in Com., 13051 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ans.) 516 (i).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2825 (ii).

—— Ret. (remarks) 9579 (v), 13081 (vii).

See 'Blunden.'

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 8604 (v); 2° m., 10690; in Com., 10691 (vi).

Prisoners released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Queebc Superior Court, Apptmt. of additional Judge (Ans.) 1288 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 28) M. to wthdrw., 3579 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission, Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4966 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 11590; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) moved in Com., 11632 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 204) 1° m., 12549; 2°*, in Com., 13046 (vii).

See 'Criminal Code.'

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition, &c. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. in Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1347 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Officers and Municipal Elections (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

—— Holidays for Officials (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re* (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

—— Disallowance of (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

School Statutes, *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6858 (iv).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (remarks) 1112 (i).

Sudbury Court Judges, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 12413 (vii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 4826; 2°*, in Com., 5497 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Justice (Dominion Police) 5509; (Exchequer Court) 5505; (printing, &c.) 5508 (iii); Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii); (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii). Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii); Generally (maintenance) 5515 (iii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint (B. 173) 1° m., 9021 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Winding-up Act (Man. Appeals) Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 3477; 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

——— (B. 144) 1° m., 6142 (iii); 2°* in Com., 6523 (iv).

Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ans.) 10301 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law and Instructions to N.W.M.P. (Ans.) 565 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 841 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S. *East Hamilton.*

Address, The, 519, (amt.) 530, Neg. (Y. 50; N. 96) 552 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4712 (iii).

Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Bank of Hamilton incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1207 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4387 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1470 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5888 (iii).

Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

Coal Lands, O.C., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal (M. for copies*) 4246 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1162 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1793 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.., 11837, 11851; (amt.) 11865 (vi).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907 (M. for copies*) 555 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor. quoted by Min., Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7775 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8133 (iv).

G. T. P., Eastern Limit Mountain Section, Establishment of (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12361 (vii).

——— and National Trans. Ry., Disputed Questions (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Land Acquisitions (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

——— Ry. Sections B and F, Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3706, 3743 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Contract, Claims of M. J. Haney, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042, 3690 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.C., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11995 (vi).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5056 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Burning of Papers, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4072 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Incomplete Return (remarks) 5726 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3138 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1441 (i).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c., Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7148 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in debate on Address, 519 (i).

——— Commission's Report (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13293 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3780 (ii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5833 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5682 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4072 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7716 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1477; (Museum) 1492 (i); Harbours and Rivers —N.B. (St. John) 12019 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. (amt.) 921 (i).

BARR, Mr. J. *Dufferin.*

Address, The, 276 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4525 (iii).
See 'National.'

Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10350 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6208 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5100 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361 (vi).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11831 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute, Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5012 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co's. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13269 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3611, 3647 (ii).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) in Com., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10501 (vi).

Inland Revenue Seizures, 1906-7 in Cornwall, Toronto, Ottawa, &c. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii), 4247 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7236 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9491 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Office Specialty Co., Fittings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4696 (iii); in Com., 10858 (vi).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi); in Com., 12624 (vii).

Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4978 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).
——— (wires, &c.) Amt. (B. 43) 1° m., 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Ry. Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Application to Board (Ques.) 1109 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3768 (ii); in Com., 12608 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 12893 (vii); (seed branch) 5504 (iii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8876 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9450 (v).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9869 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4082, 4151 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10297 (v).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5511 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10881 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8520; (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10958 (vi); Ont. (Dom. renewals) 7483; (Glencoe) 7488; (Guelph armoury) 7682 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1481 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 8577 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 12097 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11088 (vi).

Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks (Ques.) 690 (i).
See 'Railways,' &c.

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2198 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6489 (iv).

Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks (remarks) 7322 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12600 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (provisions) 12151 (vii); Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10895; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 7307 (iv).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 4356, 4372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4171 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S., and other Countries (Ques.) 1510 (i).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (ques. of priv.) 3486 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2579 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Distribution to Members (remarks) 605 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3552 (ii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4808 (iii).

Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Rehm, Fred. and Frank Patent Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3896 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Adams, Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5798 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Architects on Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ques.) 4244, 5083 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 190 (i).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6641 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging, Tenders *re*, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11397 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5623 (iii).

——— Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1048

See 'Travelling.'

Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 2382 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1151 (i).

——— Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1425 (i).

———Production in Committees, 1427 (i).

——— taken from Pub. Accounts Com. (remarks) 2305, 2308 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender of Title (remarks) 3850 (ii).

——— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

——— Protests *re* Sale (remarks) 10918 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11830, 11859 (vi), 12995; on M. for 3°, 13247 (vii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).

——— Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com., 5924 (ii).

——— Renewal without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dredging at Fort William, Amounts paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 8839 (v).

See 'Boone,' &c.

Dredging at Midland, &c., Tenders *re*, Advertisements for (remarks) 7195 (iv).

——— O.C. *re* Renewal, &c., 6741 (iv).

See 'Midland.'

Dredging in Quebec Harbours, 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dredges registered in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4677 (iii); in Com., 10767 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).
See 'Birnie,' &c.

Foresters Order, Charges in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3614 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i)

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980

—— Report from Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).
See 'Birnie.'

'Golspie' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).

G.T.Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res 2254 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12676 (vii).

Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i).

Inspector of Public Works, Apptmts. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4423 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 640, 1037 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

—— Investigation, Defalcations of Mr. Roy, &c. (remarks) 10741 (vi).

—— Investigations, Evidence (remarks) *re* Printing, 10916 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).

Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbours, Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ques.) 8181 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay,' &c.

Office Specialty Co. and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 3039 (ii), 4244 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
See 'Eclipse.'

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10335 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse-power (Ques.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— Incorrect Answer (remarks) 5566 (iii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

—— Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).
See 'Dredging,' &c.

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7259 (iv).

Pound-net Licenses, Granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration re M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1383 (i).

—— on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

—— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3082 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5924 (iii).

Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., Notice of Amt., 3751 (ii).

Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4667 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 11700 (vi).

——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Sorel Public Works, Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

———Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Irregularities *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— Ref. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 7938 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Speedy' Str., Purchase, Services, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ques.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10584, 10615 (vi).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12224; Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi); Welland (Port Colborne) 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 980; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612; (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 1459 (i), 5699 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 639 (i), 5699 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing 13323; (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4756 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3989 (ii); (patrol boats) 4750; (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii).

Marine (hospitals) 5782 (iii).

Militia (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1079 (i), 5766 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2952; (obstructions) 3211; (removal of obstructions) 3156; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221; (wrecks) 3151, 3205 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8878 (v); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Chilliwack) 13338; (Cranbrook) 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10865; (Fernie) 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesmel) 10868 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10872 (vi), 10339 (vii); (Victoria immigration) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (Selkirk) 8550 (v); (Souris) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10959 (vi); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Grand Falls) 13328 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Antigonish) 7122; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7162; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Parrsboro') 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfeville) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Dom., renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7489 (iv); (Mitchell) 13332; (North Bay) 13332; (Park Hill) 13332; (Peterborough) 13332; (Port Arthur) 13332; (Sarnia) 13333; (Seaforth) 13332; (Simcoe) 13333; (Sudbury) 13333; (Tilsonburg) 13333; (Uxbridge) 13333; (Walkerville) 13333; (Waterloo) 13333 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (Mint) 1458; (Museum) 1489 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329; (Grand Mère) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329; (Lachute) 13329 (vii); (Lévis) 7296 (iv), 13329; (Magog) 13329; (Megantic) 13330; (Plessissville) 13330; (Point St. Charles) 13330; (Roberval) 13330; (St. Thérèse) 13330; (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Battleford) 8577; (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8585 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moosejaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601; (Saskatoon) 8603 (v), 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13352; Que. and Ont. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lower Newcastle) 11695; (St. John) 12013 (vi); (St. John improvements) 5708 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207; (Baddeck) 11219; (Barachois) 11224; (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224; (Big Lorraine) 11224; (Breton Cove) 11224; (Charlos Cove) 11225; Church Point) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11225; (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Port Hood) 11277; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Pugwash wharf) 11280; (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Georgian Bay survey) 13326; (Lakefield) 13350; (Meaford) 12103; (Michipicoten) 13350; (Midland and Tiffin) 12103 (vii); (Point Edward) 5714 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144; (Port Colborne) 12146; (Rainy River) 12136; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Tiffin dredging) 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à la Barbe) 12028; (Batiscan) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Cap St. Ignace) 12030; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lake Megantic) 12033; (Lake St. Francis) 12033; (Lake St. John) 12033; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Lotbinière) 12033; (Malbaie) 12034; (Matane) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Ouelle Rivière) 12037; (Piché Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12038; (Rivière du Lièvre) 12037; (Rivière du Loup) 12036; (Rivière Maskinonge) 12037; (St. Alphonse) 12041; (Ste. Anne de Monts) 12041; (St. Francis) 12041; (St. Louis) 12040; (St. Maurice) 12041; (Saguenay) 12040; (Yamaska dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12145 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii).

Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payment to Jos. Riopelle (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

Tenders, Advertisements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7478 (iv).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co. (Ques.) 8892 (v).
See 'Dredging.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
See 'Documents.'

Travelling Expenses of Minister at Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii)
See 'Colonial.'

Trent Valley Canal, Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).
See 'Holland.'

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8893 (v).
See 'Dredging, &c.'

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2888 (ii).

Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 11500 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4722 (iii).

Architects on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7125 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10921 (vi).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre and Robert Syndicate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

——— Water-power, Copy of New Lease (remarks) 946 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Inquiry for Copy, 1740 (i).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2392 (ii).

——— Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7212 (iv).

Budget, The, 5357 (iii).

Campaign Literature (French) distributed in Prov. of Que. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6162, 6173, 6203 (iii); in Com., 6426 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12867 (vii).

Canadian Newspapers, Drawback *re* American Surtax (Ques.) 5203 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6870 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10717, 10727; in Com. on Res., 11360 (vi); in Com., 12177 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Translation into French (remarks) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Clerks of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
See 'Intercolonial.'
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 12650 (vii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3492 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. *re* Salaries (remarks) *re* Conc., 12504 (vii).
——— (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10245 (v).
——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1180 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1849 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 80 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1682 (i).
——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4573 (iii); on M. for 2°, 8681 (v); in Com., 11824, 11831, 11857 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5013 (iii).
Dredging in Ont. and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2896 (ii).
See 'Riviere la Graisse.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement of (Ques.) 6399 (iv).
Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6223 (iv).
BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
French Canadian Ministers, Attack *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1223 (i); in Com., 3582, 3636 (ii).
——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).
See 'Can. and France.'
French Translation of Govt. Statutes, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
Gaudette, Victor, Employmt. by Govt., Payments to (Ques.) 515 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3634 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Rep. of (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates.'
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents, &c. (Ques.) 6922 (iv).
Ingonish Island Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8618 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6961 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 835 (i).
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 13225, 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Employees Provident Fund Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4577; in Com., 4995 (iii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Change of Name to Govt. Rys., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6246 (iv).
——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
——— Sunday Cars, Instructions *re* (Ques.) 10734 (vi).
——— Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6400 (iv).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 968 (i).
Judges of Man. and Ont., Salaries (B. 206) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13048 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

'Le Soleil, Par. *re* Voting by French Members, Ques. of Priv., 7992 (iv).

Letter Carriers, Contract for Boots, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

MacIlreith, Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7327 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister, &c. (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Mr. Perron's Duties (Ques.) 10743 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).

——— Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Translation of Evidence (remarks) 11204 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3026 (ii).

Matane River Fishing, Complaints (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7252 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

——— Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 7197 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

New York Central Ry., Complaints *re* Discrimination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).

Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Notre Dame du Portage, Expenditure *re* Wharf (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Order Papers, French and English Editions (remarks) 6853 (iv).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

——— Issue of Pass to travel on I.C.R. Express (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 8610 (v).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2854 (ii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— (remarks) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry (Ques.) 3899 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Apptmt. to Com., 10689 (vi).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7933 (iv).

Priv., Ques. of, Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Pamphlet by Jesuit Priest, 10427 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3142 (ii).

Quebec Judges, Additional, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

——— Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

——— Apptmt. to Superior Court (remarks) 11825 (vi).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Ques. of Priv., Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader,' 8604 (v).

Railway Act (commission, ass't chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10638; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11608 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).

——— on 1st Rep., 13510 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3319 (ii), 13081 (vii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 2896, 3689 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 686 (i).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds, &c. (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

——— Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Correction of Mr. S. Hughes Speech, Ques. of Priv., 9126 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9332 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

—— Expenditure and Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

—— Expenditure by Public Works (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).

—— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1130 (i).

St. Helen's Island Sale (remarks) in Com. on B. 218, 13417 (vii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Sabourin, Maj., Cor. between Lt.-Col. Malette and Dept. (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Province, on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6862 (iv).

Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8296 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 6988, 7099, 7938 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Floods at Valleyfield (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

—— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3756 (ii).

Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 671; (census and statistics) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (exhibitions) 10601 (vi), 12889; (live stock) 12896 (vii); (Year-Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Generally—(additional remuneration) 13174 (vii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical branch) 10318 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

Canals—Soulanges (floods, &c.) 10339 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5674, 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12208; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 637; Inland Revenue (salaries) 646 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Ass't Dep. Min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977, 1014 (i); Militia (salaries) 8872 (v); Mines, 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); (salaries) 8872 (v); Public Works (salaries) 643 (i), 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9262 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Surveys (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Justice—Administration of. Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5775 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4200 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1907 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10287 (v).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Cotton strikers) 13156; (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8863; (salaries) 8863 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii); (wrecks) 3187, 3201 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10876; (Victoria immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10892; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7111; (Bridgewater) 7136; (Halifax customs) 7155; (Halifax quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii);

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings) 13478; (heating) 13340 (vii); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7286; (Dundee) 7286; (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lachute) 7293; (Lévis) 7294; (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Edmonton) 13336; (Moosejaw) 13337; (Saskatoon) 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 13339 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (gratuities) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 13178 (vii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Cape Beale) 5732 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10383 (vi); I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5549 (iii); (supplies) 10336; Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330; (extra clerks) 10345; (statistical branch) 10328; Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry. on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 917 (i).

Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Officials, Passes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

Valleyfield, Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

——— Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c. (rearks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7996 (iv).

——— Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

——— Regiment Organization, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2519, 2679 (ii).

T. Lindsay Co., Amount of Goods purchased, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (v).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks, 13066 (vii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii)

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6915 (iv).

Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ques.) 11232 (vi).

Presbyterian Church Widows' and Orphans' Fund (B. 23) 1°*, 430 (i) ; in Com. 2788 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.. *Hants.*

Canada Temperance Act. Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 10717 (vi).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 5251 (iii).

Coasting Privileges, Prop. Res., on Order being called, 2795 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of (prop. res.) 2562 (ii).

French Translation of Govt. Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3184 (ii).

Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S. (Ques.) 8894 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (remarks) 10277 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup. 4717 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855 (ii)

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5382, 5408 (iii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10944 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4502 (iii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

Bole Drug Co., Supplies furnished to Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector on Welland Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions, &c. (Ques.) 7501 (iv).

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10356 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2768 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10752 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 5087; on M. to resume debate, 5251 (iii).

——— Resolution of W.C.T.U. of Brampton (read) 7278 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11347; in Com., 11368, 11655 (vi), 12166, 12183 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5638 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members on M. for Sup., 1871 (i).

——— Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Documents, Instructions to Minister of Marine (remarks) 7810 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accts,' &c.

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ques.) 1126 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834; (amt.) 11835 (vi); 12943 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11523, 11181 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O. Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6777 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ques.) 3239 (ii).

——— Amounts paid to (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Pay (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Fire Extinguishers, &c., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7666 (iv).

——— Cor. on File, Custody of Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

Fraser, Mr. A. W., Payments to, for Legal Services (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

Fruit (apples) Inspection, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt. (Ques.) 355 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P., Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Accidents on Construction, Reports *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6655 (iv).

——— Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8748 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4544 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensation, paid, &c. (remarks) 13085 (vii).

House of Commons Accountants, &c., Increase *re* Salaries under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2454 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5997 (iii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) 7389 (iv).

——— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892, 7228; (M.) to ref. to Com., 7226 (iv).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).

Milford Haven Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13503 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5003; on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5059 (iii).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10849 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4106 (ii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, &c. (M for ret.) 7937 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement and previously (Ques.) 315 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation (prop. res.) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4952 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps, Letter (read) 8694 (v).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).
Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).
Rolla L. Crain Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3239 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Ross, Mr. D., Resignation as Member (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 98) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4580 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Item *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ques.) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Incomplete Answer (remarks) 12551, 12661 (vii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5445 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3785, 3818 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).
Speakers Expenses in House of Commons, Comparison, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Fielding) to prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5826; (amt.) to Amt., 5847, Neg. (Y., 46; N., 90) 5877 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Act, Payments under (Ques.) 7989 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed branch) 5504 (iii).
Canals—Carillon (dams) 12768 (vii); (statistical branch) 10323 (vi); Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5668; Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 624, 634; Public Works (salaries) 640 (i).
Excise (provisional allowances) 819; (travelling expenses) 816 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13166 (vii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12739 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5041, 5774 (iii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii).
BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine (hospitals) 5783 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1901 (i); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3997 (ii); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4753; (patrol boats) 4749; (Sorel property) 4752 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5746 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5784 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (pensions) 8871 (v).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522; (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 10864; (Cumberland) 10865; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887; (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10954; (Winnipeg military) 10973 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112, 7118; (Bridgewater) 7137; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7144; (Halifax Military) 7143 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7457; (Dom., renewals) 7468; (Glencoe) 7486 (iv); (Kingston) 10909 (vi); (Leamington) 7816 (iv); (Markham) 13331 (vii); (North Bay) 7813; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7827; (Simcoe) 7830 (iv); (Walkerville) 13334 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700 (iii); (rents, &c.) 10985; (repairs, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7280; (Cookshire) 7281; (Grosse Isle) 7289 (iv); (Knowlton) 13329 (vii); (Magog) 7306; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7425 (iv); (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal Post Office) 7411; (Montreal station C) 7422; (Nicolet) 7429; (Quebec citadel) 7430; (Que. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11220; (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Parker's cove) 11258; (Parrsboro) 11259; (Port Hastings) 11267; (Port Hood) 11269; (Portuguese cove) 11279; (Round Hill) 11285; (Tancook island) 11231 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12091; (Brighton) 12133; (Port Credit) 12101; (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11103 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10191 (v); (rolling stock) 5553 (iii), 12257 (vii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Tenders, Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10699 (vi).

See 'Cigarette.'

Travelling Expenses of Min. to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c. (Ques.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 5800, 5802 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5476 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

Wheat, Frozen, Shipping from Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 825 (i).

Woollen Industry, Legislation *re* Relief (remarks) 12772 (vii).

BOLE, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of, Inquiry *re* (prop. res.) 3853 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7939 (iv).

Drug Contracts with Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds (read) on Debate on Dom. Elections B. 115, 7942 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3993 (ii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. (B. 19) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 2787 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings N.S.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4399, 4498 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions from Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Canadian Patriotic Funds (B. 216) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec (Ans.) 9273 (v).

Cold Storage Co., Connection with: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction (Ans.) 1111 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Eastman Rifle Match, Investigation *re* Accident (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1293 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 1288, 1293 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Date of Sale, &c (Ans.) 354 (i).

See 'Ordnance,' &c.

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 12504 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, &c. (Ans.) 10015 (v).

——— Replacement of, by Imp. Troops (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip to (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Insurance Commission's Rept., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 9337, 9461 (v).

Kentville Rifle Range, ref. to in Budget debate, 5290 (iii).

Lancaster Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe (Ans.) 10014 (v).

——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6645 (iv).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Militia—Board of Officers, Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Camps, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

——— (stmnt.) 9835 (v).

Militia Dept., Attack *re* Boots furnished, Ques. of Priv., 10739 (vi).

——— and Civil Service Commissioner's Report, Statement in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).

——— at Quebec, Working Hours for Masons (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

——— Report (presented) 4494 (iii).

——— Threats *re*, &c. (remarks) 13584 (vii).

Militia, Apptmts. as Generals, Number and Qualifications (Ans.) 5086 (iii).

Militia Food Supplies, on Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Memorandum of General Lake (M.) *re* placing on Table, 12770 (vii).

Militia Pay, Arrears, Reasons for, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Militia Permanent Corps, Apptmt. of Commission *re* Pay (Ans.) 1293 (i).

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (remarks) 352 (i).

Militia Stores, Inspection of (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

——Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10890 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

See 'St. John.'

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Ordnance Lands—Toronto—Sale (B. 218) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

Petawawa Camp, Training of Troops, &c. (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3072 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4894 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps (remarks) 8695 (v).

—— City Corps, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

—— Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vii).

—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8855 (v).

—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ans.) 7992 (iv).

—— Representation of Veterans (remarks) 7998 (iv).

—— Transportation of Troops (remarks) 8384 (v).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11406 (vi).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2025 (ii).

Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Purchase Price (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

R.M.C., Investigation into conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv), 8176, 8442 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Consignment to N.W.M. Police, Where manufactured (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Contract *re* Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).

—— memorandum *re* agreement (read) 13553 (vii).

—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 8174 (iv).

—— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Rep. in British War Office, Disappearance from Library of House, Ques. of Priv., 4961 (iii).

—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Extension of Cove Fields Lands, &c. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

—— Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8953 (v).

—— Interchangeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

—— Number delivered as per Contract, Cost per Rifle (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

—— Number reported Unfit for Use (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

—— Provisions for Bayonets, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i).

—— Tests in England, Reps., &c., Ques. of Priv., 8167 (iv).

—— Tests, Rep. of Col. Gaudet (Ans.) 9714 (v).

—— Total Number in Use in Canada (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

See 'Dom. Arsenal.'

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 5788 (iii).

St. Helen's Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B 218, 13418 (vii)

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Annual Drill, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 847 (i).

St. John Cold Storage, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii).

See 'N.B.'

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 9273 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

——— Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ans.) 1110 (i).

——— Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3769, 3819 (ii).

Sub-target Machines ordered, Dates, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 8871 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4136 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13540; (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (gratuities) 13177; (pay and allowances) 12147; (properties) 12148; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (Quebec reviews) 13176; (rifle and artillery grants) 12152; (Ross rifle contract) 13543; (R. M. College) 12152, 13177; (salaries and wages) 12147; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg, military) 10970; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi); (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7693; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10908 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7703; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Quebec cliffs) 12148 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5207, 5258 (iii).

——— Number ordered, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).

Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Valleyfield Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from, by Govt. (Ans.) 356 (i).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

——— on M. to consider (remarks) *re* Questions, 8 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth, in Com. on Res., 4846 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4717 (iii).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

All-Red Line, Omission of (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12432, (amt.) 12439; neg. (Y. 48; N. 108) 12499 (vii).

Anglo-American Treaty with G.B., Information *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Information *re* Presenting, 8516 (v).

——— Tel. *re* (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Appeal Court of B.C., B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 8466 (v); in Com., 10863 (vi).

Architectural Institute of Canada on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).

Asiatic Labour in B.C.: Ques. of Privilege, 6526 (iv).

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10934 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389; in Com., 4400 (iii).

See 'Que. Tercentenary,' &c.

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (remarks) 2883 (ii).

——— Correction *re*, 4669 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13571 (vii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3470 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949 (iii).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13313 (vii).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction (remarks) 12661 (vii).

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 431 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

See 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes (remarks) on the Address, 24 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) on the Address, 26 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 6201 (iii); in Com., 6414 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13058 (vii).

Canada and U.S. Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

——— Boundaries Treaty (remarks) 7834 (iv).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494; on M. for 2°, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 202 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12847 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept (remarks) 6059 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Cable *re* Removal by G. B. (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use of by Political Agents (remarks) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10747, 11021 (vi).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).

See 'Asiatic,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10719, 10724; on M. for 2°, 11338; in Com. on Res., 11355; in Com., 11364, 11561, 11640 (vi), 12164; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Correction in Hansard *re* Increases, 11494 (vi).

——— Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Rep., Inquiry for, 1317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5623 (iii).

——— Policy of the Govt. *re*, on M. to Adjn. House, 5882 (iii).

——— Delay in Printing, &c., Investigations *re*, on M. to Adjn., 6143 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers (Amt.) on M. for Sup., 7506; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).

See 'Marine and Fisheries,' &c.

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com of Sup., 9193 (v).

Colchester Election (remarks) on the Address, 39 (i).

Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor, &c. *re* Govtl. Action (Ques.) 174 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (remarks) on M (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).

——— Organization &c. (remarks) 507, 560 (i).

——— Sitting concurrently with House, on M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12203 (vii).

——— Information *re* Break, 11121, 11406 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendts., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9282 (v).

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Defalcations at Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Kennedy) 9460 (v).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10134 (v).

See 'Supply.'

Customs Inspectors, Suggestion of Civil Service Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9549 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order *re* Reading, &c., 8462 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Debates, Official Reps., Conc. in without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c. (Ques.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing in 1908 (Ques.) 315 (i).

Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials, (M. for O. Cs., &c.*) 5477 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

——— Name of Govt. Agent (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5087 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1140 (i), 1617, (amt.); Production of, 1622; agreed to, 1667 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1801 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. deb. 1844 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7859 (iv), 8423 (v); in Com., 11798, 11828; (amt.) 11922 (vi), 12956; on M. for 3°, 13232 (vii), on M. for 3° (amt.) 13251; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 231; in Com., 754, 949 (i); Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127, 11153 (vi); in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11510, 11948; Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi); on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, 12395 (vii).

See 'Lands,' &c.

Doukhobors, Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. Board of Trade (read) 7620 (iv).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O. C., on Inquiry for, 6854 (iv).

——— O.C., *re* Rule *re* Producing (remarks) 6927 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 9773, 10259 (v).

Drill Halls Ret., Inquiry for, 5659 (iii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Apptmt. Inquiry for, 4963 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii); in Com., 10763 (vi).

Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation (remarks) 1861 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13261; in Com. on Res., 13279; in Com., 13419 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485 (iii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Esquimault Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance (M. for copies) 1128 (i).

Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry *re* Further, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Conc., 5920 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt.B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13459 (vii).

Financial Stringency, &c. (remarks) on the Address, 35 (i).

See 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Boundaries Treaty between U.S. and Can., Information *re* (remarks) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1712 (i).

Fishing Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Fishing Licenses: *See* 'Whale,' &c.

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1393 (i), 3514 (ii); in Com., 3582, 3642 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 3754 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Canadian Tariff &c. (remarks) 13534 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i).

——— on Preparation of Statement *re* Duty Units (remarks) 943 (i).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Can. and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10556 (vi).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayments of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

Govt. Business, Introduction of Govt. Bills (remarks) 10258 (v), 11826 (vi).

Govt. Business (remarks) 10403, 10511 (vi), 12163 (vii).

——— Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11046 (vi).

Govt. Legislation &c. (remarks) 7721 (iv), 10303, 11123 (vi).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections in N.B., on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6280 (iv).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain,' &c.

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2226 (ii); in Com., 12070 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co.: *See* 'Major's Hill Park.'

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9463 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Cost of Construction (Statement) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Reply to Min. of Rys., 12682 (vii).

——— Cost inclusive of Terminals, &c., (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

——— Total Cost, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 10393, 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).

G.T.P. Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ques.) 5563 (iii).

G.T.P., Engineering Staff, Resignation of Mr. Hodgins (Ques.) 366, 516 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

——— Charges *re* Classifications, &c. (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

G.T.P., La Tuque Branch, Flooding by Water (remarks) 8607 (v).

——— Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

——— Supplies via American Routes (remarks) 9027 (v).

See 'Indian,' &c.

Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of (remarks) 431

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Pay, Par. in Press, 5659 (iii).

See 'Esquimalt.'

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Dismissal of Mr. J. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

——— Charges *re* (remarks) 9334 (v).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3710 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. back to Ry. Com., 3229 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

See "Chinese," &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Hindus in B.C., Deportation from B.C., &c. (remarks) 5338 (iii).

House of Commons Act (members) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Rules and Hours for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 590 (i).

See 'Rules.'

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued &c. (remarks) 606 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 769 (i).

——— B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6431 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1328 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration Irregularities at Halifax, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii), 6465 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4963 (iii).

See 'Halifax,' &c.

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13129 (vii).

Indian Reserves, Land Grant to G.T.P. Ry. Co. in B.C., O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6471 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Civic Elections at Halifax, Interference of Employees (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Employes in Prov. of Quebec, Interference in Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2885 (ii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

——— Truro Sewerage Frontage, (M. for cor.*) 5800 (iii).

See 'Govt. Rys., &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Irrigation Act, Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i); on M. to withdraw, 2974 (ii).
——— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese in B.C., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) on the Address, 32 (i).
——— Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Limitation, &c., Inquiry for, 94 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, Rep. *re* (remarks) 4737 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Parliamentary Control of, 2025, (amt.) 2043 (ii). Neg. (Y. 45; N. 100) 2158 (ii).
——— Statement by Postmaster General (remarks) 1424 (i).
——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602, 1614 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs. Cor. Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 854 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1928 (i.)
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. &c. sent to by Govt. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 12551; in Com., 13050 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12399 (vii).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Woods, Disposal of, &c. (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept. and Res. of Town Council of Sydney (read) 9334 (v).
——— Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526 (vi).
See 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Life Saving Stations, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Literature distributed through Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9103 (v).
Loans to Govt., Temporary, &c., Outstanding, Rates of Interest, (Ques.) 235 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 314 (i).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou, Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Major's Hill Park, and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425, 1585 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i), 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12790 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12569 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Affidavits quoted by member (remarks) 7949 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Ass't. Judge in Exchequer Court (remarks) 11311 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Civil Service Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 7322 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. Hse., 8458 (v).
——— Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 9725 (v).
——— Deputy Minister, Resignation, Acceptance of (remarks) 7621, 7938, 7995, 8088 (iv).
——— Evidence *re* (remarks) 8516 (v).
——— Evidence presented day by day to Hse. (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).
——— Officials, Suspension *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii), 6346 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
——— Proceedings, Public, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3029 (ii); in Com., 3034 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227; in Com., 7242 (iv).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinion of Justice Dept. (M. for copies*) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).
Militia Camps, Holding of, &c. (remarks) 9779, 9835 (v).
'Montcalm' Str., Collision, Investigation *re* (remarks) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9478 (v).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13493 (vii).
See 'Que.,' &c.
N.T. Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9420 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3670 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's. B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid *re* Immigration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 770 (i).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 210 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13052 (vii).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co's. B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10856 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 12550; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co's. B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Destruction of, &c. (remarks) 1425 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12625 (vii).

Peace Union, Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13582 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3168 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

P.E.I. Public Works Expenditure, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12628 (vii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4654 (iii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10692 (vi).

Private Bills, Discrepancy in Fees between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10122 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, Increased Payments, &c.(Ques.) 173 (i).

Public Acounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3080 (ii).

——— Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1442 (i).

——— Sittings concurrently with House (remarks) 9504 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2941, 3405 (ii).

Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661, 5730 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).

Quebec Bridge Disaster (remarks) on the Address, 30 (i).

——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3048 (ii).

——— Printing of (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion (Ques.) 5566 (iii).

——— Par. in Toronto Globe *re* Change of Site (remarks) 7931 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13417; in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co's. B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Number of Troops, &., (remarks) 10259 (v).

Questions, Precedence of &c. (remarks) 350 (i).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) on Par. in 'Globe,' 2383 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5246 (iii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3397 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— on ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate, 577 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii); in Com., 8511 (v), 10636; on Amt. (Mr Monk) to M. for 3°, 11606; on M. for 3°,11614; (amt.) 11619; Amt. neg. (Y. 40, N. 74) 11631 (vi).

Ry. Mortgages: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., Applications and Constructions, 13478 (vii).

——— Inquiry for, 12771 (vii).

——— Applications for, Memorandum *re* (remarks) in Com., 13304, 13315 (vii).

Returns delayed, &c. (remarks) 13082 (vii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Returns delayed, on Inquiry for, 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 4660 (ii).

See 'Documents,' &c.

Ross Rifle Co., Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 9073 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9331 (v).

—— Report from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Rules of the House, Proposed Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2985 (ii).

See 'House of Commons.'

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3011 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) 5548 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. MCraney) in Com., 8564, 9069, 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Agreement with Govt. *re* Sale of Homestead Lands, Letter (read) 9127 (v).

—— Information *re* (remaks) 9280 (v).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10102 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1382 (i).

—— Extension of Time of Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5417; (amt.) 5460 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii), 12595; in Com., 13048; (amt.) 12612; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Stanstead By-election, Disappearance of Papers (remarks) 8087 (iv).

—— on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).

—— on M. for Com., 8888 (v).

Sub-target Machines, on M. to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 5820 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5831 (iii).

Supply B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13579 (vii).

Supply—Conc., 5499 (iii).

—— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5919 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Supply—Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9909 (v).

—— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10034 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10025

See 'Dom. Elections B. 115,' &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 672; (census, &c.) 674 (i); (dairying) 10397 (vi); (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304 (vi).

Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536 (v); Miscellaneous (cruisers) 9578 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9441 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10062 (v); (salaries) 10040 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9878 (v); (deportations) 9882 (v); (literature, &c.) 9948 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 10286 (v); (rifle ranges) 12505 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3147, 3185 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9103 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 10973; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8568 (v); Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11112; Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378 (vi); (construction) 12238 (vii); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5550 (iii); (Windsor Branch) 10145 (v).

Railways — Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 10342 (vi); (inspections, &c.) 10341 (vi); (legal expenses) 10363 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Technical Schools, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

Telegraph and Telephones and Man. Boundaries, Legislation, Inquiry for, 3042 (ii).

Telephones and Telegraphs, Control by Ry. Commission (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

See 'Ry. Act Amt.'

Timber Berths, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) Ques. of Order *re* reading Evidence before Pub. Accounts, 11308 (vi).

Timber Licenses, Inquiry for Ret., 1739 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2527 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Ry. Commission Reps., Printing of, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'

Under-Secretaries of State (remarks) on the Address, 25 (i).

U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 5338 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178,on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Whale Fishing Licenses granted in B.C., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10284 (v).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2182 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10532 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9636 (v).

Yukon Moral Reform, Inquiry for Dr. Shearer's letter, 10303, 11122 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8188 (v),10519 (vi).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c. (Ques.) 892 (i).

Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians, Pet. (read) in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).

Archives Dept., Index Cards, Quantity purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 6057 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjourn House, 5906 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5644 (iii).

Coal Lands in N.W.T., Lease granted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Charges against Postmaster Kilpatrick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on Election Bill, 11913 (vi).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

——— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv); 11739; in Com., 11818, 11905; (amt.) 11931 (vi); in Com., 12926; on M. for 3° (amt.) 13230; neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Fort William or Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale, B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12077 (vii).

G.T.P., Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ques) 12775 (vii).

——— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 10738, 10790 (vi).

——— Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S., &c. (remarks) 1443 (i).

——— Transportation of Supplies, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Rebuilding (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; (amt.) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).

——— (remarks) *re* Telegram of Mr. Sifton, 13528 (vii).

——— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2396 (ii).

I.C.R. Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c. *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

——— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ques.) 9269 (v).

Manitoulin & North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Reps. *re* &c. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

Ontario, North, Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ques) 697 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing for England, Acting Minister of Marine, &c. (Ques.) 7732 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3125 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3085 (ii).

Public Buildings and Works, Initiated since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Stmnt. of hon. member for Thunder Bay *re* Misleading House, 7995 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 11610 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt., (remarks) 12194 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 2384 (ii).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

'Sault Express,' Amounts paid for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 696 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853, 1129 (i).

Sault St. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 898 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13470 (vii).

See 'G.T.P.' &c.

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6635 (iv).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

See 'Walker.'

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5872 (iii).

Supply—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 635 (i); Labour Dept. (salaries) 12156 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4015 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1072 (i); (life-saving stations) 2972; (wrecks) 3152, 3195 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1474; (Museum) 1498 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (legal costs) 5557; (Pictou) 5559 (iii).

Timber Berths, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale to Owners, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

——— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (ii).

Timber Berths, Original Documents, &c. (M. for ret.) 2983 (ii).

See 'Indian Lands.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on M. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ques.) 3842

——— Payment by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

See 'Steel.'

Yukon Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

'Challenge' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

Dorval, Dredging at Yacht Club Wharf (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6240 (iv).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c. (Ques.) 6639 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3461 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c. (M. for reports*) 6239 (iv).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1997 (i).

——— Final Report of Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

Immigrants, Total Number entering Canada for ten Months; Deportations, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Toronto Centre.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers (remarks) 11121 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11669 (vi).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1797 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11815, 11843; (amt.) 11820 (vi); in Com., 12920; on M. for 3°, 13234 (vii).

French Treaty, going into Effect (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ques.) 9712 (v).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3705, 3720 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Parliamentary Control, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2056 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605, 1663 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7354 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. (B. 82) in Com., 4997, 5052; (amt.) 5056 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1442 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1454, 1470 (i).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8807 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8700 (v).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 11309 (vi).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8616 (v).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9679 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).
Budget, The, 5980 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10753 (vi).
Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault (remarks) 13142 (vii).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1825 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11140 (vi).
Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6905 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10591 (vi); Canals, Welland (electric lighting) 12205 (vii); Public Works, Miscellaneous (telegraph branch) 11098 (vi).
Technical Students, Employment on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3297 (ii).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Williamsburg Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12205 (vii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*
'Arctic,' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June 1904, to June, 1907 (Ans.) 185 (i).
———Trip in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup. 4012 (ii).
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ans.) 3849 (ii).
Beauchemin, A., Employment at Sorel (Ans.) 5467 (iii).
See 'Sorel,' &c.
Becancour River Dredging, Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7213 (iv).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1733 (i).
——— Expenses of Sir C. H. Tupper (explanation) 4669 (iii).
Bellechasse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).
——— Ret., Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3241 (ii).
Bernier, Capt., Islands flagged *re* Arctic Expedition (Ans.) 5208, 5466 (iii).
Birnie and Noble, Advances to, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 987 (i).
See 'Fishing,' &c.
Briar Island Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ans.) 9266 (v).
B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C. Fishing, Licenses issued to Packers Associations (Ans.) 8173 (iv).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Travelling Expenses from June 30th, 1906 (Ans.) 1347 (i).
See 'Marine,' 'Travelling,' &c.
Bronte Harbour Wharfage, Dues collected (Ans.) 13064 (vii).
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to (Ans.) 5467 (iii).
Campbellton Harbor, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ans.) 8612 (v).
Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'
Canada and France SS. Subsidy B 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6161, 6173, 6198; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 9108 (iv).
See 'Franco,' &c.
Canada Shipping Act, Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3420 (ii).
——— (B. 183) 1°*, 10119 (v); in Com., 12851, 13052 (vii).
Canso Medical Officer, Successor to Dr. Brine (Ans.) 1736 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing (Ans.) 681 (i).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Castle' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6641 (iv)

Champlain, Str., Emplymt. by Political Agents, (explanation) 9280 (v).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5890 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Marine Dept., 5620 (iii).

——— Translation (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 999, 1040 (i).

See 'Travelling.'

'Coquitlam,' Str., Compensation *re* Seizure (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

Cowie, F.W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ans.) 8184 (iv).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso (Ans.) 5651,5779, 5790 (iii), 8179 (iv).

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ans.) 1117 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of Cor. 1128 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Falconer, K., Payments to for Services (Ans.) 8890 (v).

——— Payment of Balance of Account (Ans.) 10516 (vi).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7640 (iv).

——— (personal explanation) 7663 (iv).

——— Production of Original File (remarks) 9281 (v).

——— Quotations from, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7765 (iv).

——— on Inquiry for Original Papers, 8912 (v).

Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations with Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 6849 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1723 (i).

Fisheries Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.; (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Fisheries between Dom. and Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2395, 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Provs., Instructions to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

——— Protection Service, Amounts expended since 1885 (Ans.) 1118 (i).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2390 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Selkirk, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Name &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Granted to Japanese (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Fishing Privileges, Lesser Slave Lake, Lease &c. (Ans.) 6398 (iv).

Fish Island, Name of Present Lightkeeper (Ans.) 6058 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ans.) 3427 (ii).

France and Canada SS Subsidy, (prop. res.) 3493 (ii).

See 'Can. and France.'

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 927 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i); in Com., 3609, 3636 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4335 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 515, 1120 (i).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

——— on Rep. of Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).

See 'Birnie, &c.

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6282 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10731 (vi).

——— Maintenance and Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

——— Pay of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 10736 (vi).

——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

See 'Cowie,' &c.

Hackett, Capt., Tug *re* Lime Kiln Crossing, Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Halliday Bros., Lighthouses, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4543 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 358 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1734 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6477 (iv).

I.C.R. Employes and Provincial Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9778 (v).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

——— Purchase Price, Staff, &c. (Ans.) 3434 (ii).

Life-Saving Boats in B.C., Purchase of &c. (Ans.) 684 (i).

Life Saving Stations, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3837 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Charter of Steamers, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9477 (v).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Issue of Licenses, *re* (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishery Regulations, Pet. from Fishermen's Union N.S. (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ans.) 10256 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland County (Ans.) 9473 (v).

——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Lobster Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., 5475 (iii).

Lobster Fishing at Pictou, on Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c. (Ans.) 10257 (v).

Lobsters, Undersized, Caught at Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Lockery & McCombel, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Louisburg, Bait Freezer, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

——— Harbour Dues for 1906, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business (Ans.) 513 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Operation of, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System, Regulation *re* Rates, &c. (Ans.) 174 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation and Acceptance (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Letter *re* (read) 8088 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Ret. *re* Mr. Falconer's Accounts, laid on Table, 4223 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 510 (i).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy (remarks) 10741 (vi).

——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8452 (v).

——— Deputy Minister, Suspended Officers, Date of Apptmt, &c. (Ans.) 6982 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Investigation, Public &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refund, &c. (Ans.) 8889 (v).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St. (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Marine and Militia Stationery Supplies, Purchase *re* Book-keeping (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Copy laid on Table, 11404 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3022; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Meaford Harbour, (B. 158) 1° m., 7195 (iv); in Com., 8510 (v).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Montcalm, Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (re-vestigation *re* (remarks) 8087, 8171 (iv).

——— Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* Cement (Ans.) 7199, 7499 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c. (Ans.) 8888 (v).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3456 (ii).

Motion, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).

Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).

Naval Stations in Canada, Maintenance of, Arrangements with G. B. *re* (Ans.) 1118 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ans.) 1120 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

'Petrel' Str., Amounts paid for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Mr., Date of Sailing for England, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 984 (i).

P.E.I. Cable Service, &c. (remarks) 8516 (v).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c (Ans.) 360 (i).

——— Life-Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 358 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ans.) 895 (i).

——— Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 8444 (v).

——— Progress *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i), 5796 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

——— Signing of Contract (Ans.) 10254 (v).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

——— 'Str. Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i), 6160 (iii).

——— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Withdrawl of Str., &c. (remarks) 1207 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10663 (vi).

Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority for (Ans) 12776 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2025, 2886, 3318 (ii).

——— Delayed (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Rideau Canal, Buoys, &c., Contract *re* Lighting (Ans.) 8613 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Russian Govt., Compensation to B.C. Schooners (Ans.) 683 (i).

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

——— Expenditure and Collections (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Ste Anne de Sorel, Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

St. Lawrence Route, Wrecks, Collisions, &c. (Ans.) 10739 (vi).

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in B.C., Number, Condition, &c. (Ans.) 5652, 5998 (iii).

——— Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

——— Payments *re* (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Salmon Net Fishing, Priviliges in Restigouche River (Ans.) 13518 (vii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

Shad Hatchery at Windsor, N.S. (Ans.) 8894 (v).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt of, &c. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).

Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons registered (Ans.) 2790 (ii).

See 'Canadian Shipping Act,' &c.

Signal Dues at Halifax (B. 152) 1°m., 6457 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Sorel Pay Lists, Alleged Padding, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

——— Papers laid on Table, 5477 (iii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 7099 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet laid on Table, 8170 (iv).

——— Rep. *re* Irregularities (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Sorel Shipyards, Mr. Desbarats, Connection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).

Soulanges County Wharfage Dues, Amount received, &c. (Ans.) 9277 (v).

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

——— Cor. laid on Table, 4825 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

——— (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ans.) 687 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 3896 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Payments to *re* Auditing, Dept. of Marine (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Submarine Signal at Negro Point, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5202 (iii).

Summerside Harbour and Str. Stanley (remarks) 6160 (iii).

Supplies purchased for Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977 (i).

Fisheries (dogfish works) 13325 (vii); (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii); (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9853 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039 (iii); (aids to navigation) 5040, 5773 (iii); (lighthouses) 12262 (vii); (lightkeepers) 13323 (vii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (maintenance, &c.) 5039 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (pilotage pensions, &c.) 5046 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (repairs) 5039 (iii); (salaries) 4755, 5039 (iii); (signal service) 5045 (iii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5041 (iii); (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dockyard) 5039 (iii); (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (hospitals) 5782 (iii); Hudson Bay Patrolling) 3985 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1885 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); 12262 (vii); (Patrol Boats in Hudson Bay) 4747 (iii) (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1078 (i), 5763 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942, 2952; (life-saving awards) 2972 (ii); (masters and mates) 2969 (ii); (naval schools) 3153 3222 (ii); (obstructions) 3211 (ii); (tidal service) 3215 (ii); (winter mail service) 3217 (ii); (wrecks) 3147, 3184, 3195, (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii); (St. Lawrence channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11082 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Peribonka) 12036 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3294

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 915 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 922 (i).

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans) 4586 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River (Ans.) 9476 (v).

Trap Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Travelling Expenses of Minister, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4122 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3985 (ii).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs to, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid) 9775 (v).

'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ans.) 683 (i).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ans.) 3230, 3843 (ii).

——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3843 (ii).

Washington Fisheries Commissioners, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Fraud (remarks) 6848 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6121 (iii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Signals (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Granting of Licenses, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A McLean) 10269 (v).

——— Moneys due, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 5996 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., Amount of Revenue collected (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure, on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ans.) 683 (i).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 155) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sales of Articles, &c. (Ans.) 238 (i).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Judges, Supreme Court, Quebec Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ans.) 358 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Report (presented) 185 (i).

'Le Soleil,' *re* Voting of French Members, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7994 (iv).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ans.) 357 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 10396 (v); Justice (Exchequer Court) 5506; (salaries) 5505 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Arctic cruise) 4012 (ii); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii); (maintenance) 5509 (iii).

BURROWS, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8357 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11172, 11445, 11526; (amt.) 11943 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10822 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12812 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12568 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii); Public Works— Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr Lake) 2378 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).

——— Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8734 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (v).

CALDWELL, Mr. T. B., *Lanark, N.*

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5446 (iii).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *Middlesex, W.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82, on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5062 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 3° m., 1929 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 430 (i).

CARNEY, Mr. M., *Halifax.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 764 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4160 (ii).

CARON, Mr. J. B. T., *Ottawa.*

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11344 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2005 (i).

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 2160 (ii).

Royal Mint of Canada, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copy*) 5210 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, (N.B.)*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8401 (v); in Com., 13021 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6798 (iv).

Fraser Lumber Co.'s (B. 8) 1°*, 231 (i).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10990 (vi).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep., 12293 (vii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

N.B. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1108 (ii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9929 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5441 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12619 (vii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.— *Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi); N. S. (Shelburne) 7177 (iv); Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 13348 (vii); (St. John tidal waters) 12005 (vi); N.S. (Port Hood) 11276 (vi); Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12112 (vii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (amt.) 11964 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5014 (iii).

—— Manner of Living, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3314 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 26) 1°*, 430 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12580 (vii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron, E.*

Address, The, 263 (i).

Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ques.) 686 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6214 (iii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2573 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11945, 11953 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).

Fishing Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559, 697 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. 2896 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1238 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10564 (vi).

Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Registers of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6834 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

McGee, Hon. Thomas D'Arcy, Monument *re* (remarks) 6288 (iv).

Mint Building, Ventilation of, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9945 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii); in Com., 12623 (vii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 6458 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. McLean) to conc., 13353 (vii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 5998 (iii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 351 (i).

S.A. SS. Subsidy, Amount to Elder-Dempster Co. (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 622 (i); Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4184 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1702 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4630 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11695 (vi).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P., *Ontario, S.*

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B. (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U.S., from 1904-7 (Ques.) 6238 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7266 (iv).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S. (remarks) 13537 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12895 (vii); (seeds) 12893 (vii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex, S.*

Address, The, 254 (i).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4385 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5120 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11825, 11859; (amt.) 11881 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226, 3621,3692, 3737 (ii), 4224 (iii); 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Patent Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12627 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1440 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (M. to conc.) 2159 (ii).

——— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3131 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection *re* Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 913 (i).

Walker, Andrew, Relief (B. 124) 1°*, 5336 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6126 (iii).

Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 3834 (ii).

Windsor Pump and Foundry Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 72) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8494 (v).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Kent, W.*

Address, The, 194 (i).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6465 (iv).
See 'Militia.'

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— (Ques.) 895 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Brome County Employees, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Budget, The, 6527 (iv).

Canned Foods, &c., Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c. (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8894 (v), 9266 (v).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10515 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12164 (vii).

Colchester Point, Essex Pier, Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

——— Material imported, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

——— Material entered free of Customs Duties (Ques.) 10254 (v).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10417 (vi).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs Dept. at Windsor (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Documents, Original, Ques. of Priv., 6010 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5031 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Falconer, Payments to *re* Auditing Accounts of Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).

Floods at Chatham, Damage &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4742 (iii).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of, at Amherstburg (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13092 (vii).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Cause, &c. (Ques.) 5796 (iii).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation of (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Immigration Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Immigration Agents, Special Prizes, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Officers in Kent County, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 3172 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3041 (ii), 4223 (iii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management (remarks) on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11066 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6470 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Lady Evelyn' (Ques.) 5799 (iii).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Meats and Canned Food Inspectors, Number appointed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in debate on Address, 196 (i).

Meat Inspection Act Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Purchase of Blankets, Return *re* (remarks) 5914 (iii).

See 'Blankets.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 793 (i).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs, Windsor (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Perdue, Dr M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 173 (i).

Piggeries at Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11405 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 12894 (vii); (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (seeds) 12892 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12732 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5042 (iii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (naval schools) 3154 (ii); (obstructions) 3212 (ii); (wrecks) 3188 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8524 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 7479 (iv); (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Guelph armoury) 7678 (iv); (Kingston R. M. C.) 7704 (iv); (Leamington) 7705 (iv); (Markham) 7712 (iv); (North Bay) 7712 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Station C.) 7420 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8599 (v); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11273 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11073 (vi).

Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition (remarks) 12657 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to (remarks) 7506 (iv).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 908 (i).

Wallace, Michael J, Emplymt in Customs at Windsor (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

Waugh, James, Refund to Govt. *re* Immigration Agent (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6138 (iii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Cor. Accounts, &c. (M. for copies*) 1129 (i).

Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

—— Expiration of Franchise (Ques.) 1940 (i).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 123, (amt.) 147 (i); Amt. Neg. (Y. 95: N. 56) 274 (i).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12448 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10940 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4391; in Com., 4400 (iii).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

Brantford Srike, Cor. with Justice Dept (Ques.) 10016 (v).

Budget, The, 5314 (iii).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, Countries of Origin, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6176 (iii).

Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).

Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at DeCew Falls, &c. (Ques.) 897 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Customs Dept. and Civil Service Rep. *re* on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

Customs Seizure for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

—— Customs Dept., Criticism, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10428 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10825 (vi).

Dominion Power Co.'s Bill, Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1237 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3556 (ii); in Com., 3617 (ii), 3640 (ii).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2240 (ii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6661 (iv).

—— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12725 (vii).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6451 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, &c. (prop. res.) 1295 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2074 (ii).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications (M. for copy*) 1295 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8857 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchean, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4238 (ii)

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed branch) 5501 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 625 (i).

Indians—(destitute, relief) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891 (vi); Ont. (Brantford) 7455 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2873 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5097 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721 (vi); in Com., 11386 (vi); 12167 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7982 (iv), 7998 (iv), 11727 (vi); in Com., 11802 (vi), 11833 (vi), 12958 (vii); on M. for 3°, 13235 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5030 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6803 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6659 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12678 (vii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3702 (ii), 3719 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry. (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Financial Review, 13467 (vii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12561 (vii).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4914 (iii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4971 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4054, 4132 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt (Mr. Lake) 2345 (ii).

COPP, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby*

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1108 (i); in Com., 4231 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5785 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 5412, 5519 (iii).

Townsend, Arthur James, Relief (B. 196) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*

Address, The, 316 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8076, 8089 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Ry Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 6287 (iv).

——— on Order for Com., 7141 (iv); in Com., 7667, 8125 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8741, 9377, 9461 (v).

Grazing Land leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 2132 (v).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv)

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1, 1896 (Ques) 13512 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3381 (ii).

Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c. (Ques.) 4242 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1364 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5523 (iii)

Public Works--Buildings--Man. (Dauphin) 8521 (iii); (Neepawa) 8537 (v).

Timber Berths, Awarded between June 1904 and July 15th, 1896, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

——— Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2676 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York (N.B.)*

Blackhall, Mrs., Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6878 (iv).

Civil Service Act. Amt B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11558 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1861 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13028 (vii)

Elections in N.B., Federal Govt. Patronage, on M. for Sup., 3043 (ii)

Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St John, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9464 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12710 (vii).

——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Immigration in N.B., Co-operation with N.B. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

I.C.R., Claim Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).

——— Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 2558 (ii).

——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12403 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12796 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ques.) 8892 (v).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Post Office Services Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4916 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr Graham) in Com., 10639 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9830 (v).

St. Mary's Indian Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 12889 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 621 (i); Mines (salaries) 647 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 9886 (v).

Indians—N.B. (agents salaries) 13170 (vii); (salaries) 12736 (vii); (schools) 13170 (vii).

Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 8537 (v); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton) 13328 (vii); (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, water service) 7187; (St. John) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7119; (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv) (Halifax customs) 7156 (iv); (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Westville) 7179; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7679 (iv); (Kingston artillery park) 7701 (iv); (Kingston, hospital)

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

7702 (iv); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704 (iv); (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7438 (iv); (Dundee) 7287 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Knowlton) 7291 (iv); (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta (Battleford) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 8581 (v); (Humboldt) 8584 (v); (Moosejaw) 13337 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11684 (iv); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Campbellton 13344 (vii); (Caraquet wharf) 11685 (vi); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi); 13344 (vii); (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (v); (St. John river) 11693 (vi); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12008 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11216 (vi); (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384 (vi); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 12758 (vii); (claims dept.) 10176 (v); (double tracking) 12250 (vii); (Fredericton improvements) 12758 (vii); Halifax accommodation) 12227 (vii); (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (locomotives) 10156 (v); (machinery) 12257 (vii); (Moncton car shops) 12251 (vii), 12256 (vii); (Pictou accommodation) 12230 (vi); (Sackville) 12235 (vii); (salaries) 10147 (v); (supplies) 10191 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10389 (vi).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ques.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2886 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10534 (vi).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John (City)*.

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3862 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12469 (vii).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6173 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W. —*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12852 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11983 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4686 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1722 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1236 (i); on M. for 1°, 3494 (ii); in Com., 3593 (ii), 3637

Franco-Canadian Treaty, and Favoured Nation Clause (Ques.) 514 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res, 2222 (ii); in Com., 12081 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 10015 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

Imports from France, Value for five years, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

I.C.R., Claims *re* Damages, Settled and Unsettled, &c. (Ques.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— Employees, Names and Number taken in Jan. and Feb. in N.B. (Ques). 5793 (iii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 5800 (iii).

——— Number employed in N.B. for Jan. Feb., &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241.

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12795 (vii), 12829 (vii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9494 (v).

Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

——— Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9313 (v).

See 'Trueman.'

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

N.B. Credit, Amount &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. Patronage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3050 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10032 (v).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12624 (vii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 10692 (vi).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4958 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10648 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in House of Com., on M. for Sup., 9780 (v).

—— Ques. of Priv., 9891 (v).

Rifle Range, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Ry. Mail Supt., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1561 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com on Res,, 3787 (ii); in Com., 12596 (vii).

Sussex Military Camp (remarks) 9836 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10569 (vi); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries, &c.) 639 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9541; Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9229 (v).

Fisheries (dogfish reduction works) 13325; (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9972 (v).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13172 (vii).

Labour Dept.—(Gazette) 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040 (iii); (lifeboats) 13323; (lighthouses) 12262; (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (salaries) 5039 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Cumberland) 12263.

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Marine—Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii); Dom. arsenal) 12155; (gratuities) 13177; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (R. M. College) 12152; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3221 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1082 (i); (ice-breakers) 2961; (life-saving awards) 2973; (masters and mates) 2969; (Naval Schools) 3153, 3223; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3194, 3196 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors, N.B.) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (St. John) 13329 (vii); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston militia stores) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. (additions) 1487; (mint) 1451, 1483; (museum) 1497 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John harbour) 12012 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11218; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11226; (Round Hill) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11100; Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10186 (v); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (Halifax accommodation) 12229 (vii); (legal services) 10190 (v); St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii); (salaries) 10154 (v).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9344 (v).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

Uniforms, Official, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Money Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1738 (i).

DEMERS, Mr. J., *St. John's and Iberville.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3576 (ii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, Quantity imported from G. B. for 1904-5-6-7 (Ques.) 1506 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

DESJARDINS, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ques) 6980 (iv).

Peat Industry, Employment of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12487 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1177 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8143 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2012 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com of Sup., 662 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4056 (ii); Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1098 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3573 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 679 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— (M. for copies) 899 (i).

DUGAS, Mr. F. O., *Montcalm.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8282 (iv); in Com., 11863 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt., B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

Tobacco, Foreign, Refund, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).

DYMENT, Mr. A. E., *Algoma East.*

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 5913 (iii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 5913 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9070 (v).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2195 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex, E.*

Address, The, 304 (i).

Binder Twine, Purchasers Names and P. O. Addresses (Ques.) 9715 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6209 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5098 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5011 (iii).

Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

Opium, Amount received *re* Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Ry. Semaphores, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, B.C., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c. (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671, 8553 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6267 (iv).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, (prop. res.) 2435 (ii).
——— Passes issued to P. S. Archibald, (Ques.) 2387 (ii).
N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3058 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch, B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12629 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor, I. C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10154 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi).
Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Railways—I. C. R. (inspecting auditor) 10154 (v); (double tracking) 12237 (vii); (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 9242 (v).
William, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Architectural Institute of Can., Refund of Fees (M.) 11234 (vi), 11404 (vi).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3488 (ii).
Geological Survey, Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13575 (vii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3459 (ii).
Ry. Act (land surveys) Amt. (B. 30) 1° m., 560 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13482 (vii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 911 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)*
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 352, 363 (i).
Address, The, 94; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 531 (i).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4719 (iii).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12465 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 8444 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by British Govt. (remarks) 11706 (vi).
See 'Franco,' &c.
Apples seized at Port of Montreal, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5381 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).
Aud. Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (Vol. i)—(presented) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii)—(presented) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii)—(presented) 6 (i).
Aud. General, Salary (B. 208) Prop. Res., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12645, 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 12645 (vii).
Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ans.) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2° m., 10919; in Com., 10933 (vi).
Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4298 (ii).
Banks, Aid to: *See* 'Dom. Notes Bill,' 'Wheat,' &c.
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9336 (v).
Belleville Harbour, Total Revenue, &c. (remarks) 2593 (ii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8556, 8609 (v).
Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 133) 1°*, 5337 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 11987 (vi); in Com., 12393 (vii).
Bonusing System, on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 (iv).
Boone Co., Payments to (remarks) 5083 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ans.) 13226 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13312 (vii).
British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1469 (i).
B.C., Revenue contributed to Dom. from 1872-3 to 1905, on M. (Mr. D. Ross) for Ret. 3436 (ii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Budget, The, (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means (annual statement) 5137 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 560 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
See 'Financial Review.'

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 430 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174, 6194 (iii); in Com., 6412 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

——— Trade Relations (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 209) prop. Res., 12392 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12646; 1°, 12649; in Com., 13053 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 187) on M. to place on Order Paper, 13493; 2° m, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press (B. 201) prop. Res., 12052 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12408 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii); 2° m., 12837; in Com., 12848 (vii).

——— Memorial from Pres'dt. J. Ross Robertson (read), 12837 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).
See 'Loans,' &c.

Canadian Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. M. S. Schell) in Com., 5174 (iii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 6647 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarette, Anti-Legislation *re* (remarks) 7279 (iv).

Civil Servants, Increases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 11300 (vi); in Com. on Res., 11359 (vi); in Com., 11402, 11641 (vi), 12185 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, on Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolution *re* (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 90, 938, 1740 (i), 3043, 3317 (ii), 4316, 4832, 4963, 5108, 5491, 5567 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4495 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission's Rep., presented, 5620 (iii).

——— Number distributed, &c. (remarks) 5723, 6060 (iii), 6222 (iv).

——— Translation, &c. (remarks) 6222, 6926 (iv), 13477 (vii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Civil Service Commission's Report, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on M. to Adjn. House, 5883 (iii).

Civil Service System, Re-organization of, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ans.) 6924 (iv).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ans.) 1938 (i).

Colonial Conference, 1907, Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, &c., Cor. *re* Govtl. Action (Ans.) 174 (i).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 2°* and in Com., 5492 (iii).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ans.) 1112 (i).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 659 (i).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 9962 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10143 (v).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries) 9221 (v).

Debates, Official, Adoption of 2nd Rep. (remarks) 12505 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to Conc., 8835 (v).

——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling Due (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing 1908 (Ans.) 315 (i).
See 'Loans,' &c.

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10482 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1805 (i).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11202 (vi).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt., on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) on M. for 3°, 11977 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due to N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

Dom. Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ans.) 313 (i).

Dominion Notes Issue (grain advances) (B. 159), 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2°*, in Com., 10795 (vi).

See 'Seed Grain,' &c.

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Oct. 1907, Total Amount (Ans.) 692 (i).

See 'Loans.'

Dom. Power and Development Co.'s (B. 173) on Conc. by Senate, 12549 (vii).

Dominion Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ans.) 1734 (i).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office (Ans.) 687 (i).

——— (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dry Docks Subsidy (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (iii); in Com. on Res., 4675 (iii); 1°*, 4689 (iii); in Com., 6911 (iv), 10761; on Senate Amts., 11633 (vi).

Easter Adjournment (M.) *re* 6843 (iv).

Employees of Parliament, Religions, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).

Estimates of 1908-9 (presented) 554 (i).

——— Suppl. (1908) presented, 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1909) presented, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13442 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Financial Stringency : *See* 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5780 (iii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty (B. 57), Res. prop., 941; (M.) for Com. on prop. Res., 1213 (i); on M. for 1°, 1421 (i); 2° m., 2220, 3502; in Com., 3582, 3636; 3°m., 4317, agreed to (Y. 103; N. 5) 4376 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 930 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Goods and Minimum Tariff, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 851 (i).

——— Delay in Approval, &c. (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delays *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13535 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i), 3754 (ii).

——— Distribution to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

——— Favoured Nation Clause and Foreign Countries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Going into Effect (Ans.) 8614 (v).

——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion, &c. (Ans.) 846 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail (remarks) 1585 (i).

——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

——— Mess from His Ex. (presented) 6 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause (Ans.) 514, 564 (i).

——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Preparation of Stmnt. (remarks) 8 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 94 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Papers to be distributed 848 (i).

——— U.S. Exports, &c. (Ans.) 896 (i).

See 'Mess. from His Ex.'

Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ans.) 2982 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623 (ii).

Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv).

Grain Shipments from the West, Financial Aid, &c. (remarks) 608 (i).

See 'Dom. Notes Bill.'

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract (Ans.) 5053 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12694 (vii).

——— Guarantee Bonds (B. 171) 1° m., 8835 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10771 (vi).

——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Deductions (Ans.) 1937 (i).
—— Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ans.) 9473 (v).
—— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
—— Route, Change of, Financial Reasons, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Ques. of Priv., 8089 (iv).
—— Securities *re* Construction Contracts (Ans.) 357 (i).
—— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).
Gunn, B. B., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 431 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* accepting Municipal Offices (Ans.) 3430 (ii).
—— Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).
Hay and Straw Embargo, by G. B. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Immigrants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 42) 1° m., 827 (i); 2° m., 1741, (M.) to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv).
—— Introduction of (Ans.) 9272 (v).
—— (Remarks) 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Total Expenditure, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
—— Evidence, Sale of, for private Profit (Ans.) 6059 (iii).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt., Salary (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).
Intercolonial Conference, Expenses of Canadian Ministers (Ans.) 13511 (vii).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).
—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907 (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Judges Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ans.) 10735 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 191) prop. Res., 9773 (v); in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°*, of B., 10953 (vi); 2° m., 11235; in Com., 11243 (vi); 3° m., 12054 (vii).
Lead Bounty Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11408, 11705 (vi).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. Outside of Canada (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Live Stock, N.B., Information *re* Figures, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).
Loans, Temporary, since Oct. 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loan of August, 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ans.) 564 (i).
Loan negotiated in London, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ans.) 11501 (vi).
Loan, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
See 'Dom. Loans,' &c.
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
McGee, Hon. Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to (remarks) 6288 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12794 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Aptmt. of Counsel, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7330 (iv).
—— Deptl. Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence, Printing, &c. (Ans.) remarks) 8517 (v), 11301 (vi).
—— on Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
—— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
See 'Civil Service,' &c.
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Number and Names of Establishments (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Military Camps, &c. (remarks) 9838 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mint Building, Ventilation of (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

Mint, Date of Operation, Value of Coinage, &c. (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

——— Gold Coins, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

Mint, on Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).

Mint, Royal, Sums expended, Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).

Money-Lenders operating in Public Departments (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit in Govt. Hands (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

N.B. Credit, Amount of (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 10025 (v).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Old Age Annuities (B. 120) in Com. on Res., 4690; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 10848 (vi); 3° m., 12053 (vii); on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Old Age Pensions Bill (M.) to withdraw, 3654 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2433 (ii).

Ordnance Property, Toronto, Sale Bill (prop. res.) 13226 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182, 6228 (iv).

Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 610 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloane) to Com. of Sup., 3978 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty (B. 199) in Com. on Res., 12406 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii).

Pianos rented, &c. for Speaker's Rooms (Ans.) 563 (i).

Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 691 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

——— Communication with C. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).

P.E.I. and G.B., SS. Subventions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12754 (vii).

P.E.I., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12636 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

P.E.I., Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement, &c. (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ans.) 8616 (v).

——— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c. (Ans.) 564 (i).

——— Date of last Payments, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— Increased Payments, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Public Accounts (presented) 6 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3110 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9504 (v).

——— on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business (remarks) 13493 (vii).

——— Precedence of, &c. (remarks) 3104 (ii).

Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 5730 (iii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7146 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4937 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Deficit, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

——— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2553 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 5566 (iii).

——— Corrected answer, 6059 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Report, on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11605 (vi).

Railway Commissioners Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Religious Fanatics in Man. (remark) 12161 (vii).

Representation of the Mar. Provs. in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9839 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9892 (v).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 6010 (iii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5654 (iii).

Royal Mint, Amount of Gold and Silver Coins (Ans.) 8613 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Ques. of Order *re* Govt. Apptmts., 1461 (i).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563, 8610, 9068, 9167 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2780 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii).

See 'Grain,' &c.

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2916 (ii).

Senate Sittings, Number of Days, Cost, &c., for 1895, 1906-7 (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).

——— Royal Commission *re* (remarks) 5916 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5520 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

South Huron By-Election, Amount paid Returning Officer (Ans.) 9270 (v).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5822; (amt.) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879 (iiii).

Supply—(M.) for Com., 554 (i).

Supply (B. 96) *re* Seed Grain, 1° m., 2°*, and in Com., 2782 (ii).

——— (B. 136) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

——— (B. 186) 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

——— (B. 220) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

——— Charges of Obstruction by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9395 (v).

See 'Obstructions,' &c.

——— Conc. (M.) 5499, 5915, 5919 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* Estimates (remarks) 5661 (iii).

——— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5920 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10588 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 5562 (iii); (Receiver General) 12160 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) Conc., 13578 (vii); (Ross, H. T.) 12914 (vii); (salaries) 637 (i); Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610 (i); Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i), 9708 (v); Militia (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612 (i); Privy Council (Bennetts, F. K.) 12902 (vii); Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii); Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

Finance (Treasury Board) 5562 (iii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508 (vi); (printing, &c.) 10507; (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13578 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Insurance (Supt.'s office) 12160 (vii).

Justice (Exhequer Court) 5507 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii); (China and Canada, &c.) 13152 (vii); (G. B. and Canada) 12728 (vii); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 12264 (vii); (St. John and Cumberland) 12263; (subsidies) 12262 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4017 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662 (iii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Brantford monument, Telephone) Conc., 13567 (vii); (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii); (Jamaica Earthquake) 5784 (iii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed wheat) 2770 (ii); (Yukon, Bank of Commerce) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3152 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Post Office (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8535 (v); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1453, 1472 (i); (rents, &c.) 11004 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7437; (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Lakevale channel) Conc., 13568 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways Generally (extra clerks) 10344 (vi); I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5694 (iii); (Moncton—Truro, additional line) 12760 (vii); (salaries) 10128 (v); Ry. Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (salaries) 10489 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 234, 235 (i).
Town Site, Section 32, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ans.) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
Uniforms and Customs Refunds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Wallberg, E. A., Payments by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
——— (remarks) 13416 (vii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 554 (i), 13579 (vii).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 5137 (iii).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6118 (iii).
Wednesday Evenings and Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9486 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).
West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).
——— Bank Negotiations (Ans.) 171 (i).
——— Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).
——— Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Papers, &c., 899 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Cor. &c., 2176 (ii).
——— Special Arrangements *re* Shipments of Feed Wheat with Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 893 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines, Customs Frauds, &c. (remarks) 9894 (v).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
——— Dom. Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 1346
——— Expenditures, Total Expenditure (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).
——— Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).
——— Money Transmission, Rates, *re* &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

FINLAYSON, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1733 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12872 (vii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11865 (vi).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse. (M.) 9579 (v).
Washington Fisheries Commission at Washington, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Accountants for Marine Dept., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
Address, The, 213 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co. (Ans.) 8615 (v).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5385 (iii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (iii).
Blankets purchased, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6465 (iv).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
——— Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ans.) 686 (i).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6202 (iii).
Canned Goods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6870 (iv).
Canned Goods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Canned Goods Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ans.) 514 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Removal of, Action of Govt. since 1896 (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
——— Par. in Montreal Gazette, 13081 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).
Census (complete) of the N.W. Provinces Report (presented) 3422 (ii).
Census Map, Publication of (Ans.) 4406 (iii).
Central Experimental Farm, Sale of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

Chartered Banks of Canada, Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5109 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 189) in Com. on Res., 11350; 1° m., 10717; 2° m., 11315; in Com., 11362, 11536, 11634 (vi), 12163; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

See 'Marine.'

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Examiners' Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishment in East Elgin, Assistance to (Ans.) 352 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Cold Storage, Number constructed, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for, 4223, 4407 (iii).

See 'N.B.'

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1908 (Ans.) 6404 (v).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs. (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

——— Establishment of (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

——— Number under control of Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Rep. (presented) 1018 (i).

——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4585 (iii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c. (Ans.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2756 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 516 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 6221 (iv); in Com., 10553 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apples, &c. (Ans.) 4831 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°*, 5337; in Com., 5495 (iii).

——— (B. 197) 1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°*, in Com., 12554 (vii).

Govt. Steamers, Built in Canada (stmnt.) 11124 (vi).

Grain Commissioners Report, on Inquiry for, 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 5791 (iii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 10737 (vi).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ans.) 9280 (v).

——— Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13089 (vii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

House of Commons Accountant, &c., Increase of Salary under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Inspectors of Food Products, Number of Apptmts. (Ans.) 353 (i).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2123 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 880 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigations, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7351 (iv).

See 'C. S. Commission.'

Meats and Canned Foods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6890, 7244; 3° m., 7215 (iv).

Meats and Canned Foods Inspectors, Number appointed, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, &c., Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in Debate on Address, 213 (i).

Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 3848 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ans.) 9272 (v).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, Remarks of Hon. Mr. Scott, 4965 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Perdue, Dr. M. B., Duties and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for 1018, 1740 (i), 2385 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 6000 (iii).

Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c. (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Smith, Mr. W. M., Dom. Fruit Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Appmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5860 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture (Archives) 671; (census, &c.) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (dairying) 10397; (exhibitions) 10569 (vi), 12889; (fumigating stations) 12879 (vii); (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi); (live stock) 12895 (vii); (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (Patent Record) 672 (i); (Seed Control Act) 5500 (iii); (seeds) 12891 (vii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); (salaries) 645; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4044 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13340 (vii); Que. (Cookshire) 7283; (Grosse Isle) 7290; (Knowlton) 7291 (iv).

Quarantine (public health) 5504 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 11120 (vi); in Com., 12408 (vii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Wheat Frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

FORGET, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

I.C.R. 'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and ending of running (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

——— Trains and Official Cars, &c. (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ques.) 5795 (iii).

FORGET, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto, North.*

Accountants for Marine Dept., Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).

Address, The, 66 (i).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 509 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (

Agricultural Implements, Amounts of Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

All-Red Route (remarks) in debate on Address, 87 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12419, 12488 (vii).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Duties in England (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Statement *re*, Negotiations (remarks) 366 (i).

American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Analytical Index to Debates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification of by British Govt. (remarks) 11705 (vi).

See 'Franco, &c.

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 600 (i).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907 (Ques.) 184 (i).

——— Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13573 (vii).

Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7307 (iv); on M. for 2°, 10924; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4309 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9335 (v).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4380; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Belleville Hospital Site, Inquiry for Ret., 7506 (iv).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports Flagged by him (Ques.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes *re* (remarks) 194 (i).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Brass Importations, &c. (remarks) 6233 (iv).

Briar Island, N.S., Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904 (M. for ret.*) 1689 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Buchanan Town Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10086 (v).

Budget, The (reply) 5163; (M.) to adjn. debate, 5199; (rsmd.) 5260 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 559 (i); 4316, 4670 (iii).

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
See 'Financial,' &c.

Buffalo Herd, Location in Elk Park, &c. (Ques.) 5208 (iii).

——— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

——— Purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ques.) 896 (i).

Business of Hse. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).

Cabinet Appointments (remarks) in debate on Address, 80 (i).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12841, 12850 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11253 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11351; on M. for 1°, 10718, 10727; in Com., 11369, 11549, 11634 (vi), 12164 (vii).

——— (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, Inquiry for, 7505 (iv).

——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Rep., Inquiry for, 938, 1740 (i), 2787, 3043 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).

——— Number printed, &c. (remarks) 6222 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5884 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5631 (iii).

Civil Service System, prop. Res. (M.) to drop, 6242 (iv).

——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9132 (v).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 11300 (vi).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 8379 (v).

Cold Storage Ret., Missing Letter (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv. *re* Minister's Stmnt. *re* Insurance Commission, 9337 (v).
See 'N. B. Cold Storage,' &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address, 82 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
See 'Imperial.'

Committee Meetings, Rep. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2383 (ii).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Administration of Estates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

——— Instructions *re* Estates Trusts (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ques.) 1112 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11981 (vi).

Customs Defalcations, Punishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9455 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8 (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order, *re* Stmnts., 8460 (v).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Deep Waterways Commission, Inquiry *re* Proceedings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Customs Tariff *re* Materials, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10472 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13526 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called, 2794 (ii).

——— Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1766 (i).

———Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1628 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1851 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8321 (v); in Com., 11828, 11895 (vi), 12945; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 13257 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126 (vi).

——— in Com., 11163, 11165, 11203, 11408,11503, 11453, 11940; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ques.) 313 (i).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10796 (vi).

Doukhobors, Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4679 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B. C. and Natal Act, &c. (remarks) 1738 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239, 4577 (iii).

Estimates, Insufficient Votes, *re* Public Works, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

Falconer, K., Payment to for Services (Ques.) 8890 (v).

——— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

'Fielding' Dredge, Number of Days Working (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Financial Review, (amt.) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7646 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7784 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Original Papers, 8901 (v).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Production of Original Papers (remarks) 9281 (v).

Fish Exportations from Man., Value, &c. (remarks) 4241 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations with Provs., Instruction to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1253 (i); on M. for 2°, 2220; in Com., 3582 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4341 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Discussion *re* prop. Res. (remarks) 942 (i).

——— preparation of stmnt *re* duty units, 943 (i).

——— Delays in Ratification (remarks) 13536 (vii).

——— Distribution of, to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail asked for, 1585 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 931 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 93 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 86 (i).

——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs (remarks) 8 (i).

——— U. S. Exports, Articles, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).

Geological Survey Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 991

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Girouard, Mr., Resignation from Yukon Council (remarks) 11634, 11938 (vi).
See 'Yukon.'

Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11908 (vi).

Govt. Ownership, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 75 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for three years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).

Grain Transportation from the West, Financial Aid, Explanation in the Senate (remarks) 607 (i).

G. B., Australia and Canada, &c., Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2227 (ii); in Com., 12061 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8134 (iv).

——— Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8837 (v); in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8440 (v).

——— Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6458, 6636 (iv).

——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections (Ques.) 6234 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Liquor Prohibition Sale: Inquiry for Ret. 2024 (ii).

——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

——— Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

——— Prohibition Zone, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

——— Purchase of Rails for Eastern Division, &c. (Ques.) 9263 (v).

——— Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Halifax Platform of Conservative Leader (remarks) in debate on Address, 66 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims *re* Damages (remarks) 5791 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Ret., Inquiry for, 2882 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against by Immigrants, Par. in Ottawa Citizen, 5488 (iii).

——— Tel. *re* Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

Honey Imports, from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8177 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 10495 (vi).

——— Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 591 (i).

——— and Senate, Cost outside of Indemnities (Ques.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii).

Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 511 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'

Imports and Exports, ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June, to Dec. 1907 (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8 (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6467 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. for 2°, 1742 (i).

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (personal explanation) Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 1860 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).

Insurance Commission, Rep. *re* Political Literature, Ques. of Priv., 10792 (vi).

——— Rep., Ques. of Priv., 9461 (v).

——— Total Expenditure of Commission, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

I.C.R., Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Circular Letter *re* Payments of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).
—— Claims for Damages, by A. W. Belyea, &c. (Ques.) 9472 (v).
—— Employees, and N.B. Elections (remarks) 3317 (ii).
—— Extension Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 73 (i).
—— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv).
—— Transportation, &c. on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4424 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 970 (i).
—— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) in debate on Address, 77 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
—— Ques. of Order *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt., 1763 (i).
—— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Lacas, E., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980, 1035 (i).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ques.) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ques.) 8379 (v).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10528 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; on M. for 3° (remarks) 11250 (vi), 12054 (vii).
—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11407 (vi).
Lead Production, by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11705 (vi).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ques.) 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ques.) 564 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c. (personal explanation) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest outstanding, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts: *See* 'Dom. Loans.'
'Lord Kitchener' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ques.) 7198 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to for Legal Services (Ques.) 695 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).
Marconi Co., and Commercial Press Business, (Ques.) 512 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Change of Book-keeping System, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 510 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., &c., *re* System (M. for copies*) 852 (i).
—— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).
—— Deputy Minister, Date of Apptmts. of Suspended Officers, &c. (Ques.) 6982 (iv).
—— Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7335 (iv).
—— Amounts paid Counsel (Ques.) 8837 (v).
—— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c., M. to adjourn (remarks) 8445 (v).
—— Evidence *re* (remarks) 11203 (vi).
—— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence and Reports, Printing, &c. (remarks) 11301 (vi).
—— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
—— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10741 (vi).
—— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 8889 (v).
—— Public Investigation, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Returns, Inquiry for, 2883 (ii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).
Militia Depts., Threats by Min. of Militia (remarks) 13583 (vii).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).
Militia Stores, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 8181 (iv).
Mines Branch, Acting Director, Additional Salary (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Mint, Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c. (Ques.) 11296 (vi).
—— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).
—— Total Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

'Montcalm,' Str., Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).

——— Rep. *re* Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9483 (v).

Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 8839 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Interests, &c., on M. for Sup., 9283; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9425 (v).
See 'St. John,' &c.

N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials (remarks) 3579 (ii).

——— Telegram (read) *re* Interference, 3229 (ii).

——— M. to adjn. House, 3657, 3678 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3060 (ii).
See 'Govt. Officials.'

Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid (Ques.) 509 (i).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5060 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10033 (v).

——— Order, Question of (Mr. D. Ross) 10024 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10332 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); in Com., 10850 (vi).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2425 (ii).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ques.) 11499 (vi).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2822; (amt.) to Ret., 2846 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 9579 (v), 12919 (vii).

Patronage *re* Civil Service, &c. (M.) to drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil,' &c.

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11300 (v).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Preston, W. T. R., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 360 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).

Printing in 'Sun,' &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5661 (iii).

Prisoners, Released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Protection Tariff, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 74 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Dates of last Payments, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).

——— Sums owing, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 79 (i)

Public Accounts Com., Meetings of (remarks) 945 (i).

——— Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3106 (ii).

——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4496 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.

Public Lands of Dom. (remarks) *re* in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Public Works, Applications *re*, Useless Expenditures (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

——— Deptl. Salaries in Hamilton, Delays (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).

——— Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report, Inquiry for, 4494 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rental, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials (Ques.) 13517 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans Association (remarks) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10633; in Com., 10638; on M. for 3°, 11613 (vi).

Railway Estimates, Obstruction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 13069 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2385, 2882, 3318 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii), 13081 (vii).

Returns ordered and lost in H. of C., placed in Record Dept. (remarks) 2882 (ii).

——— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. 4663 (iii).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure (Ques.) 5467 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Ross Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, Advances, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i), 8180 (iv).

——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

St. John Cold Storage Ret., Inquiry for, 2309, 3690 (ii).

——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii). *See* 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

St. Louis, H., Employment by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232, 4579 (iii).

School Lands Exhange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8086 (iv); on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Seed Grain buying and distribution, Information *re* (remarks) 13420 (vii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

Senate, Number of Sittings, Cost, &c., for 1895 and 1906-7 (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1574 (i).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (Ques.) 1112 (i).

——— Payments to (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5410 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Obed, Status in London (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Spain, Commander, Expenses *re*, Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

——— Aud. Gen.'s Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4405 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1033 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8847 (v).

Sub-target Machines, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Sub-target Machines, Papers referred to Com. for last Session (remarks) 945 (i).

——— Return, Ref. to Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 312 (i).

Supplies for Govt. Contracts, Tenders, Appmt. of Purchasing Commission (prop. res.) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5838 (iii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical offices) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5675 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 636 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) 13578 (vii); (salaries) 637; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610; Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 619 (i); 9693 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 976, 1033; Militia (salaries) 611 (i), 8871 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 614; Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 610; Public Works (salaries) 639; Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9229, 9444; (ports, &c.) 9220 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10054; (homesteads) 10086 (v).

Geological Survey (explorations, officers, &c.) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (printing, &c.) 10507; (Library of Parlt.) 10504; (salaries) 10501 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13577 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5754 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrols) 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1885, 1904 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752; (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662, 5732 (iii), 10289 (v), 13540 (vii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (Ross rifle) 13542 (vii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

N.W.M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries) 8863 (v).

N.W.T. (Govt salaries) 10116; (school grants) 10117 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i); (ice-breakers) 2969; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Post Office (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9108; (uniforms, &c.) 9110 (v).
Public Works (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Alberta (Edmonton) 5705 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 5706 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8519; (Dauphin) 8520 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700; (improvements) 5707; (rents, &c.) 5707 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Montreal pneumatic postal station) 5703 (iii); (Montreal station C) 7419; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Baddeck) 11219; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11273; (Porter's Lake) 11263 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Architects' branch) 11096; (cement testing) 11088; (clerical assistance) 11099, 11100; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (gratuities) 5730; (graving docks) 5731 (iii); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731; (B.C., Cape Beale Lines) 5731; (cable service) 5731 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5695 (iii); (salaries) 10126; (train service) 10159 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).
Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).
Yukon (Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5206 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ques.) 1126 (i).
Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal, *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8703 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 3038 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
——— Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Copies, 2855 (ii).
Timber Limit Grants to Messrs McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
——— Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff, Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).
Timber Sales, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff), Ques. of Order, 11304 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10700 (vi).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (remarks) 5565 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (remarks) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers at Colonial Conference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).
——— Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Trent Canal, Newmarket Canal, Reps., Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, on M. for Sup., 7651 (iv).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
Washington Treaty Negotiations and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11233 (vi).
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c. (Ques.) 512 (i).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10283 (v).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid by Govt. (M.) for Copies of Memorials, Cor., &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Negotiations with Banks, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).
See 'Bank,' 'Financial Stringency'
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11166 (vi).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon,' &c.
Woollen Industry, Reply to Manufacturers Ass'n. by Prime Minister (remarks) 13420 (vii).
Woollen Industry, Pet. *re* (remarks) 13518 (vii).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10529 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5785 (iii).

Yukon-Congdon, F. T., Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts (Ques.) 12050 (vii).

See 'Wiley.'

——— Election Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1114 (i).

——— Expenditures, Total Amount (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).

——— Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 1346 (i).

Yukon Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe (M. for copy*) 1132 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

Yukon, Govt. Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. T. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10519 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instruction to N.W.M.P. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

——— Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 512 (i).

——— White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Lands, Names (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley vs. Congdon, O.C.s., &c., *re* Charges (M. for copies) (amt.) 1691 (i).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Budget Debate, Ques. of Order, 6616 (iv).

Buildings, Architectural Designs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Campaign Literature (French) sent by Justice Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10354 (vi).

Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8612 (v).

Campbellton Wharf, Tender *re* Piling Supply (Ques.) 8612 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vii).

Cigarette Restraint Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).

Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11362, 11553 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) on Presentation, 5640 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9187 (v).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 695 (i).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13540 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11842 (vi), 13033 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11162, 11165, 11475, 11508, 11964 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10823 (vi).

Doukhobors Bonuses *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 9952 (v).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).

Foresters, I. O., Charges in 'Le Canala,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs, &c. (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12072 (vii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6391 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 629 (i).

Insurance Commission, Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit (Ques.) 6059 (iii).

I.C.R., Answer to Questions (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 13510 (vii).

——— Employees, Circular *re* Non-Payment, Par. in St. John Press, on M. for Sup., 10016 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2465 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

——— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ques.) 13511 (vii).

——— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

——— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ques.) 9712 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co. (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Loggieville Dredging, Payments *re* (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12793, 12816 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Official, Remarks checked, 6633 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St., &c. (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

National Battlefields Commission (land) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13505 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9328; (M.) to adjn. debate, 9330; rsmd., 9344 (v).

N.B. Elections, Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).

——— Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10331 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Circular Letter from C. S. Association (read) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3130 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4924 (iii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13485 (vii).

Rattenbury & Co., Govt. Agents *re* purchasing Oats in P.E.I., Assignment, &c. (Ques.) 12392 (vii).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vii).

Ross Rifle Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9053, 9070 (v).

St. John River, Removing Snags, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

Salmon Fishing by Nets, Privileges in Restigouche River (Ques.) 13518 (vii).

Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598; in Com., 13047 (vii).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10607 (vi); (live stock) 12899; (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Generally (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi); Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174; Trent (damages) 12768 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878; Finance (Ross, H. T.) 12914; Marine and Fisheries (asst. dep. min.) 12915; Railways (Butler, Mr. M. J.) 12755; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 650 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9240, 9260, 9444 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10041, 10051; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Geological Survey (oil boring) 13165 (vii).

House of Commons (salary increases) 13567 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13170 (vii).

Immigration (agents, U.S.) 9965; (literature, &c.) 9950; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12752; (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 12728 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10287 (v); (gratuities) 13177; (R.M. College) 13177; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 13168; (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2954 (ii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9107 (v), 13153 (vii)
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 13338; (Ladysmith) 13338 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10982 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10974 (vi); (Portage la Prairie) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10960; (Winnipeg military) 10970 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John, military) 7186; (Tracadie, lazaretto) 7187 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7151; (Yarmouth) 7181, 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490; (Guelph, armoury) 7684; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7698; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702; (London, magazine) 7706; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7811; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Port Arthur) 7825; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7830 (iv).
Public Works—Building—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 11011; (grounds) 11012; (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (museum) 1504 (i); (rents, &c.) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi); (Victoria Museum) 13477 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7279; (Cookshire) 7281; (Dom. renewals) 7286; (Farnham) 7287; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Lachute) 7294; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Levis) 7298; (Longueuil) 7305; (Montreal, post office) 7417; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Nicolet) 7428; (Plessisville) 7430; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, Dom. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Quebec, hospital) 7433; (Quebec, immigrant) 7432; (Quebec, warehouse) 7432; (St. Hyacinthe) 7440; (St. John's) 7441; (St. John's, military) 7442; (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Moose Jaw) 13337; (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver Harbour) 13344; (Dorchester) 13344; (Harvey) 13344; (Leonardsville) 13344; (Lorneville) 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (St. Andrews) 12011; (St. John) 12013; (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345; (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11279; (Round Hill wharf) 11282; (Yarmouth) 11291
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich breakwater) 13350; (Juniper Island) 13350; (McGillicuddy & Smeeth claims) 13350 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Souris) 13341; (Summerside) 13343 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028; (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029; (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029; (Batiscan) 12036; (Berthier) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Chicoutimi) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (East Templeton) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Les Eboulements) 12033; (Montmagny) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Peribonka) 12035; (Petite Decharge) 12034; (Piche Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12037; (Rimouski) 12035; (Rivière du Lievre) 12037; (St. Laurent) 12042; (St. Maurice) 12041 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alta. (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11099; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Chicoutimi) 13179; (operating) 13178 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (locomotives) 10150 (v); (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759; (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329 (vi).
Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12762 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup, 7653 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10533 (vi).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*

Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 192) 1°*, 11120 (vi).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).
Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3474 (ii).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 350 (i).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 606 (i).

Cannon, Catharine Ann Relief (B. 175) M. to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10760 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5128 (iii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1170 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8619 (v); in Com., 11894 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5913; 2° m., 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6437 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6492 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 959 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 878 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11237; in Com., 11243 (vi); on M. for 3°, 12059 (vii).

Metal Shingle Patent Relief (B. 207) 2° m., 12649; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 12649 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1108; 2° m., 1468 (i).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9224 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Conc., 13405 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13404 (vii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4967 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10653 (vi).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payments, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5413, 5519 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3808 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3284 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10070 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1484 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8489 (v)

GANONG, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3870 (ii).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Geological Report *re* Graphite Properties, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

I.C.R. Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 5466 (iii).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re* (Ques.) 9270 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3667 (ii).

Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms (Ques.) 563 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4935 (iii).

Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., &c., Amounts paid and still due (Ques.) 9269 (v).

GANONG, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 12412 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

Marine, &c., Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10883; (Victoria immigration) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10897 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8533 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7497; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7705; (Leamington) 7705; (Markham) 7710; (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (rents, &c.) 11002 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10189; (train service) 10160 (v).

Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12923 (vii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ques.) 4582 (iii).

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Literary Aid Fund, Proposed Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1286 (i).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt. of, Capt. Koenig's Duties (Ques.) 11699 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4757 (iii).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 12265, Agreed to, 12389 (vii).

——— 1st rep. (presented) 8515 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4852 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., Ques. of Order, 2809 (ii).

Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°*, 1859 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 891 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3093 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12207 (vii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal (St. James).*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) on prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4854 (iii).

Anglo-Canadian Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 126) 1°*, 5256 (iii).

Architects, Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10950 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3419 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11538 (vi).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 92) 1° m., 2543 (ii).

——— (trade restraint) Amt. (B. 96) 1° m., 2976 (ii).

Debates, Official (M.) *re* Correction in Res. on Committees, 824 (i).

——— 1st Rep. (presented) 2590 (ii).

——— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee (presented) 6979 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 7834 (iv); (amt.) 13224 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8835 (v).

——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10228 (v).

Debates, Official Reporters, and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com. on B. 189, 11539 (vi).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Limited (B. 127) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13302 (vii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on Bill 206, 12552 (vii).

Montreal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott, Ques. of Priv., 4064 (ii)

GERVAIS, Mr. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2996 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 91) 1° m., 2542 (ii).

Travellers Life Assurance Co.'s Incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 606 (i).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Chicoutimi Public Works Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13188 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4886 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 3834 (ii); in Com., 5386 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent, E.*

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389 iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of Sale, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

Floods at Chatham, Damages *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4743 (iii).

Giraud, Eugene Francois, Patent Relief (B. 52) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Immigration Agents in Ont., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).

Immigration Distribution Agents, James S. Waugh, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1690 (i).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9898 (v).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7486 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

Bear River Station Dwelling, P.E.I. Tender, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to Robert Co., &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

——— Lease on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co. and G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2811 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552, 9066 (v).

'Bessie Butler' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 13310 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. (remarks) 192 (i).

——— Connections with C.P.R. (remarks) 432 (i).

Brockville-Ottawa and Prescott Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

Buell, W. S., Employment *re* Telephone Commission (Ans.) 10011 (v).

Campaign Literature sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) prop. Res., 13282; in Com., 13420 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood Branch (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canals, Statistical Branch, List of Officers (read) 10317 (vi).

Cataract Power Co., Amount of Water diverted at De Cew Falls (Ans.) 897 (i).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter, Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5656 (iii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction (Ans.) 517 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5894 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9207 (v).

Cold Storage Co. of N.B., Lease of Land to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

Cold Storage Cars for I.C.R. *re* Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1688 (i).

Cooper & White, Payments to Govt. for Land at Welland (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Accident to Bank (statement, 11120 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, (remarks) 12660 (vii).
——— Rep. *re* Repairs, 12161 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Breakage, 11406 (vi).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos., *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Deep Waterways Commission, Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13152 (vii).
Dom. Power Co.'s Bill, on Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ans.) 9711 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) prop. Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1° of B., 13282; in Com., 13419 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5483 (iii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Express Charges in Mar. Prov., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 518 (i).
Falconer, Kenneth, Emplymt. in Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
——— Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6181 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635, 3794 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Accidents *re* Construction, Prevention of (remarks) 6850 (iv).
——— Accidents to Workmen, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora (Ans.) 895 (i).
——— Branch Lines, B. 51 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 8137 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8742, 9381 (v).
——— Classifications of Districts 'B' and 'F,' Investigation *re* (Ans.) 12051 (vii).
——— Construction, Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).
——— Contracts, Dates, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6158, 6637 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c. (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Contract for Supplies to District No. 3 (Ans.) 1120 (i).
——— Cost of Construction (M.) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction, on Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12247 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (reply) on M. for Sup., 12662 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (remarks) 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).
——— Discrimination against Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 7936 (iv).
——— Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ans.) 5563 (iii).
——— Eastern and Western Limits, Establishment of (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— Engineering Staff, Changes *re* (Ans.) 509, 681 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, Inclusive of Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10395 (vi).
——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9266 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Floods, &c. (explanation) 8894 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding (remarks) 8607 (v).
——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ans.) 8618 (v).
——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
——— Moncton and Winnipeg Section, Number of Miles located (Ans.) 2387 (ii).
——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
——— and N.T. Ry., Disputed Question (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
——— Prohibition Zone, Reduction of (Ans.) 517 (i).
——— Protest *re* Land Acquisitions (Ans.) 6640 (iv).
——— Purchase of Rails, &c., for Eastern Div. (Ans.) 9264 (v).
——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).
——— Return, on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).
——— Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ans.) 12775 (vii).
——— Steel Rails, Names of Manufacturers, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10790 (vi).
——— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10738 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Steel Rails purchased, Corrected Answer, 13065 (vii).

—— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9026 (v).

—— Transcontinental Commission, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 13226, 13517 (vii).

—— Transportation of Supplies, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

—— Winnipeg to Moncton Section, Number of Miles completed, &c. (Ans.) 6643 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, 3621, 3702, 3726 (ii),4225; on M. for 3°, 4363, 4542 (iii).

Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connection (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, Total Cost *re* Construction (Ans.) 1686 (i).

—— Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) 1739 (i).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 2882, 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hodgins, Major, Resignation from G.T.P. Staff (Ans.) 516 (i).

Holland River Dredging, Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

—— Payments to Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1292 (i), 3237 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re*, &c. (remarks) 6987 (iv).

—— Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10012 (v).

—— Amqui Station, Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

—— Asphalt Platforms: *See* 'Stations.'

—— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151, 10214 (v).

—— Book-keeping System, Cor. *re* Par. in St. John Daily Telegraph, 5260 (iii).

—— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

—— Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).

—— Claims Agent, Mr. E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

—— Claims *re* Damages, Settled and unsettled (Ans.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

—— (remarks) 6002 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Concrete Pipe Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6640 (iv).

—— Connections with Quebec Central at Lévis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

—— Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

—— Delays to 'Maritime Express' (Ans.) 8615 (v).

—— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).

—— Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

—— (remarks) 13415 (vii).

—— Employees and Civic Elections in Halifax (remarks) 6845 (iv).

—— Increased Wages, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

—— Employees, and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2884 (ii).

—— Employees, Number and Names of Persons taken in N.B. during Jan. and Feb. (Ans.) 5793 (iii).

—— Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ans.) 4582 (iii).

—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 4576; in Com., 4994 (iii).

—— Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

—— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ans.) 13225 (vii).

—— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

—— Horses killed at Truro, Compensation &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

—— Ice Supply Contract (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

—— Lac Saumon Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

—— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing (Ans.) 5800 (iii).

—— Motor Cars, Test *re* Operation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

—— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

—— Notices printed in French, &c. (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

—— 'Ocean Limited,' Number of Trips, &c. (Ans.) 6054 (iii).

—— O'Shaughnessy, Pass to (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

——Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 10733 (vi).

—— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10158 (v).

—— Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald, &c. (Ans.) 2387 (ii).

—— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax Division, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., answer to question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou and Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10790 (vi).

——— Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I. (Ans.) 5995 (iii).

——— Receipts and Expenditures" (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

——— Riviere du Loup Station Master (Ans.) 7445 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).

——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

——— Stations, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, *re* (Ans.) 5466 (iii).

——— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ans.) 9269 (v).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 9712 (v).

See 'Audit,' &c.

——— Sunday Trains, Instructions *re* (Ans.) 10735 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay in Train Service (Ans.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ans.) 12052 (vii).

——— Trains, Hauling of Private Cars (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv). 10149 (v).

——— Transportation, &c. (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).

——— Trois Pistoles Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ans.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Station, Unsanitary Condition (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

——— Williams, Mr., Emplymt. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

——— Unopposed Returns (remarks) 5914 (iii).

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Stock, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Inverness County Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12404 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Name of Contractor of G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ans.) 8892 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 9270, 9714 (v).

N.B. Elections, and Govt. Employees (remarks) 3317, 3579 (ii).

——— Interference by Dom. Govt. on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3662 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5049 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10512 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288, 13289 (vii).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power (Ans.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5567 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ans.) 691 (i).

——— Appmt. of Mr. W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ans.) 9274 (v).

P.E. I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

——— Bear River Stationmaster's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3264 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).
——— Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
——— Contract *re* News Agency (Ans.) 8444 (v).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
——— Earnings and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 848 (i).
——— Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) prop. Res., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 2° m., 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2751 (ii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim (remarks) 7100 (iv).
——— Montague Branch Extension (M.) to dsch. Bill, 11405 (vi).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. for Ret., 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ans.) 569 (i).
——— Tunnel, Rep. *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ans.) 562 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Mail Service, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 1206 (i).
Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8851 (v).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 217) prop. Res., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; in Com., 13491 (vii).
Quebec Bridge Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ans.) 8173 (iv).
——— Names of Jurymen (Ans.) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse or Vehicle Traffic (Ans.) 10739 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report (presented) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
——— on Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii), 6223 (iv).
——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv), 8608 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Distribution of Printed Evidence (remarks) 10302 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co., Salaries to Officials (Ans.) 13517 (vii).
Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 581 (i); on Amt. to Senate Amts., 12192 (vii).
——— (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3389 (ii).
——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Kennedy) on M. for 2°, 939 (i).
——— (telegraph and telephones) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 4658 (iii); 2° m., 10625, 10633; in Com., 10636; 3° m., 10777; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 10783, 11124; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11622; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607 (vi).
Railway Commission Act (Ass't Chief, &c.) Amt (B. 112) prop. Res., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1° m., 3933 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railway Commission, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Counsel Fees (Ans.) 10257 (v).
Railway Estimates, Vote for (remarks) 10007 (v).
Ry. Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railways and Municipal Agreements, &c. (remarks) 6988 (iv).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Amounts paid and still due (Ans.) 9269 (v).
Ry. Semaphores, Iron Ladders and Posts, &c. (Ans.) 239 (i).
Railway Statistics Report (presented) 1346 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 215) prop. Res., 13066; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1° m., 13315; in Com., 13478 (vii).
——— (stmnt.) re Railways under Construction, 13478 (vii).
——— Applications for, Memorandum *re*, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, Bridge Construction (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

Ry. Surveys in Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Correction *re* Answer, 5046 (iii).

Ry. Tracks crossed by Water Mains, &c. (Ans.) 690, 1109 (i).

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 12412 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Ste. Barbe, Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Plans, Surveys, &c., 3005 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4234, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13474 (vii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 9714 (v).
See 'Ry. Semaphores.'

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Soulanges Canal, Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 10011 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Overseer (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

———(Ans.) 12413 (vii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Investigation (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ans.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals (additional remuneration) 13174 (vii).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remunerations) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304; (statistical branch) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Cornwall (break in bank) 12768; (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (District office) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii); (Manning & Macdonald's claim) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12225 (vii); (damages) 10308 (vi); (damages) 12768; (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207 (vii); (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi), 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12755 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (Owen Sound) 7822; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185; Que. (Dominion Arsenal) 7437 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11085 (vi).

Railways—C.P.R. (compensation) 5561 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378; (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12764 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10187 (v); (Amherst) 12233; (Antigonish) 12229; (bridges) 12259; (Chatham diversion) 12757 (vii); (claims dept.) 10177 (v); (collection of revenue) 5694 (iii); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (facilities, &c.) 12259; (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12227; (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (legal costs) 5557 (iii), 10190; (locomotives) 10150 (v); (machinery) 12257; (Moncton, car shops) 12250; (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Mulgrave) 12229; (New Glasgow) 12230; (North Sydney) 12229; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii); (Pictou) 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549 (iii), 12257; (St. Cyrille, diversion) 12756; (St. John, accommodation) 12257 (vii); (St. Rosalie, improvements) 5558 (iii); (Ste. Rosalie) 12259; (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10127 (v); (Springhill junction) 12233 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v); (Stellarton) 12230; (surveys, branch lines) 12764; (Sydney Mines) 12229; (Sydney Mines, diversion) 12759; (Truro) 12231 (vii); (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (extra clerks) 10342; (inspections, &c.) 10341; (litigation) 10357; (statistical branch) 10328; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Telephone Wires, Application to cross R. Tracks (Ans.) 690 (i).

See 'Ry. Tracks,' &c.

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

—— Cameron Lake, Water Level, &c. (Ans.) 9772 (v).

—— Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1735 (i).

—— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11940 (vi).

—— Tributaries, Completion of Works, &c. (Ans.) 1115 (i).

—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

—— Surveys, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Tusket Wedge, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Valleyfield Floods, Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808, 7996 (iv).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

—— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

—— Resignation of John E. Scott (Ans.) 6059 (iii).

White Horse Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade (Ans.) 10736 (v).

Wilberforce Dam, Obstruction to Traffic, &c. Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copies, 2989 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Yukon Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ans.) 894 (i).

GRANT, Mr. G. D., *Ontario, N.*

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1584 (i); on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

GREENWAY, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7880 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1355 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *Wellington, S.*

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 6054 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Budget, The, 6011 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).

Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Eastern Trust Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court, &c. (B. 62) 1°*, 1283 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Hamilton Electric Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3697 (ii).

—— on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, *re* Ref. back to Committee, 3362 (ii).

Northern Bank and Crown Bank (B. 156) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3339 (ii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 350 (i).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry (prop. res.) 2856 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *Lanark, S.*

Address, The, 548 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3864 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's B. 214 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13285 (vii).

C.P.R. Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6153 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5643 (iii).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8899 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1175 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1778 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 758 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6774 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5484 (iii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1240 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3632, 3803 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Line Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9462 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12717 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12249 (vii).

——— Montreal Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

——— Port Arthur Branch, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3748 (ii), 4228 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6431 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13128 (vii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).

——— Rolling Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Transportation, &c. (reply) to Annual Statement, 4448 (iii).

Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 8481 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11245 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12802 (vii).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted, Ruling *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6228 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3270 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in Debate on Address, 548 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13292 (vii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii); in Com., 4980 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10664 (vi).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3011 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4579 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5450 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi).
Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii); (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5668 (iii).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12196 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i).
Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10381; (inspection) 10392 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 12259 (vii); (collection of revenue) 5693 (iii); (double tracking) 12237; (facilities, &c.) 12259 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12228 (vii); (locomotives) 10149 (v); (Moncton car shops) 12253; (North Sydney) 12229 (vii); (Pictou) 5559 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549, 5550 (iii), 12257; (St. John, accommodation) 12258 (vii); (St. Rosalie) 5558 (iii); (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10128; (supplies) 10202 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10386 (vi).

Temiskaming Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 13305 (vii).

Tenders, *re* Opening of, Ques. of Priv., 2738 (ii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2339 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

HALL, Mr. R. R., *Peterborough, W.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).

Dominion Lumbering and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 9021 (v).

——— Pet. (presented) 1731 (i).

Petition (M.) to Present, 1731 (i).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clark) in Com., 3731 (ii).

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11091 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4398, 4517 (iii).
See 'National,' &c.

Binder Twine Bounty, Amount paid from 1903 to 1907, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 191 (i).

Bronte Harbour Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6166, 6174, 6195 (iii); in Com., 6411 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) in Com., 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5119 (iii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) 9734 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, and Customs Tariff, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10488 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13022; on M. for 3°, 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11194 (vi).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13268; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase of, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7665 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7797 (iv).

Fort William Ry. Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3584 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10557, 10568 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12557 (vii).

'Grafter,' Use of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 10994 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2236 (ii).

G.T.P., Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141 (iv), 8751 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 95 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3621, 3712, 3735, (ii), 4226; on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10499 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1323 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13137 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10528 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3035 (ii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P.R. Extension (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7661 (iv).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13504 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) 797 (i).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4698 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Postal Rate Reduction, &c. (remarks) 3159 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv); in Com., 10704 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).

—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4939 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3913 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10669 (vi).

Railways and Municipal Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations (remarks) 6987 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7676, 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4235, 4546 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Supply, Estimates, Total Appropriations, 5919 (iii).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10572 (vi); (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9748 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613; Sec. of State (salaries) 612 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 814; (tobacco stamps) 816 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4207 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1896 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (wrecks) 3197 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5526; (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5699 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10864; (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10870; (Victoria, immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military) 10973 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) customs) 7143; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, military) 7143 (iv); (Parrsborough) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7498; (Guelph, armoury) 7680; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7694; (Hamilton, post office) 7696; (North Bay) 7714; (Owen Sound) 7818; (Sarnia) 7829; (Simcoe) 7830; (Welland) 7831 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents, &c.) 10983, 10994 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Bronte) 12091 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5712 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11108 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 12728 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Tobacco, Canadian, Protection to, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 914 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Vancouver Bank incorp B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2787 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Alberta.*

Blairmore Townsite (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12741 (vii).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vii).

—— on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3475 (ii).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10547 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11915 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 761 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11136; in Com., 11164, 11169, 11410, 11504 (vi); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12397 (vii).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 3433 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Fishery Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13214 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Application for, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Homesteaders for Sections 16, 15, 27, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c. *re* Coal Mining Lands, (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure from March, 1907, 1908 (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4674 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin under Irrigation Regulations (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

Land Patents, S.E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

—— (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8867 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 430 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Report re Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13223 (vii).

Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

—— (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipping, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3402 (ii).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470 (v).

Section 14, South-east Quarter, Application for, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).

Seed Grain Supply Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2782 (ii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3810 (ii), 12596; in Com., 12620; in Com., 13048 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Squatters' Claims in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10617 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 632 (i).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (coal lands) 10072; (forest rangers) 10049; (salaries) 10044 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9881; (agents, U.S.) 9967; (deportations) 9884 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5758 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5743 (iii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8867 (v).

Post Office (inspectors) 9109 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farm, repairs, &c.) 10907; (quarantine stations) 11008 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Edmonton) 8580; (Humboldt) 8587 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2373 (ii).

White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6183 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *Kings (P.E.I.)*

Address, The, 380 (i)

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

Budget, The, 6097 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1709 (i).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name of I.C.R., &c. (prop. res.) 6243, 6284 (iv).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2449 (ii).

Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald,' Ques. of Priv., 8289 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12826 (vii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°, 8694 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3258 (ii).

—— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12635 (vii).

—— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

P.E.I., Ice-Breaker, Contract for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 365, 1734 (i); 5796 (iii); 8444 (v).

—— Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re* (remarks) 8515 (v).

—— Winter Comunication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4628 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7752 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943, 2953; (wrecks) 3191 (ii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2212 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

Advertisements in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Balsam Lake and Gull River Ret., Incomplete, &c. (remarks) 6059 (iii).

Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10308(vi). *See* 'Trent,' &c.

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); in Com., 4399, 4417, 4527 (iii).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Board of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, Protection *re* (prop. res.) 2992 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation B. 105 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 1°, 3655 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization and British Rights, on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii). *See* 'Naturalization.'

C.P.R. Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Canadian Patriotic Funds B. 216 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 13320 (vii).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).
Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11317; in Com., 11544, 11639 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7579, 7596 (iv)
Cornwall Canal, Breakage, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 13085 (vii).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup., (remarks) 10136 (v).
Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10247 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11808, 11837 (vi); 12955 (vii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B.181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11170, 11950; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13281 (vii).
Fishing Licenses in B.C., Grants to Japanese (Ques.) 7445 (iv).
Fruit Inspection, Apples, &c., Complaints *re*, 2757 (ii).
G.T.R., Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12078 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6850 (iv).
G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12680 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10396 (vi).
G.T.P., Supplies, Transportation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi)
——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1448 (i).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6706 (iv).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportation, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).
I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re* (read) 6986 (iv);
——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10218 (v).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1601 (i).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ques.) 10735 (vi).
Lancaster, Cadet, R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct, &c., on M. for Sup, 1019 (i).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ques.) 10014 (v).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 606 (i).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. for Sup., 9504 (v).
Lumber Industry, Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Militia Rations, Cost per Day (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13505 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com.,11992 (vi).
See 'Canadian Naturalization.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. for Sup., 10403 (vi).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting (M. for copies) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
Peace River Valley Lands, Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Postal Service in the House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 12629 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, in Com. on B. 215 (remarks) 13485 (vii).
Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald (Ques.) 6401 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4953 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
——— City Corps., &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Quebec Tercentenary, Transportation of Volunteers (remarks) 8377, 8384 (v).
Ques. of Priv. *re* Doukhobors, &c., 7321 (iv).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3413 (ii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re* (Ques.) 8610 (v).
Religious Fanatics (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ques.) 11494 (vi).
——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).
——— Deficiency in Manufacture, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
——— Par in Ottawa Citizen, *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges (Ques.) 10515 (vi).
———Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v)
——— Tests, &c. (remarks) 8169 (iv).
See 'Lee-Enfield,' &c.
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1019 (i).
School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6864 (iv).
Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., Extension, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903, 2935 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).
Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).
Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).
S. A. Contingent, Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ques) 1110 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) on prop. Res., 3759 (ii); in Com. on Res, 12596 (vii).
S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 1110 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).
Stewart, James, Inspecting Auditor, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10152 (v).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs to bank) 12768 (vii).
Canals—Generally (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).
Canals—Trent (damages) 12768 (vii); (repairs, &c.) 10305 (vi).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12219 (vii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 823 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13162 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13170; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12751 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4030 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (provisions, &c.) 12152; (R. M. College) 12152 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commission) 13168; (cotton strikers) 13158; (Olympic Games) 13167; (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (seed grain) 2775 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7495 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7712 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1459 (i); (ventilation) 11010 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10885 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Porter's Lake) 11263; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11270; (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090; (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12090; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Collingwood) 12096; (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11093; (engineering branch) 11095; (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11071 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (operating) 13178; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12760; (Sydney Mines diversion) 12759 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Resolution from Moral Reform Associations, 11302 (vi).
Trent Canal, Cameron Lake Water Level, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).
——— Extension to Gull River, Reps., Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 2991 (ii).
See 'Balsam,' 'Bobcaygeon,' 'Newmarket.'
——— Tributary Works, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).
Wilberforce Dam., Obstruction to Traffic, &c., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2988 (ii)

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4818 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8212 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11173, 11442, 11526, 11954 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act, Man. Voters' Lists, Polling Divisions made by Judges (remarks) 13139 (vii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10819 (vi).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11035 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12583 (vii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Ques. of Priv., 10793 (vi).

Ques. of Privilege, Letter from Mr. Cyr (read) 8460 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1365 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9881 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; (Selkirk) 8548; Sask. (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8602 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12767 (vii).

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Elgin, W.*

Address, The, 412 (i).

Budget, The, 5959 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vii).

Cattle sold at Central Experimental Farm, Sale of (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for seeds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Sale of Cattle, &c. (Mr. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amount of Expenditure for Cleaning, &c. (Ques.) 8888 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Vehicle Traffic (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10576 (vi); (live stock) 12899 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4086 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1077 (i); (naval schools) 3224; (wrecks) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Yarmouth) 7181 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii).

'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ques.) 682 (i).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A., *Cape Breton, South.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13056 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5254 (iii).

Committee Meeting, Rep. *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Ques. of Order, 2383 (ii).

Co-Operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9129 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1337 (i).

I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4487 (iii).

Keewatin Diocese Synod incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal (B. 185) 1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896 (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Metal Shingle and Siding Co.'s Patent (B. 210) 1° m., 12649 (vii).

Obstruction to Supply, Ques. of Order, 10024 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2429 (ii).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3128, 3139 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 9890 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4949 (iii).

Public Works, &c., in N. S., Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7129 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on order for 2° (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Sessional Papers and Returns: Number ordered, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Number presented, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

Supplies purchased for Govt., &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Investigation by Pub. Accounts Com., 5830 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5667 (iii).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (contingencies) 10502 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4759 (iii).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1906 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1053 (i); (ice-breakers) 2958 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 11226 (vi); Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 12258 (vii); (supplies) 10201 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) 1°*, 9330 (v); on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E., *Toronto, East.*

Address, The, 434 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12460 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of B. E. Walker (read) 6008 (iii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12877 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6889 (iv).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9735 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12932; on M. for 3°, 13230 (vii).

Election Corruption, Charges of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, ref. to in debate on Address, 435 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Miles Located, &c. (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12567 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9487 (v).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12218 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3893 (ii).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3906, 3922 (ii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (construtions) 12226; (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12209 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9738; (salaries) 9699 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2962; (life-saving stations) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (new deptl. building) 5701; (post office) 5705; (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal,

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

postal station B) 7419; (Montreal, post office) 7411; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Point St. Charles) 7419; (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 5702; Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10146 (v).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Toronto Harbour, (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 10014 (v).

KENNEDY, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

B. C. Fishing Licenses to Packer's Association, Issue of (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

Customs Defalcations in B. C., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10485 (vi).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9459 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Speakers (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1725 (i).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031 (vi).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 748 (i).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9501 (v).

Obstructions *re* Supplies, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9943 (v).

Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 350; 2° m., 938 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Assiniboia, West.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11549 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11413, 11958 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10826 (vi).

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8128 (iv), 9382 (v).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6291 (iv).

Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9510 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9068 (v).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1368 (i).

Seed Wheat in N. W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P., Ques. of Priv., 1438 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12595 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9700 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8596 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9668 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Address, The, 459 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4713 (iii).

Autonomy Act Validity, Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12740 (vii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Buchaman Townsite, Applications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10079 (v).

Budget, The, 5605 (iii).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 12309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R. Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6882 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10550 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c. (Ques.) 12656 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Coal Mines Royalty, Sums received by Govt. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1637 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1839 (i).
Documents, Original, *re* Timber Berths (M. for papers, &c.) 2855 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8150 (iv), 11791; in Com., (amt.) 11898 (vi).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11158, 11168 11415, 11505, 11942; on M. for 3° (amt.) 11976 (vi), 12395; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 65) 12395; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).
Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 754 (i).
Dom. Lands, Area disposed of by Govt. (Ques.) 3431 (ii).
——— Sales of during 1907 (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
——— Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).
——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905 &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10816 (vi).
Doukhobor Prisoners at Fort William, Pardon by Justice Dept. (remarks) 6847 (iv).
——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ques.) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. *re* Conduct, &c. (remarks) 7621 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, 6752 (iv).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ques.) 694 (i).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3651 (ii).
Grain Commission's Rep., Inquiry for, 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13208 (vii).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9469 (v).
Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. in Excise Dept., &c. (Ques.) 7730 (iv).
Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10100 (v).
Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by R. Cruickshank, of N. W. (M. for copies*) 698 (i).
LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Homestead Entry for S. W. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ques.) 2167 (ii).
Homestead Entries N. E. ¼ Sec. 28, Permissions *re* Grants (Ques.) 1941 (i).
Homestead Entries in N. W. Quarter Section 35, &c. (Ques.) 4762 (iii).
Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).
Homesteads, Sale of in Township 13, Range 13 (Ques.) 7206 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6368 (iv).
Indian Lands, Sale of, Ret., Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 962 (i).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of ¼ section 16, &c. (Ques.) 3432 (ii).
Land Patents, Sections 36, &c., Issue of (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of (Ques.) 5083 (iii).
Land Titles Act Assurance B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8481 (v).
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ques.) 9475 (v).
Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton (Ques.) 6981 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ques.) 6401 (iv).
Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re* (remarks) 9281, 9723 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13221 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6890 (iv).
Moberly, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3848 (ii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9493; (amt.) 9494 (v).
Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ques.) 5082 (iii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10001 (v).

'Phoenix' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10713 (vi).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co., Last Deficit, &c. (Ques.) 6459 (iv).

Quarter Sections 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3410 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3401 (ii).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 5209 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).

Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 3435 (ii).

———.Report *re* (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

See 'Timber,' &c.

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, Mines, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c. Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Payment, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers in N. W. (Ques.) 692 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1352 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 6242 (iv).

——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 6239 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3790, 3831 (ii); in Com. (amt.) 12621; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9764 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10041; (homesteads) 10082; (salaries) 10041 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9858; (deportations) 9882; (Doukhobors) 9956; (hospitals) 9983; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12733 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii).

N. W. M. Police (pay of force) 8869 (v).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii).

Post Office (inspection) 9114 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10906 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10957 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10910 (vi); (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Edmonton) 8579; (Battleford) 8577; (Estevan) 8581; (Humboldt) 8582; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Lesser Slave) 5719 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 12764; I.C.R. (surveys, branch lines) 12764 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1220-1272, on Order for Ret. (amt.) 849 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ques.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

——— (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 2260, 2269; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).

Timber Sales, &c., on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 8769; (amt.) 8778; Amt. neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).

Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

Wheat Feed Shipments, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Wheat Transportation, Financial Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Address, The, 292 (i).

Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6177, 6197 (iii).

Canada-Germany Trade Relations (remarks) 13081 (vii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Cattle exported to U. S. during 1900-7, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11252 (vi).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ques.) 1937 (i).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13039 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13265 (vii).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Packing of Apples (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11249 (vi).

Meat and Canned Food Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 352 (i).

Militia Stores and Arms, Care of for Rural Battalions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).

Port Maitland, Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ques.) 690 (i).

——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10714 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, &c. (remarks) 8862 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10676 (vi).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 677 (i).

Canals, 10319 (vi); Welland (Port Maitland) 5676 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5735; (stores, care of) 5736 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8522 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7815; (Owen Sound) 7822; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7832 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11275; (Pugwash wharf) 11281 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Welland Canal, Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation (M. for copy*) 852 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).

——— Resignation of John R. Scott (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2189 (ii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Charges against A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 657 (i).

Woollen Industry, Deputations *re* (remarks) 13082 (vii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 362 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4865 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3473 (ii).

Campaign Literature, franking by Depts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. to place on Order Paper (remarks) 13494 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cannon, Catherine Ann Relief B. 175, on M. (Mr. Galliher) to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12204 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1814 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11726; in Com. (amt.) 11816; (amt.) 11841 (vi), 12967 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11177 (vi).

Electrical and Gas Power Licenses granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ques.) 360 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trades Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3532 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3801 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5239 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10313 (vi).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9382 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup. 12707 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12318 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2246 (ii); in Com., 12076 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3718 (ii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12400 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12566 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 90 (i); 2° m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

——— on Order for 2° (remarks) 570 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13501 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9367 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3057 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Purchase for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

Niagara Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5002 (iii).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9906 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* improvements (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 570; in Com., 583 (i); (amt.) on Senate Amts., 12191, Neg. (Y. 42; N. 85) 12192 (vii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3353 (ii).

———(compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5247 (iii).

Railway Commission (ass't chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3909 (ii); in Com., 4967 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10645; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11624; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

——— (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Chap. 38, B. 204 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 12550 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12601 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10309; (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12221; (surveys) 12208 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9753 (v).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540; Miscellaneous (legal expenses) 9578; Outside Service (salaries) 9439 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4050, 4103 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Colborne) 12096; (Collingwood) 12096; (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (inspections) 10342 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) in Com., 12408 (vii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

Waterways Commission *re* International Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9753 (v).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— Deepening, Estimated Cost (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).

——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2190 (ii).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ques.) 516 (i).

——— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3373 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay Patrol) 4027 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provinces (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

——— Number under Control of Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).

LAURIER, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Prime Minister) G.C.M.G., *Quebec East.*

Address, The, (M.) *re* Precedence, 8 (i).

Address, The 40 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 544 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 554 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: (M.) 754 (i).

See 'Business,' &c.

Advertisements for Tenders of Public Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4706 (iii).

All-Red Line (prop. res.) 12414, Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501 (vii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12495 (ii).

All-Red Route, Authority *re* Negotiations, &c. (statement) 366 (i).

——— Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ans.) 353 (i).

——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ans.) 10254 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Presence in London (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. White's Duties in England (Ans). 694 (i).

——— Resolutions (remarks) 12162 (vii).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of (remarks) 8440 (v).

Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. &c. (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 7447 (iv), 8516 (v).

——— on Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

——— Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Tel. from Mr. Bryce *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty Cor, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 599 (i).

See 'Japanese.'

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4221, 4314 (iii).

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) prop. Res., 3579, 3901; 1° m., 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4530, 4534, Agreed to (Y. 90; N. 11) 4535 (iii).

Battlefields Commission (lands) Amt. B. 219 1° m., 13495; in Com., 13501 (vii).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, New Lease (remarks) 947 (i).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2820 (ii).

Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 241 (i).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3471 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (remarks) 895 (i).

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re* Installation (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Business of the House (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii), 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) 2982 (ii)

See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Cabinet Appointments, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 44 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges and Investigation *re* (remarks) in debate on Address 65 (i).

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 941 (i).

——— Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ans.) 12391 (vii.)

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6418 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaties, on Inquiry (Mr R. L. Borden) 7835 (iv).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by Customs Officer of U. S. (remarks) 11122 (vi).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12849 (vii).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Conditions *re* Investigation of Marine Dept., 6143 (iii).

——— Cor. *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. Laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

See 'Civil Service,' &c., 'Marine and Fisheries.'

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo by G. B., Cable *re* Removal (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes (remarks) 9127, 9343, 9460 (v).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8894, 9266 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ans.) 514 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on M. to resume adjn. debate, (remarks) 5246, 5251 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11562 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6148 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).

—— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals (announcement 6003 (iii).

—— Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to Adjn. House, 5887 (iii).

—— Report, (remarks) on Presentation, 5633 (iii).

—— Translation of (remarks) 11312 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 93 (i).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9200 (v).

Cold Storage, Papers on, Inquiry for, 3690 (ii).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage, &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address 41 (i).

See 'Travelling,' &c.

Commercial Travellers Tax, Condition *re* Abolition of (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).

—— (M.) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).

—— Organization of (remarks) 505 (i).

—— (M.) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 583 (i); (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).

Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9283 (v).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2786 (ii).

Debates of the House, Average Price per Column (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

—— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).

—— (remarks) 12505 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Debates of the House, 4th Rep. (translaters) on M. to ref. back to Com. (remarks) 8900, 9710, 9889, 10119, 10242 (v).

Debates, Official, French Edition, Delays in Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

—— Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

—— French Supt. of Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).

—— Instruction *re* Laying on Table (remarks) 7810 (iv).

—— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1623 (i).

—— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1845 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 1927 (i).

—— on Notice being called, 2794 (ii).

See 'Public Documents,' 'Timber,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 5247 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8296 (v); in Com., 11807 (vi), 12922; on M. for 3°, 13231 (vii).

Dom. Election Bill, 1903, Preparation of (remarks) &c., 8393 (v).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with (remarks) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) on Senate Amts., 12773 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi).

Doukhobors, Prisoners at Fort William (remarks) 6848 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7620 (iv).

Dredging Companies, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6747 (iv).

Dredging in Quebec Harbours in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1738 (i).

—— Tel. of Sec. of State (read) 1859 (i).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Easter Adjournment (M.) 6464 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to S. Africa (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Empire Day and Ascension Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 8894 (v).

Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (remarks) 5206 (iii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations, &c., between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 2023 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Boundaries with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6740, 6844 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8295 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* 3°, 3754 (ii).

See 'Canada and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Govt. Business, (announcement) 7834 (iv).

—— Introduction of Bills (remarks) 10258 (v).

—— Legislation (remarks) 10303, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).

—— Stmnt. *re* Legislation, 12049, 12163 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 6287 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) 11903 (vi).

Govt. Ownership of Rys., &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 51 (i).

Grain Commission, Number of Members, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Grain Commissioner's Report (Ans.) 180 (i).

—— on Inquiry for, 609 (i), 2381 (ii).

Grain Inspection, Total Expenditure and Receipts in 1906 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9465 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimate of Cost (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com., 7320 (iv).

—— Charges *re* Classification (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

—— Statement from Mr. Parent (remarks) 6985, 7097 (iv).

—— (M.) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Location, Conference in Montreal, Par. in Toronto 'World' (remarks) 7809 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2224 (ii); in Com., 12071 (vii).

G.B. and U.S. Treaties, Papers laid on Table, 8694 (v).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of (remarks) 1208 (i).

Halifax Platform, *re* Conservative Speeches (remarks) in debate on Address, 47 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3695 (ii), 4226 (iii).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hindus, Immigrants and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5489 (iii).

Hodgins, Major, Retirement of (remarks) 366 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allottment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

—— Employees, Apptmts. and Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

—— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 588 (i).

House of Commons and Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities (Ans.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Co., Lord Selkirk's Estate, Original Land Registers, &c. (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6432 (iv).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).

—— on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 iv).

—— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7454 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued, &c. (remarks) 607 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1939 (i).

Indian Lands, Sale in Algoma, Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 13416 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Indian Lands (remarks) 13532 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6479 (iv).
Insurance, Supt. of, Salary (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
I.C.R., Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea (Ans.) 9472 (v).
——— Freight Rate *re* Fredericton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 2562 (ii).
——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line, Representation *re* Placing of Buildings (Ans.) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer, 519 (i).
Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10596 (vi).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 1424 (i).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) on debate on Address, 58 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, *re* (remarks) 4738 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 864 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1929 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,' &c., 'Dunsmuir.'
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of, from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).
Labour Rep. (presented) 841 (i).
Library of Parlt., Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Lumber Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Inland Rev. Dept. at Toronto and Sub-Postal Stations (Ques.) 5798 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Toronto Globe' *re* (remarks) 6986 (iv).
Major's Hill Park and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' &c.
Manitoba Boundaries (prop. res.) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 2882 (ii), 7506 (iv), 11706 (vi).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of (remarks) 7996 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Ass't. Judge (remarks) 11312 (vi).
——— Delay in Investigation, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8453 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup., 9731 (v).
——— Evidence transmitted day by day to House (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
Marine Deptl. Officials, Suspension, &c. (remarks) 6003 (iii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 46 (i).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).
Midland 'Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertising (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
Montreal Directory in Library of House, (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures *re* for the last fifty years (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3441, (amt.) 3442, Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt. *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9477; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9495 (v).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 5256 (iii); in Com., 11990 (vi).
Naval Defences, Imperial, Contributions by Canada (Ans.) 1118 (i).
N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3049, 3075 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3675 (ii).
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid, &c (remarks) 509 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Obstruction Tactics *re* Dom. Elections Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10035 (v).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Old Age Pensions (M.) for Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2423 (ii).

Ontario, Northern Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6852 (iv).

——— Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2853 (ii).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13581 (vii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Bill (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy, &c. (Ans.) 352 (i).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 93 (i).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2742 (ii).

——— Mail Service, on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., &c., 1206 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-Establishing of (Ans.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I., Queen's County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 355 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4650 (iii).

Printing and Lithographing outside of Canada, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1732, 1931 (i).

Printing, Supt. of, Apptmt. of a Frenchman (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Printing of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 312 (i).

Private Bills Com., Extension of Time (M.) 891 (i).

Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10123 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 61 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3075 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1384 (i).

Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (M.) to ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 311 (i).

Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure (remarks) 2940 (ii).

Public Documents, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).

——— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).
See 'Documents.'

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height (Ans.) 5203 (iii).

——— Change of Site, &c. (remarks) 7931

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2557 (ii).

——— Ref. to, in debate on Address, 544 (i).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13403 (vii).

——— (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).

Quebec Judges, Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans (remarks) 7448 (iv).

——— Legal Holidays (Ans.) 7934 (iv).

——— Transportation of Volunteers remarks) 8378 (v).

Quebec Tercentenary, and Visit of Prince of Wales, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5210 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary: *See* 'Battlefields.'

Questions, Precedence of (Ans.) 350 (i).

Railway Act (water mains, &c.) Amt. B. 43 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 5225 (iii).

——— B. 85 (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for 2°, 5243 (iii).

——— (passenger tickets) Amt. B. 90 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 5245 (iii).

——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10644; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11605 (vi).

——— (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10121 (v).

Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for 569, 1739 (i), 2024 (ii), 6010 (iii).
See 'Sessional.'

Rolla L. Crain, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Report from Public Accounts (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Target Practice, Suspension by N. W. M. Police (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to amend, 2986 (ii).
Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 2391 (ii).
St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).
Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).
St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3012
St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to (Ans.) 2977 (ii).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 11501 (vi).
School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6866 (iv).
Seed Grain Distribution, Extension *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1567 (i).
Sessional Returns, Number presented, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).
Shipping Cos., Pacific Coast, Amount of Subsidies (Ans.) 6920 (iv).
Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract for (Ans.) 2386 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res., 3757 (ii).
S. A. School Teachers, Recognition by Govt. (Ans.) 2791 (ii).
South Huron Elections Expenses, Payment by Ret. Officer (Ans.) 11935 (vi).
Speech from Throne, Reply from Gov. Gen. (presented) 1584 (i).
Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8846 (v).
Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of (remarks) 8087 (iv).
—— Ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections (M.) 8887 (v).
Sub-Target Machines, on submitting Papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).
Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3286 (ii).
Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under (Ans.) 7989 (iv).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5816 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10594 (vi).
Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).
N. W. M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries, &c.) 8863 (v).
Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10364 (vi).
LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Telegraph and Telephone Bill, and Man. Boundaries (remarks) 3043 (ii).
Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).
Timber Berths, Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret. (amt.) 2856 (ii).
—— Returns, on Inquiry for, 1739 (i).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921; Ques. of Order, 921 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5199 (iii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).
Treaty Negotiations between Canada and U. S., &c. (remarks) 937 (i).
See 'Anglo-American.'
Trent Canal Extension, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2992 (ii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).
Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ans.) 7936 (iv).
U. S. Training Ships passing through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).
—— (remarks) 5338 (iii).
—— Inquiry as to Armaments, &c. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).
Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).
Wednesday Evening Sittings (M.) 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).
Winnipeg Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Henderson) in Com., 2788 (ii).
Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) 7452 (iv).
Woollen Industry Relief, Legislation (remarks) 12772 (vii).
—— Memorandum from Mfg. Ass'n. read 13518-19 (vii).
—— Specific Duties (remarks) 6988 (iv).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9648 (v).
—— Finance Ret., on Inqiury for, 6464
—— Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689 (vii).
—— (remarks) 10303 (vi).
Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N. W. M. P. (remarks) 565 (i).
LAVERGNE, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*
Address, The, 476 (i).
Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4410, 4499; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4533 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ques.) 842 (i).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ques.) 2545 (ii).
——— Payments *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
——— Residence in District, &c. (Ques.) 2218 (ii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5900 (iii).
Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Beauparlant) on M. for 1°, 7319 (iv).
Customs Dues on French Books, Reduction *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 2160 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3487 (ii).
——— Delays in Printing (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
——— French Supt. of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1827 (i).
French Language, Par. in 'La Presse,' Ques. of Priv., 8291 (v).
——— Pet. *re* (read) 8886 (v).
——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 1209 (i).
——— Use of on Railway Crossings, &c. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii).
Halifax Garrison, Replace by Imp. Troops (Ques.) 1288 (i).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3716 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1303 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).
I.C.R., Notices printed in French, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2137 (ii).
——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1603 (i).
Japanese Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta (Ques.) 2162 (ii).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ques.) 357 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Quebec, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 842 (i).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruption of Services, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G. T. P. Commission (Ques.) 2162 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4070 (ii).
Order Paper, Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7934 (iv).
——— New Series, Issue of (Ques.) 6397 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3095 (ii).
Quebec Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (Ques.) 1288 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Legal Holidays (Ques.) 7934 (iv).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 4669 (iii).
——— Postage Stamps, Printing in French and English (Ques.) 7935 (iv).
——— Postage Stamps (remarks) 8895 (v).
——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7449 (iv).
——— Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle,' Ques. of Priv., 5209 (iii).
Ques. of Privilege, Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
——— Voting of French Members (remarks) 7993 (iv).
Railway Act (dual language) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).
——— (scheduled time) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 3655 (ii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3914 (ii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ques.) 357 (i).
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau, Ques. of Priv., 7094 (iv).
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of (Ques.) 6644 (iv).
——— Notice of Discussion, 6647 (iv).
——— (M.) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3758 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii).
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadians as Commissioners, Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges *re* (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction of, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3269 (i).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Presbyterian College Board (B. 154) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii); (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A., *Prince (P.E.I.)*

Adjournment of the House (M.) 4495 (iii).

Alberton Fire, Damage Claims, Inquiry for Ret., 1209 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13053, 13055 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494 (vii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ques.) 513 (i).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).

Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract (Ques.) 4831 (iii).

Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ques.) 1733 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon anl Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Estimates, Discussion on Resolutions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1726 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction between Dom. and Provs., Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

—— Conference *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6261 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8382 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 694 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

—— (Ques.) 1686 (i).

—— Return, Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

—— (Ques.) 10254 (v).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2444 (ii).

—— Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8444 (v).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Issue of Licenses (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2430 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3892 (ii).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

P.E.I. Life-saving Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishment of (Ques.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1686 (i).

—— (M. for ret.) 2171 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

—— (remarks) 11679 (vi).

P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet *re* Construction (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

—— Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3254 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13490 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry., Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

—— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

—— Tenders *re* News Agency (Ques.) 8444 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4606 (iii).

—— Rep. *re*, Inquiry for, 9893 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ques.) 2546 (ii).
—— Discussion, &c., 4496 (iii).
—— Ice-breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).
See 'Ice-breaker.'
P.E.I. Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
—— Withdrawal of Steamer, &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Changes (Ques.) 1940 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3920 (ii); in Com., 4975 (iii).
Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9821 (v).
Returns, Detention of by Members, Ques. of Priv., 5048 (iii).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690, 3752 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3777 (ii); in Com., 13047 (vii).
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ques.) 687 (i).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley' (remarks) 6160 (iii)
SUPPLY—
Marine (ice-breakers) 1899 (i).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2944, 2949 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 8576 (v); Ottawa (Mint) 1459 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11679 (vi).
Tignish Breakwater Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3229 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 682 (i).
—— Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tobacco Infractions of Inland Revenue Act. in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9526 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General and Min. of Labour) Gaspe.

Alien Labour Regulations, Pet. *re* from Sault Ste Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Charges *re* Customs, Montreal (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 2° m., 5763 (iii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Bonn P. O., Application *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 10516 (vi).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6404 (iv).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 1436 (i).
Canadian Newspapers, Refund *re* American Surtax (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
C.P.R., Papineauville Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12489 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ans.) 5654 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11403, 11636 (vi), 12179 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) *re* Distribution to Press, 5723 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) 2° m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13317 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Denis des Saintes, Charges *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ans.) 1121 (i).
Digby to Westport, Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Labour Dispute, Settlement Tel. (read) 4995 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 13043 (vii).
Drop Letter One-cent Rate (remarks) 3159 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ans.) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails (Ans.) 7731 (iv).
French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3183 (ii).
Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3846 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10733 (vi).
Harlaka Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
Hindoo Immigrants, and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).
House of Commons Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939; (stmnt.) 12044 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11704 (vi).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6444 (iv).
Immigration Agents in France (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9848 (v).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets, 12659 (vii).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ans.) 7197 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table, 1550 (i).
—— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).
—— Result of Mission (statement) 1585 (i).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 5201 (iii).
Labour Gazette, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Japanese Investigation) Rep. (presented) 1583 (i).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges to (Ans.) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).
Literature distributed through Mail (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9096 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Mackinnon Post Office, Application *re* Establishment (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Mail Contract between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Mail Contract at Rimouski, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing of, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter delayed by C.P.R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
—— (remarks) 9281 (v).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2215 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B.C. (remarks) 3754 (ii).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Service, Soulanges county, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers, via Coteau Landing (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda,' &c. (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12830 (vii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ans.) 7209 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 9275 (v).
Montreal P. O. Building Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 7198 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).
N. B. Election, Patronage of Federal Govt., &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3016 (ii).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 11298 (vi).
—— Postal Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ans.) 11499 (vi).
North Grove Post Office Ret., on Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re* (remarks) 7722 (iv), 12660 (vii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 205) prop. Res., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 2° m., 12851; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train (remarks) 1425 (i).
Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).
Postage Stamps, New Series issued *re* Quebec Tercentenary (Ans.) 6398 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
—— Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangements of (remarks) 3040 (ii).
—— (statement) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3886 (ii).
Postal Notes Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 9279 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Postal Rates on Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

—— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ans.) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7263 (iv).

Postal Service Improvements (Ans.) 8891 (v).

—— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Post Office Act (P. O. supt., &c.) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7931 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10703 (vi); on Senate Amts., 12393 (vii).

Post Offices built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Post Offices, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

Printing, Postal Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, signed 'P. M. G., Ques. of Priv., 11501 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Postage Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv), 8895 (v), 12414 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. *re* Postmaster, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank, Recommendation *re* (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1687 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Sandy Cove Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii).

Southvale, N.S., Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 4829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10599 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries) 12159 (vii); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8872; (salaries) 8872 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9848 (v).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13156 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii).

Post Office (contingencies) 5562; (Durston, R., promotion) 5561 (iii); (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9092 (v), 13155 (vii); (mail service) 5561 (iii); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii); (outside service) 9092; (stamps, &c.) 9111; (uniforms, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7459; (Hamilton, post office) 7697 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Levis) 7298; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7427 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5705 (iii); Montreal post office) 7411; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal station B) 7419; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12129 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10371 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Town Site, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Trent Canal, Clearing of Logs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith and Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).

—— Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Service during Winter (remarks) 5137 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe, S.*

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, &c., on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4708 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) in Com. on Res.. 3901 (ii); in Com., 4507; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2818

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Campaign Literature sent from Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10346 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res.. 6164. 6215 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12348 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361; on M. for 1°, 10729; in Com., 11394, 11553, 11659 (vi), 12183 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9203 (v).

Criminal Code (ry. act.) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13318 (vii).

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals,, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1155 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1776 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11869 (vi), 13020 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 9333 (v).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res.. 4678 (iii); in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13263 (vii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545, 4577 (iii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collection *re* (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3615 (ii).

Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 129 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3622. 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8609, 8741, 9377 (v).

G.T.P., Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspections *re* (Ques.) 12051 (vii).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12675 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12271; (amt.) Minority Rep.. 12291. (Neg. (Y. 53; N. 98) 12388 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2233 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands, Reserved by Govt. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lands Reservations, &c.. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Township 12 to 19 (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 3228, in Com., 3692; on M. for 3°, 4540 (iii).

——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 10737 (vi).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of additional Living Allowance (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10497 (vi).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6446 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 8607, 8696, 9890 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Immigration, O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv), 11018 (vi).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6902 (iv).
I.C.R. Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4492 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, Restriction *re* B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1752 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, &c., on (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).
Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10527 (vi).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ques.) 11935 (vi).
Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Employment in the Yukon, Total Amount paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12801 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to Com. of Sup., 7342 (iv).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).
Mining Regulations, published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette' (M. for copy*) 5801 (iii).
Ministers of Crown and Govt. Contracts and Subsidies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11997 (vi).
N.B. Cold Storage Co and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9398; (amt.) 9415 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re* (Ques.) 2392 (ii).
Obstruction to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9935 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. Fisher) *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, 4065 '(ii).
Pacific Coast Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii), 6230 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).
Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, Specification, &c., Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 5802 (iii).
Quebec and New Brunswick B. 128 (M.) Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, Letter from Mr. G. W. Stoddart (read) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
———(demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean on M. for 2°, 3369 (ii).
——— (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii).
——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10625; in Com., 10639 (vi).
Ross Rifle Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham (remarks) 3903 (ii).
——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4546, 4580 (iii).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 6981 (iv).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409, 5519; (amt.) 5445 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3767 (ii).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2785 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals (repairs) 10306 (vi); Trent (construction) 12225 (vii); (surveys) 10339 (vi).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9257 (v).
Excise—(travelling expenses, &c.) 814 (i).
House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).
Immigration (agents) 9854 (v).
Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol, 3996 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10292 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 13331; (Markham) 13331; (Walkerville) 13333 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Barracks) 7409 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 12039 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11103 (vi).
Railways (extra clerks) 10346; G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10380; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12766 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10129 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.,) 10388 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415, Applications, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Engineer's Rep., Inquiry for, 6925 (iv).

——— Newmarket, Extension to Devil's Elbow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Surveys, Inquiry for 6988 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°, 779 (i); in Com., 4581 (iii).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Sloan) on Senate Amts., 6190 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6187 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10275 (v).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6523 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, and Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2889 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon, Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Official Administrators, Charges against *re* Settlement of Estates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Yukon Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4588, 4589 (iii).

——— Public Administrators, Charges against, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

LEONARD, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Bridge Subsidies to Rys. (amt.) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 13310 (vii).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ques.) 5653 (iii).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Montreal Directory in Library of House (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3442 (ii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 5654 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

——— Officials interfering in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).

——— Votes of Officers in Municipal Affairs (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).
Penitentiaries— (binder twine) 5522, 5530; St. Vincent de Paul (meat contracts) 5519; (officials) 5538 (iii).
Public Works — Buildings—Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, W.*

Address, The, 242 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press (remarks) 5723 (iii).

Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders (remarks) 9281 (v).

Criminal Code (offensive weapons) Am't. (B. 78) 1° m., 1668 (i).

——— (assaults) Amt. (B. 79) 1° m., 1670 (i).

——— (hunting) Amt. (B. 93) 1° m., 2590 (ii).

——— (motors) Amt. (B. 140) 1° m., 5993 (iii).

Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1284 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty on (prop. res.) 4774 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3923

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1530 (i).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7449 (iv).

LOGAN, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12480 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3512 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 1992 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2460 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4460 (iii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3066 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2417 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10165 (v).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The 6553 (iv).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6195 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7230 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4863 (iii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648; in Com., 13056 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Conciliation Boards, Application *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations Act, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1160 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13012 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9467 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12723 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12340 (vii).

——— counsel fees, payment of (M.) 13578 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4479 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11222 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12827 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7381 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9489 (v).

Phoenix Assurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 8603 (v).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4647 (iii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 27) 1° m., 430 (i); on Order for 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3783 (ii); in Com., 12602 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4138 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (icebreakers) 2966 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston military buildings) 10909 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Caribou Island) 11225; (Round Hill) 11286 (vi).

Railways — I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (double tracking) 12250; (Moncton, additional line) 12760; (Moncton, car shops) 12250 (vii); (rolling stock) 5558 (iii).

Railways—Railway Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Patent Relief (B. 63) 1°*, 1283 (i).

MACDONALD, E. M.—*Con.*

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8778 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, S.*

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Continuance of (Ques.) 941 (i).

Canadian Naval Stations, Maintenance of, Arrangement with G. B. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

Canadians entering U.S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).

——— Letter form Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries (read) 2739 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 508; 2° m., 939 (i).

Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. (B. 29) 1° m., 508 (i); 2° m., 5247 (iii).

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount 1907, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

Dredging Contract, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ques.) 9710 (v).

Drop Letter, One-cent Rate (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Electrical Power exported at Niagara Falls, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Fisheries Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Foss, C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3500 (ii).

Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ques.) 10731 (vi).

G.T.P., Apptmt. of Engineer at Kenora (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Changes in Engineering Staff (Ques.) 509, 681 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, Appointment of Successor (Ques.) 358 (i).

G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 556 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3700 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4358 (iii).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).

Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto, Tel. (read) &c. 185 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Questions, 242 (i).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ques.) 567 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Insurance Bill, Introduction of (Ques.) 9272 (v).

Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals, asked for, 7988 (iv).

Insurance Companies' Deposits, -Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ques.) 241 (i).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ques.) 897 (i).

Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept. (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Militia—Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

Naval Defence, Imperial, Contributions by Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 1119 (i).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4996 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Printing and Lithographing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada (Ques.) 1506, 1732, 1931 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2397 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8851 (v).

Railway Commission (Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii); in Com., 4985 (iii).

Railway Commission, Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c. (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 569 (i), 2885 (ii).

Smith, Wm. R., Patent Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 12393 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3820 (ii).

Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 5337 (iii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Manufacture, Regulation *re* Saccharine Standards (Ques.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii).

Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Term of Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4774 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Murray & Cleveland's Contract *re*, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap) Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 354 (i).

——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western gap) Construction of Entrance, &c. (Ques.) 354, 518 (i), 4587 (iii).

——— Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 2974 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

Yukon Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 7725 (iv).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8486 (v).

MACLAREN, Mr. A. F., *Perth, N.*

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11255 (vi).

Goderich Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ques.) 184 (i).

International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12870, 13052 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5648 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1718 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3021; in Com., 3035 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9363 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3113 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 3083 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Commission, Rep., Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Special Committee, 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (M.) to conc., 13353; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13373 (vii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to (prop. Res.) 2984 (ii).

Shipping Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 313 (i).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5834 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron S.*

Budget Speech by Fin. Min., Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11871 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York (O.) S.*

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10935, 10941 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 433 (i).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Business of the House, Precedence on Tuesday (remarks) 2982 (ii).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12845; in Com., 12849 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10718, 10729; in Com., 11635 (vi).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11170 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1692 (i).

Foresters' Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3726 (ii).
——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. to Com., 3362 (ii).
Hindus in B.C., Protest *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).
House of Commons Chamber, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10379 (vi).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12787 (vii).
Marconi System, Regulation of Rates, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3031 (ii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7657 (iv).
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2939, 3405 (ii).
Ry. Act (demurrage, &c.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i); 2° m., 3320 (ii).
——— (tel. cos.) Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 231 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3904 (ii).
Ry. Act (ry. comn.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10783; (amt.) 11602; on M. for 3°, 11613; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11619; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633 (vi).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903 (ii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 8185 (iv).
Standard Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1424 (i).
Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3282 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 9851 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 10291 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2965 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi); Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 7678 (iv).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 907 (i).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade (remarks) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 13415 (vii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12472 (vii).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5380 (iii).
Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9741 (v).
British Columbia Chartered Bank incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ques.) 513 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11384 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13032 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 3477 (ii); in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223 (iv).
G.T.P., Supplies to Prince Rupert via Seattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10376 (vi).
Hindus, Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031, 11062 (vi).
Indian Lands, B.C. Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c. (Ques.) 4243 (iii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 719 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2087 (ii).
——— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).
Japanese Immigration Restriction and B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1760 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7231; on M. for 3°, 7219 (iv).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227 (iv).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4983 (iii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9086 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 627 (i); Interior (astronomical surveys) 9741 (v).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3187 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865; (Quesnel) 10868; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10871 (vi); N.S. (Antigonish) 7121 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10703 (vi).

Vancouver Bank incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 606 (i); in Com., 4580 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6183 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9662 (v).

McCARTHY, Mr. L. G., *Simcoe, N.*

Canada Shipping Act (marine engineers) Amt. (B. 17) 2° m., 3414 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11360; in Com., 11382 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1143 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12986 (vii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10762 (vi).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 139 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Birnie and Noble (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3017 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3012 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 349 (i).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Buffalo imported from Montana for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Buildings in Man. and N.W. Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Sites (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546 (vi).

'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11133; in Com., 11159, 11177, 11426, 11524, 11957; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 11975 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Game Preserve, Alberta, Buffalo imported from Montana, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6326 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6443 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in West, Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).

Japanese Immigration, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 692 (i).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10527 (vi).

Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of, from U. S. (Ques.) 683 (i).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 688 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 683 (i), 2391 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1376 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12605 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9967; (Doukhobors) 9956 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12750 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii)

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10979 (vi).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Timber Berths in Man. and N. W. Ters., under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2347 (ii).

Wireless Tel. Station on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ques.) 683 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland, W. (O.)*

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 6073 (iii).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 350 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Issue of Denominations (Ques.) 12414 (vii).

McCOOL, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Copper Cliff Postmaster and Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11916 (vi).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, on M. for Sup., 7805 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 12973 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1941 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5438 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); Ottawa (Museum) 1503 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11463, 11948 (vi).

Doukhobors, Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

Keewatin Diocese incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9889 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7658 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 6525; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9068, 9166 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1363 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c., &c., (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

—— Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. G. H., *Perth, S.*

Address, The, 455 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5130 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5482 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6842, 6928 (iv).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1024 (i).

Patent Medicine B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12623 (vii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2986 (ii).

Senate Reform (prop. res.) 1513 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1458 (i).

Wheat Transportation in N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2211 (ii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Address, The, 445 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4231 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 891 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2585 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11171, 11420, 11502 (vi).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6735, 6956 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11034 (vi).

Inspection and Sale Act (oats) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 4312 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7262 (iv).

Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c., incorp. (B.69) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1358 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3760 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2327 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. P. H., *Bruce, S.*

Agriculture Com.'s Rep. (M.) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) 191 (i).

Budget, The, 6573 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12883 (vii).

G.T. Ry. and C.P.R., Connection at Wingham (remarks) 191 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Address, The, 420 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

Bear River Station Dwelling, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6204 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842 (vii).

Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7246 (iv).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 517 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso, &c. (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Offices (Ques.) 687 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Fishing Licenses, River John, Inquiry for Ret., 10511 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 3427 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6252 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).

——— Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act, Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

I.C. Ry. Rates, Increase in Winter to P. E. I. (Ques.) 5995 (iii).

Legal Agents for Govt. in P. E. I., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N. S. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., N.S., Reps. *re* Undersized Fish (Ques.) 2792 (ii)

Lobster Hatchery, License to E. H. McLennan and G. A. Redmond, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

Louisburg, Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ques.) 4401 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892 (iv).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S., &c. (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).

Naval Schools, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 10254 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Port Hood Harbour Works, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ques.) 10255 (v).

P.E.I., Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

——— Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

——— Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

——— Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4620 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Bear River Station Master's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction re, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3261 (ii).

——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifiations, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 5086 (iii).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 850 (i).

——— (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10715 (vi).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9806 (v).

Scotch Hill East Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. for Sup., 7732 (iv).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Souris Ry. Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

——— Permission to Build, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3767, 3825 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9770 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9221, 9237 (v).

House of Commons (accommodation) 10490 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5768 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949; (obstructions) 3212; (winter mail service) 3216; (wrecks) 3195 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9092 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10905 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8572 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, militia clothes) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12027 (vi).

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (claims dept.) 10177 (v)

P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12763 (vii)

Tobacco, Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties *re*, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

Tobacco Infractions of Inland Rev. Act in P.E.I., on M. for Sup., 9514 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).

Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c. (Ques.) 9476 (v).

Travelling Expenses of R. A. Wiallard *re* Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3987 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6136 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (M.) 10259 (v).

——— Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 5996 (iii).

McLEAN, Mr. P. D., *Centre York.*

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

McLENNAN, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2589 (ii).

Dog Fish Reduction Works at Canso, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 5790 (iii).

Inverness County and Increased Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 7173 (iv); (Lake Ainslie) 11228; (Margaree) 11229; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268 (vi).

McLENNAN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761; (stations) 12233 (vii).

MARCIL, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N. B. (B. 76) 1°*, 1584 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

C.P.R., Papineauville to Little Nation River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin, E.*

Aylmer, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6206 (iii).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment (Ques.) 351 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1242 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing, &c. (remarks) 2766 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 516 (i).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number employed (Ques.) 692 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods B. 149, in Com., 7227; on M. for 3°, 7215 (iv).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3924 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ques.) 2390 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5750 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10894 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7493; (Leamington) 7815; (St. Mary's) 7828; (Owen Sound) 7824 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of, &c. (remarks) 8439 (v).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 685 (i).

Budget, The, 6113 (iii).

Charlottetown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels (M. for copy*) 6240 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5099 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10723; in Com., 11559 (vi).

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. of Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ques.) 5470 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Express Charges in Mar. Provinces, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 518 (i).

Fisheries Dispute between Dom. and Mar. Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10563 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6250 (v).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1342 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2450 (ii).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10157 (v).

Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I. (M. for cor.) 5475 (iii).

Lobster Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O. (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12798 (vii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. Improved Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 6239 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 10123 (v).

Peat for Fuel, Deposits in Canada, Industry, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 685 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4588 (iii).

Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3895 (ii).

P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 355 (i).

——— Steam Communication between P.E.I. and C. B. (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12754, 13353 (vii).

——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ques.) 562 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

——— (Ques.) 843 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Mail Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1203 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, Tels., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 4589 (iii).

——— Withdrawal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

——— (remarks) 1207 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3242, 3272 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re* (M. for copies*)6240 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 12408; on M. for 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim, Progress *re* (remarks) 7100 (iv).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 848 (i).

———Time-Table, Protest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ques.) 568 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11630 (vi).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3926 (ii); in Com., 4978 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9811 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Returns, Unopposed (remarks) 5914 (iii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1687 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2786 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution *re*, Purchases in P.E.I. (remarks) 3157 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3812 (ii); in Com., 12610 (vii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12754 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1085 (i); (obstructions) 3213; (winter mail service) 3218 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13339 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (New London) 11292; N.S. (Port Hood) 11276; P.E.I. (repairs) 11292; (Rustico) 11293 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10157 (v).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal (St. Mary's).*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6511 (iv).

Monteal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4911 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13393 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3316 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

G.T.P., Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).

MICHAUD, Mr. P.—*Con.*

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3068 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunsick Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, S.*

Address, The, 148 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3860 (ii).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 5567 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5104 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11707; in Com., 11844 (vi), 12944 (vii).

Fruit Inspection *re* Apple Packing, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 2764 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

Indian Department, Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11068 (vi).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3102 (ii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H McIntyre) 1533 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12620 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12749 (vii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4058 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Owen Sound) 7817; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185 (iv).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2359 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13045 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., on M. Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2194 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Address, The, 535 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3875 (ii).

——— All-Red Line, Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ques.) 10253 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Negotiations, Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re* (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Treaty, Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ques.) 8611 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor. Rep., &c. (M. for copies) 594 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4395 (iii).

Becancour, Blanche, &c., Dredging at during 1907, &c. (Ques.) 3040 (ii).

Bonus System, *re* Immigration (notice of motion) 6288 (iv).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13311 (vii).

B.C. Appeal Court B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 8466 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169, 6174, 6192 (iii), 6409 (iv).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12868 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10724; in Com., 11573 (vi).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Co-operative Societies (B. 5) 1° m., 92; on Order for 2°, 583 (i).; on M. for 2°, 4558; in Com., 4564 (iii).

——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ques.) 9277 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2544 (ii).

Cumberland Railway and Coal Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. (translators) Notice to ref. back to Debates Com., 9709 (v).

——— M. to ref back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).

——— (remarks) 9889, 10119 (v).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, Contractor, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5464 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8116, 8138 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3896 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims pending, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil Co., Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10763 (vi).

Fisheries Treaties, Boundaries with U. S. (remarks) 6632 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1397 (i); on M. for 2°, 2221 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4317 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Consideration of Proposed Convention, (M.) for Sel. Com., 923 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

See 'Can. and France,' &c.

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Vessels, Pay of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P., Winnipeg to Moncton, Number of Miles completed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 6643 (iv).

House of Commons, Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 592 (i).

Hudson, Dredging,, Total Expenditure, 1907 (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ques.) 11703 (vi).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-07 (Ques.) 11704 (vi).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 6921 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B.135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5658 (iii); in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Agents in France, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).

——— (notice of motion) 4769 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of *re* Agents, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6663; Amt. neg. (Y. 42; N. 95) 7092 (iv).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Par. in Press (remarks) 4834 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6491, 6514 (iv).

I.C.R., Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10012 (v).

——— Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 12774 (vii).

Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for copies of O.Cs., &c., 872 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Recent Entries into B. C. (remarks) 3751 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).

——— from U. S., Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

——— (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River and Fort St. Francois, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c. (M. for ret.*) 554 (i).

——— (Ques.) 314 (i).

Mail Service, Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Renewal of Contract (Ques.) 5257

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c. (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Marine, Deptl. Officials, Suspension of *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii).

——— Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Roads, Claim of Govt., &c. (prop. res.) 3465 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c. (prop. res.) 3436; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3452 (ii).

——— Amounts collected and expended, &c. (M. for ret.) 1688 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ques.)1931 (i), 2979 (ii).

——— Rep. of Auditor General (M. for copy*) 2983 (ii).

Nicolet County, Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet Post Office, Contract, Tender, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* answering questions by Govt., 234 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).

Pointe Aux Trembles Wharf, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9267 (v).

——— Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).

——— Tender of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c. (Ques.) 8838 (v).

Quebec Bridge Commission, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. Rep., Evidence, &c., to Special Com., 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to conc. (amt.) 13363; Amt. neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Commission's Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 8608 (v), 10302 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 2547 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 535 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected (Ques.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Ques. of Priv., Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 7994 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 10688; (amt) 11603, neg. (Y. 36; N. 89) 11608 (vi).

Ry. Act (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10120 (v).

Railway Commissioners' Board, Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8513 (v).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5658 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10013 (v).

St. Gabriel de Brandon, Post Office Savings Bank, Opening, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

St. Francois Port Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Total Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of six Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v).

Seven Islands, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Commissioner Boyer, (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &. (Ques.) 10011 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigation by Messrs. Sauve and Boyer (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer, Inquiry for, 9890 (v).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3805 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery (prop. res.) 3276 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10585 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Canals — Soulanges (investigation) 10304 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9698 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 9840 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3988 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943 (ii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8877 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12128 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11081 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., *re*

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, 904; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921 (i).
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of (prop. res.) 3299 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6123 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c. (Ques.) 9276 (v).
Wheat, frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines (remarks) 9894 (v).

MORIN, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Bic Wharf, Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).
Brockville-Ottawa Ry Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 189 (i).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10505 (vi).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8613 (v).
G.T.P., Contracts, Safeguard Clause, &c. (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ques.) 8618 (v).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).
I.C.R., Connection with Quebec Central at Levis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 189, 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
——— Riviere du Loup Station Master, &c. (Ques.) 7445 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4813 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Disaster, Lifting of Ruins (remarks) 10303 (vi).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Riviere du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6462 (iv).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ques.) 5788 (iii).
Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Employment of (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5414; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).

MORIN, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 9875 (v).
Marine—(ice-breakers) 1913 (i).
Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10508 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal service) 3216 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (Museum) 1495 (i).
Public Works—Que. (Montreal post office) 7413; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Levis) 7295 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10179 (v).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, E.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12476 (vii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4505 (iii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T.Ry. Co. (M. for copies) 2796 (ii).
Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 9330 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1190 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1658 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1830; (amt.) 1839; neg. (Y. 50: N. 95) 1882 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11803 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6753 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13271 (vii).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1030 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10743 (vi).
Militia and Marine Stationery Supplies, Purchases *re* Book-keeping (Ques.) 6233 (iv).
Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (ii).
P.E.I.Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2750 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°,4659 (iii); in Com., 10647; on M. for 3° (amt.) 10777; on M. for 3°, 11598; Amt. neg. (Y. 36; N. 77) 11600 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8994 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5854 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4182 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1923 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Watson, Mr. G. H., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds (remarks) 6848 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5798 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amounts, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Boyle Concession, Memorial of Dawson Legislature (Ans.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

Buchanan Townsite, Homestead Entry of Mr. Ramsland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10083 (v).

Buffalo Herd located at Elk Park (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Buffalo Herd for Moose Mountain Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Buffalo Herd for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve in Alberta, Payments *re* (Ans.) 847.

Buffalo purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ans.) 896 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9776 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian repatriated from U.S. (Ans.) 685 (i).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 513 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 10008 (v); 2° m., and in Com., 10545, 10744, 11020 (vi).

Clearwater Lake, Half Breeds' Location, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Squatters' Claims (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).

Clement, W. H. P., Legal Adviser in Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 5469, 5790 (iii).

Coal and Govt. Lands in Possession of Govt., &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

Coal Lands, Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ans.) 9278 (v).

——— Royalty Dues, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

——— Leases, Applicants *re* (Ans.) 2395 (ii).

——— Leased by Govt., Original Grantees, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re* (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

——— Timber, &c., Dates of Regulations, O.Cs., &c. (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Coal Mining Cos. in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Coal Mine Royalties, Sums received in Alberta (Ans.) 12391 (vii).

Colonization Lands, Alienations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4317 (iii).

Colonization Societies in Quebec, Amounts paid (Ans.) 684 (i).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Estates administered (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Trusts and Estates (Ans.) 12050, 12413 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 565 (i).

See 'Yukon.'

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Cypress Hills Reservation, Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).
——— Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1133 (i).
——— Examination of, by Members (remarks) 3853 (ii).
——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1636 (i).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 5655 (iii).
See 'Halifax.'
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent of Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ans.) 8175 (iv).
——— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).
——— Name of Agent (Ans.) 5084 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Surrender (Ans.) 3849 (ii).
——— Protest *re* Sale of Timber (remarks) 10918 (vi).
——— Sale, Notice in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 7501 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ans.) 10512 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8659 (v).
Dom. Lands Survey (B. 9) 1° m., 231; 2°, and in Com., 754, 948 (i); on Senate Amts., 3755 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 9333 (v); 2° m., 11125; in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi); on Mr. Lake's Amt., 12394; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).
Dom. Lands, Areas disposed of (Ans.) 3431 (ii).
——— Disposed of from 1896 to 1905, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret., 3852 (ii).
Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 8183 (iv).
Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10806 (vi).
Doukhobors, Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
——— Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2219 (ii).
——— Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5017 (iii).
——— Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
——— at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7630 (iv).
Doyle, Mr. P., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 6923 (iv).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ans.) 694 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Fence Post Fees on Permits, &c. (Ans.) 10258 (v).
Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 3433 (ii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re* (Ans.) 5475 (iii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ans.) 10514 (vi).
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council (Ans.) 11938 (vi).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 203) 1°*, 12594; in Com., 13048, 13208 (vii).
Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ans.) 13062 (vii).
Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ans.) 238 (i).
——— Irrevocable for 21 Years, Applications for, &c. (Ans.) 1512 (i).
Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).
Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ans.) 13060 (vii).
Grazing Ranches, Names of Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 7211 (iv).
Griffith Island, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Halifax Frauds, Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).
——— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).
See 'Dodds.'
Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).
See 'Immigration,' 'Japanese,' &c.
Hintz, Fred., Homestead Location, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).
Holliday, Mr. P., Additional Living Allowance (Ans.) 5475 (iii).
Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11200 (vi).
Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090, 10101 (v).
Homestead Entries, Granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian (Ans.) 9773 (v).
Homestead Entry for S.W. Quarter-Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ans.) 2167 (ii).
Homestead Entries in Quarter-Section No. 35, History of (Ans.) 4762 (iii).
Homestead Entries on Quarter Section 16, &c., Applications, Inspections, &c. (Ans.) 3432 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, N.E. Quarter-Section 28, Permission *re* Grants (Ans.) 1941 (i).
Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Homesteaders on Sections 15, 16 and 27, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).
Homesteading in Section 18, Extension of Time Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).
Homestead Sale of Township 13 (Ans.) 7206 (iv).
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).
Hough, Mr. J. S., and Hough, Campbell and Ferguson (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5657 (iii); in Com., 6429 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ans.) 7500 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8608, 9891 (v).
Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 693 (i).
——— G.B., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).
——— Italy, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).
——— Names of those paid Commissions in Europe, &c. (Ans.) 3845 (ii).
——— N.B., Apptmt. (Ans.) 843 (i).
——— Number of Special Agents, Addresses, &c. (Ans.) 180 (i).
——— Special Prizes, &c. (Ans.) 3484 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1311 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).
Immigration, Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ans.) 2545 (ii).
Immigration, Co-operation with Govt. of N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Immigration, Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants (Ans.) 5084 (iii).
Immigration, Expenditure for March, 1907-8 (Ans.) 5081 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number received by Farmers, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Investigation *re* (statement) 4963 (iii).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii).
——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Immigration Frauds at Halifax (remarks) 4835, 5567, 5659 (iii), 6465 (iv).
See 'Halifax.'
Immigration from U. S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 6403 (iv).
Immigration Officers, Waugh and Perrin, Payments to (Ans.) 514 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 9773 (v).
Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re* (remarks) 11019 (vi).
Immigration Relief to Gimli Galicians, Rep. of Mr. Walker (read) in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Immigration Returns, on Inquiry for, 1108 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3429 (ii).
Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto (remarks) 186, 242 (i).
Immigrants cared for in Toulon Sheds, 1906-7 (Ans.) 892 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation (Ans.) 6922 (iv).
Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Causes, &c. (Ans.) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 5080 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ans.) 567 (i).
Immigrant Detention Hospital, Amount expended (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigrants entering Canada, Number, Bonuses paid on, &c. (Ans.) 5256 (iii).
——— Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
——— Restriction of (remarks) 5491 (iii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Agents (Ans.) 6923 (iv).
Immigrant Inspection of Ships, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).
Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ans.) 5468 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Indian Lands, Acres sold, Total Receipts, &c., since 1896 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122 (vii).

—— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned, sold, &c., by Indians (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, B.C., Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

Indian Lands, Sale of, on Inquiry for Ret., 4495 (iii).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation by Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).

Irrigation (B. 10) 1°*, 231; 2° m., 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); (M.) to withdraw, 2974 (ii).

—— (B. 99) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in Western Provs., Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9990 (v).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 692 (i).

Japanese entering B. C., Passports, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Japanese Immigrants entering from U.S. into Canada, Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Japanese Syndicate purchasing Land in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Alwyn under Irrigation Regulations (Ans.) 7209 (iv).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Area reserved on July 1st, 1896 (Ans.) 13512 (vii).

Land Grants to Rys., Selections, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii), 6920 (iv).

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Patent issued for E. ½ S.E. ¼ Section 2, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

Land Patents for Section 8, Twp. 53, Present Owner, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3430 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Land Patents for Sections 10 and 17, Applicants for (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Land Patents, Section 36, &c., Issue of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

Lands, Section 2, 10, 14, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6 (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 4221 (iii); in Com., 6517 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480 (v); 2° m., 10525; in Com., 10526 (vi).

Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Assistance *re* (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8444 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants (Ans.) 8617 (v).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 688 (i).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Edmonton (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 10717 (iv); in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).

Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Ret., on Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co. (Ans.) 5257 (iii).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Newspapers, Payments to (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses paid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 773 (i).

——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter, &c. (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Assignment of, &c. (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12731 (vii).

Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B. C., Sale to (Ans.) 6002 (iii).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10408 (vi).

——— Surveys of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep. (presented) 3834 (ii).

Peace River Timber Limits, Granting of Leases, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3851 (ii).

Peace River Land Co., Cancellation of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).

——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, paid, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipments, Weighing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents, on Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).

Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).

Quarter Sections, 35, 31 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Land Grants in Man., Alberta, Sask., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Rama Indians Fund, Payments *re* (Ans.) 8611 (v).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 5209 (iii).

See 'Buchanan,' &c.

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5258 (iii).

——— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Rattenbury & Co., Purchasers of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c. (Ans.) 12392 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2309, 2384, 3318 (ii).

——— Questions, &c., ordered by the House, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications *re* Homesteads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9994 (v).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Entry for Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654

——— Squatters' Rights, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Rocky Mountain Park, Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).

St. Peter's Reserve, Extinguishment of Title, Issue of Patents (Ans.) 1933 (i).

——— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).

——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale &c. (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

——— (stmnt.) 10402 (vi).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 9280 (v).

——— Sale of Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) 9127 (v).

School Lands Exchange (B. 163) 1° m., 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478 (v).

School Timber and Coal Lands, Average Price, &c. (Ans) 3431 (ii).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, &c., on M. (Mr. Lake) for Cor., 3852 (ii).

Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c. (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

Section 32, Report *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1377 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech (remarks) 3041 (ii).

——— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

——— Distribution of (Ans.) 692 (i).

——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv)

——— in N. W., Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2901 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

——— Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Purchases from P.E.I. (remarks) 3158, 3752 (ii), 12392 (vii).

——— Corrected answer, 13066 (vii).

Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 8185 (iv).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Register, State Papers and Register 'B,' Custody of, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Six Nations Indians, Refusal *re* Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 6239 (iv).

Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

S. A. Volunteers Land Grant Bounty (B. 109) Res. prop., 3316, 3756 (ii); 11938 (vi); in Com. on Res., 3823 (ii) 12595; in Com., 13047; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserves (remarks) 4741 (iii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2784 (ii).

Supply—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries) 616 (i), 9693 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (forest rangers) 10049; (forest reserves) 10060; (homesteads) 10083; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Immigration (agents, G. B.) 9840; (agents in U. S.) 9965; (deportations) 9882 (v); (general expenses) 5753 (iii); (hospitals) 9983; (literature) 9949; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v); (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Indians—B. C. (land sales) 12752 (vii).

Indians — Generally (destitute) 5762; (printing, &c.) 5762 (iii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Indians—N.W.T. (Sioux) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

N.W. Ter. (Govt. salaries) 10117; (school grants) 10117 (v).

Public Works—Telegraphs (towers) 13178 (vii).

Yukon—(Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).

Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Swamps Lands in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10106 (v).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ans.) 693 (i).

——— Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Tanguay, Mr., Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v).

Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Timber Berth, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W. T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— Nos. 1220, &c., on Order for Ret. (remarks) 849 (i).

Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications, &. (Ans.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Lands, Sales to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ans.) 181 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ans.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses granted under Mackenzie Govt. (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N.W.T. during 1896-7 (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ans.) 182, 691, 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re* (Ans.) 179 (i), 11496 (vi).

Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re* (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (iii), 7649 (iv).

Vacant Land Reservations, Instructions to Agents *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Water Power Sales or Leases in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 8378 (v).

Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

Whitehorse Town Site, Portions sold and retained (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 568 (i).

Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 8604 (v); 2° m., 10528; in Com., 10529; on Senate Amts., 11634 (vi).

Yukon, Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Finnie-Perron Case, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

——— Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ans.) 7726 (iv).

——— Liquor Permits, Agents, &c., Corrected Answer, 5048 (iii).

——— Lithgow, Girouard and Congdon, Messrs., Apptmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

See 'Congdon,' &c.

——— Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518 (vi).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley *vs.* Congdon, Amt. *re* Return (remarks) 1691 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto W.*

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1800 (i).
Dry Docks, Construction, B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 60) 1°*, 1283 (i).
I.C.R. Audit System (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 10214 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 91 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).
Montague Moore and T. J. Haskett Patent Relief (B. 61) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (iii).
Seed Grain for Northest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1362 (i).

SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10209 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland, E., Ont.*

Brighton Wharf, Rep. of Mr. Sing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
—— Repairs *re* (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Cambellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12889 (vii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11820 (vi).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13469 (vii).
Fruit Inspection, *re* Apple Packing, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2761 (ii).
House of Commons Clerks, Changes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
—— Recommendations *re* Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 3899 (ii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7248 (iv).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re* (remarks) 5915 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12226 (vii).
Justice—Supreme Court (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4087 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5533 (iii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10879; (Victoria Immigration) 10879 (vi).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Owen Sound) 7823; (St. Mary's) 7827 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12133 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11078 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of (remarks) 609 (i).
Woolen Industry, Specific Duty (remarks) 6988 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 505 (i).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Canadians repatriated from U. S. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of (Ques.) 2593 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3545 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).
Immigrants, Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c. (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).
I.C.R., Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1688 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Services as an Ice-breaker, in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Societies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure, since Confederation (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
—— Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).

SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4038, 4172 (ii); Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2941 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton W.*

Budget, The, 5364 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12859 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1424 (i); on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5910 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett)—(remarks) 6749 (iv).

Erie, London & Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1108 (i).

'Golspie,' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4137 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2955; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12106 (vii); (Tiffin) 5711 (iii).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13411 (vii).

PARMELEE, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

Printing of Parliament, 5th Rep. of Com. (peresented) 10915 (vi).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*

Absinthe and Brandy imported, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, (Ans.) 1112 (i).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

Anthracite Coal, Quantitv imported from U. S. and other Countries (Ans.) 1511 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) 4163 (ii).

Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Bernier, Capt., Customs Ports opened, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Budget. The, 5296 (iii).

Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, and Countries of Origin (Ans.) 1116 (i).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B. (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle exported to U. S. during Years 1900-07, Value &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U. S. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10746 (iv).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9139 (v).

Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ans.) 6237 (iv).

Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. (B. 194) Res. prop., 11233, in Com. on Res., 11312, 1°*, of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Customs Brokers, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Customs Defalcations in Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

Customs Dept., Criticism by Civil Service Rep., 10448 (vi).

Customs Dept., Criticism, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10448 (vi).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Customs Frauds in Montreal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).

Customs Inspectors, and Rep. of Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9555 (v).

Customs Officers at Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age and Salary (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Customs Outside Service, Ports, &c., 9220 (v).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U. S. during 1905-7, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures for 1907-8 (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, Materials entered free of Duty (Ans.) 10254 (v).

——— Material imported, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

——— Duties on Construction Materials (Ans.) 1117 (i), 3841 (ii).

——— (statement) 13524 (vii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ans.) 7291 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12951 (vii).

Dredging Companies, Insinuations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792 (iv).

Fish Exportations from Man., to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4240 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1257 (i); on M. for 1°, 3507, 3567; in Com. 3588 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 852 (i).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

—— Dismissal from Customs Service (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

See 'Customs Defalcations.'

French Books, Reduction of Customs *re* French Treaty (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 689 (i).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2249 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4226 (iii).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value. &c. (Ans.) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle imported from U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Sept. 30 and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 350 (i).

—— Values from June to Dec., 1907 (Ans). 1113 (i).

Imports from France for last five years, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Value, &c., for 1897-8 (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ans.) 898 (i).

Literature distributed through Customs and Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9104 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8442 (v).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4067 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

Opium, Amount of Duty received, Pet. from B. C. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benj., Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

Pepin, J. E., Emplymt. at Customs Office in Windsor (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Pork, Fresh, Imported for Home Consumption (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Port, South Bar, C. B., Number of Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Posters, Prohibition *re* Indecent Ones, Tariff *re* (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. McDonald (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

Pulp Wood exported to U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Quebec Bridge Material, Total Amount of Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4977 (iii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils imported from G. B. in 1904-5-6-7 (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Port, Quantity of Farm Produce entered, &c. (Ans.) 898 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).

Sugar Imports for 1898, Total Amount (Ans.) 13065 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 637 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536; Miscellaneous (Guarantee Cos.) 9577; (cruisers) 9578; (legal expenses) 9578; (printing, &c.) 9577; Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9442 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2964 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v); Ont. (Brantford) 7465 (iv).

Trade and Nav. Returns (presented) 7 (i).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ans.) 8616 (v).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ans.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Wallace, Michael J., Employment in Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2196 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Address, The, 449 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3873 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 90 (i).

Coal Lands, Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

Corry Building, Total Rental by Govt., Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 11938 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1818 (i).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Sale of Timber, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2256 (ii); in Com., 12073 (vii).

Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 3851 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Postal Stamps, Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

Public Works Dept. Expenditures, on M. for Sup., 4868; (amt.) 4886; Neg. (Y.43; N. 99) 4959 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637 (vi).

Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re* (Ques.) 183 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4140 (ii).

Post Office (inspection) 9115; (mail service) 9119 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 10971 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10978 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (mint) 1453 (i); (rents, &c.) 10999; (telephones) 11012 (vi).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2310 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c. (explanation) *re* Mr. McDonald's letter, 2679 (ii).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10559 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 11211; (Round Hill) 11283 (vi).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, W.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4851 (iii).

Belleville City, Flood Investigation by Govt. (remarks) 3319 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4744 (iii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ques.) 1737 (i).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

——— Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

——— Total Revenue, for 1903-7, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8552, 8609, 9066 (v).

——— on Order being called for 2°, 681 (i).

Bell Rapids P. O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connection (remarks) 1437 (i).

Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission (Ques.) 10011 (v).

Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288, 7447 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11892 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Prosecutions, Violation *re* Apples, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii)

Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead (Ques.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, Records of Payments, of Scale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1283 (i); on Order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1031 (i).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ques.) 9272 (v).

——— Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9372, 9390 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8862 (v).

Section 32, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

SUPPLY—

Post Office (clerical assistance) 8883 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8525 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10967 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11078 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11072 (vi).

Trent Valley Canal Contracts, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i).

POWER, Mr. W., *Quebec, W.*

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 1584 (i).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amendment (prop. res.) 4248 (iii).

Banking Systems, Par. in 'Financial Post,' Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).

See 'Wheat.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. E. B. Walker, Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).

——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12201 (vii).

——— Opening (remarks) 12660 (vii).

——— Payment of Dues on Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*

Deep Waterways Commission, Damming St. Lawrence River at Long Sault (remarks) 13146 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s (B. 127) in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231 (iv); on Senate Amts., 12772 (vii).

——— (B. 211) M. to suspend Rule, 12836 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).

Old Age Pension Scheme (M.) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).

——— Progress *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

——— (remarks) 7722 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1899 (i).

Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid *re* (Ques.) 173 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2204 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Chute à Blondeau) 12094 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4723 (iii).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anse. St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Bell Memorial Association (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11207 (vi).

Bell River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 685 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8557, 9067 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Bic Wharf, Materials supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5943 (iii).
Booms in International Streams, Regulation (B. 105) 1° m., 3654 (ii).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iv).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, Construction of, Papers laid on Table, 12771 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman (Ans.) 4404 (iii).
Campbellton Wharf, Contract *re* Piling (Ans.) 8612 (v).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).
C.P.R., Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, Cost, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 11250 (vi).
—— Purposes of Vote (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ans.) 12651 (vii).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ans.) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Chicoutimi Boom and Pulp Co.'s Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8175 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditure, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 13204 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).
Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 2394 (ii).
Clerk of Works *re* Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 695 (i).
Clinton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4832 (iii).
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8380 (v).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Colchester Point, Pier, Essex County, Amt. expended (Ans.) 12652 (vii).
Conry Building, Total Annual Rental, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 11938 (vi).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 12650 (vii).
Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) *re* Progress (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ans.) 1736 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (iii).
Documents, Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).
—— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).
—— Taken from Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2308 (ii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club (Ans.) 13060 (vii).
Dredges, registered in Canada (Ans.) 11497 (vi).
Dredging at Becancour, Blanche, &c., during 1907 (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 8839 (v).
Dredging at Port Arthur and Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8618 (v).
Dredging Contract, O.C. *re*, on Inquiry for, 6927 (iv).
Dredging Contracts at Midland, &c., Advertisements for Tenders (remarks) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments (Ans) 9711 (v).
—— O.C. *re* (remarks) 6853 (iv).
—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6745-6816 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 1737 (i).
Dredging Contracts (remarks) 7105 (iv).
—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* (remarks) 9773 (v).
Dredging in Ont. and Que., for 1907-8, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 10008 (v).
Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims Pending, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular (read) in Com. of Sup., 12043 (vi).
Dredging Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 8696 (v).
Dredging Work at Nicolet River, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Drill Halls, Ret., on Inquiry for, 4834, 5659 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

——— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13279

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvements (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days working (Ans.) 7199 (iv).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1510 (i).

——— Explanation *re* Purchases, 5658 (iii).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7643 (iv).

Floods at Chatham and Belleville (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4745 (iii).

Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8613 (v).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Garthby, Govt. Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Amount contributed by Govt. (Ans.) 355 (i).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Report *re* Estimated Cost (remarks) 12053 (vii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 8378 (v).

——— Rep. of Surveys, on Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Employees, and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 13059 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale (B. 89) M. for Com. on Res., 2221; 1**, 2260 (ii); in Com., 12060 (viii).

See 'Major's Hill Park.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8130, 8745, 9462 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Imputing Motives,' 8134 (iv).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of (Ans.) 7730 (iv).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 7212 (iv).

Higgin's Shore Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 695 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Return, on Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

——— Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

——— Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi), 13340 (vii).

See 'Postal,' 'Restaurent.'

Howard's Cape, Wharf, Pet. *re* Investigation (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Hudson, Dredging, 1907, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i), 5698 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).

Inspectors of Public Works, Apptmts. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5998 (iii).

I.C.R., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13489 (vii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4451 (iii).

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Jesus River, Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents, B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12406 (vii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12098 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Lafferty, Thos., Payment for Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).

Lake Megantic, Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re* (Ans.) 9472 (v).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Major's Hill Park and G.T.Ry. Co.'s Hotel, Sale (B. 89) prop. Res., 1584 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12799 (vii).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging done at Fesserton, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

Medicine Hat, Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Midland and Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Milford Haven Wharf, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i), 8172 (iv).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Montmorency Falls, Walls, Length, &c. (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

N. B. Inland Water Wharfs, Construction Policy (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3663 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditures from 1896-1908 (Ans.) 12775 (vii).

—— Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Nicolet Post Office, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied Govt. (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Ont. and Quebec Dredging, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 9276 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Withdrawal of word 'grafter,' 10994 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. at Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Petawawa Dock, Tenders *re* Improvements (Ans.) 685 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Return (remarks) 7103 (iv).

—— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5725 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

—— Papers laid on Table, 10402 (vi).

—— Statement as to Missing Letters (remarks) 9716 (v).

Pictou Post Office, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost (Ans.) 10518 (vi).

Pinette Harbour, Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 685 (i).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3898 (ii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau (Ans.) 8839 (v).

—— Date of Contract (Ans.) 9268 (v).

—— Tenders, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1734 (i)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2389 (ii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 4403 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10513 (vi).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Port Hood Harbours, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ans.) 10255 (v).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (ii).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Port Vernon Bridge, Completion of Works, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).
Postal Service in House of Com. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).
P.E.I., Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1686 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I., Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iv).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Public Works Dept., New Apptmts. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).
——— Employees at Hamilton, Delay in Pay (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).
——— Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661 (iii).
——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).
Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 3853 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10649 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4588 (iii).
——— correcting answer, 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Reinhardt, Paul, Emplymt. in Provincial Elections, Hull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10988 (vi).
Representation from the Mar. Provs., Ques. of Priv., 9892 (v).
Restaurant of House of Com. and Senate, Joint Com. (M.) 13224 (vii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2385, 3581 (ii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary as Port Physician (Ans.) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5467 (iii).
Rimouski Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn' (Ans.) 7727 (iv).
Rimouski Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10013 (v).
Rivard, Mr. S., Apptmt. as Supt. of Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds (Ans.) 6399 (iv).
——— Wharf, Total Amount of Dredging (Ans.) 6462 (iv).
Ruscomb River Works, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvement Co., Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ans.) 238 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Expenditure by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Removal of Rock, &c. (Ans.) 6918 (iv).
——— Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 6641, 6919 (iv).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Pay List, &c. (Ans.) 1116 (i).
St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 11497 (vi).
St. John River, Snags, Removal of, Tender *re* (Ans.) 3478 (ii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Payments to *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 896, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
St. Mary's Post Office, Total Cost (Ans.) 11019 (vi).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Saguenay and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid for Use of Boom, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal, &c. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8381 (v).

See 'Chicoutimi.'

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8563, 9068 (v).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5425, 5520 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10012 (v).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 567, 891 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1939 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564, 5787 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 638 (i), 12917 (vii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12737; (schools) 13172 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—(Ass't. Dep. Minister) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 13338 (vii); (Cranbrook) 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10864 (vi); (Fernie) 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Quesnel) 10867 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vancouver) 10868 (v), 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii); (Victoria) 10883; (Victoria, immigration) 10874; (William's Head) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farms, repairs) 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii); (furniture) 11007; (immigration, repairs) 11008; (post office fittings) 11007; (quarantine stations) J½

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

11008; (rents, &c.) 10981; List read, 10998; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953, 10974; (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); Emerson) 8534 (v), 13335 (vii); (Neepawa) 8536 (v), 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Souris) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg immigration) 8573 (v); (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi); (Winnipeg P. O.) 8575; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8566 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Fredericton) 13328; (Grand Falls) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328; (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John) 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7110; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7144; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, military) 7143; (Halifax, quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326; (Parrsboro) 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfville) 13327 (vii); (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Arnprior) 7454; (Belleville) 7678; (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Brantford) 7455; (Dom. renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7473 (iv), 13331; (Guelph) 13331 (vii); (Guelph, armoury) 7678; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7696 (iv); (Harriston) 13331 (vii); (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi); (Leamington) 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331; (Listowel) 13331 (vii); (London, magazine) 7705; (London, military) 7706; (Markham) 7709 (iv), 13331; (Mitchell) 13332; (Mount Forest) 13331; (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Owen Sound) 7817 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii); (Peterborough) 13332 (vii); (Port Arthur) 7825 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Renfrew) 7825 (iv); (St. Mary's) 7826 (iv); (Sarnia) 7829 (iv), 13333; (Seaforth) 13332 (vii); (Simcoe) 7830 (iv), 13333; (Sudbury) 13333 (vii); (Tilsonburg) 13333 (vii); (Uxbridge) 13333 (vii); (Walkerville) 13333 (vii); (Waterloo) 13333 (vii); (Welland) 7830 (iv); (Whitby) 7833 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (deptl. buildings) 1505 (i), (eastern block) 1504 (i); (elevator attendants) 11011 (vi); (grounds) 11012 (vi); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii); (House of Commons, addition) 1486 (i); (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (lighting) 11011 (vi); (Major's Hill park) 11015 (vi); (mint) 1451, 1474 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(museum) 1489 (i), 13477 (vii); (new deptl. building) 5701 (iii); (observatory) 1450, 1485 (i); (post office) 5705 (iii); (printing bureau, motors) 7817 (iv); (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii); (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi); (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329 (vii); (Chicoutimi) 7279 (iv); (Cookshire) 7281 (iv); (Dominion, renewals) 7286 (iv); (Dundee) 7286 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Grand Mere) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7289, 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lachute) 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lake Megantic) 7294 (iv); (Levis) 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Magog) 7306 (iv); 13329 (vii); (Marieville) 7306 (iv); (Megantic) 13330 (vii); (Montreal, barracks) 7407 (iv); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423 (iv); (Montreal, military) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5703 (iii); (Montreal, postal station) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, post office) 7410 (iv); (Montreal, station C) 7419 (iv); (Nicolet) 7428 (iv); (Plessisville) 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Point St. Charles) 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Quebec Citadel) 7430 (iv); (Que. Dominion arsenal) 7435 (iv); (Quebec, drill hall) 7431 (iv); (Quebec, hospital) 7433 (iv); (Quebec, immigrants) 7432 (iv); (Quebec, warehouse) 7432 (iv); (Roberval) 13330 (vii); (St. Henri) 7439 (iv); (St. Hyacinthe) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, post office) 7444 (iv); (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv); (St. Therese) 13330 (vii); (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii); (Westmount) 13331 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 8576 (v); (Calgary) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 5706 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii); (Estevan) 8581 (v), 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8582 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moose Jaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Prince Albert, penitentiary) 8601 (v); (Regina) 8602 (v); (Saskatoon) 8602 (v), 13337 (i); (Strathcona) 13338 (vii); (Wetaskiwin) 13338 (vii); (Yorkton) 8603)v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 10883 (vi); (Dawson) 13339 (vii); (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson river) 13352 (vii); Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12143 (vii); Ont. and Que. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Spillumcheen) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11694, 12032 (vi); (graving docks) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140 (vii); (Lake Dauphin) 12141 (vii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 5701 (iii), 12145 (v); Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 13344 (vii); (Buctouche) 11679 (vi); (Campbellton) 13344 (vii); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Caraquet) 11685 (vi); (Dorchester) 13344 (vii); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Harvey) 13344 (vii); (Leonardsville) 13344 (vii); (Lorneville) 13344 (vii); (Lower Newcastle) 11696 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi), 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (vi); (St. Andrews) 12011 (vi); (St. John) 11698 (vi); (St. John, harbour) 12011 (vi); (St. John, improvements) 5708 (iii); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345 (vii); (Shippegan) 12027 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207 (vi); (Baddeck) 11219 (vi); (Barachois) 11224 (vi); (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224 (vi); (Big Lorraine) 11224 (vi); (Breton Cove) 11224 (vi); (Cape St. Mary) 11224 (vi); (Caribou Island causeway) 11224 (vi); (Charlos cove) 11225 (vi); (Church Point) 11225 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13340 (vii); (Glace Bay) 11228 (vi); (Hall's Harbour) 11228 (vi); (McPherson's cove) 11229 (vi); (Margaree) 11229 (vi); (Middle River) 11230 (vi); (New Glasgow) 11257 (vi); (Oyster Pond) 11258 (vi); (Parker's Cove) 11258 (vi); (Parrsborough) 11259 (vi); (Poirierville pier) 11260 (v); (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi); (Port Hastings) 11265 (vi); (Port Hilford) 11267 (vi); (Port Hood) 11268 (vi); (Port Joli West) 11279 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi); (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); (Round Hill) 11282 (vi); (Skinner's cove) 11290 (vi); (Sydney wharf) 11230 (vi); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090 (vii); (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (Blanche River) 12090 (vii); (Blind River) 12091 (vii); (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Burlington) 12092 (vii); (Chute a Blondeau) 12092 (vii); (Cobourg) 12095 (vii); (Colborne) 12095 (vii); (Collingwood) 12096 (vii); (Georgian Bay surveys) 13326 (vii); (Goderich) 12101 (vii); (Goderich, breakwater) 13350 (vii); (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii); (Juniper Island) 13350 (vii); (Lakefield) 13350 (vii); (Little Current) 13350 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii); (Magnetawan) 13350 (vii); (Meaford) 12103 (vii); (Michipicoten) 13350 (vii); (Midland and Tiffin) 12105 (vii); (Petawawa) 12133 (vii); (Peterborough) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144 (vii); (Port Burwell) 12135 (vii); (Port Colborne) 12146 (vii); (Port Credit) 12102 (vii); (Port Hope) 12135 (vii); (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii); (Rainy River) 12136 (vii); (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Ron-

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

deau) 12137 (vii); (Rossport) 12137 (vii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 12137 (vii); (Severn) 12137 (vii); (Smeeth and McGillicuddy) 13350 (vii); (Southampton) 12137 (vii); (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii); (Temiskaming Lake) 13350 (vii); (Tiffin) 13351 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5709 (iii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii); (Victoria) 12137 (vii); (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 11292 (vi); (New London) 11292 (vi); (repairs) 11292 (vi); (Rustico) 11293 (vi); (Souris) 13341 (vii); (Summerside) 13343 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028 (vi); (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029 (vi); (Baie St. Paul) 12029 (vi); (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan, river) 12036 (vi); (Berthier) 12029 (vi); (Bic wharf) 12030 (vi); (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Cap St. Ignace) 12030 (vi); (Chateauguay) 12030 (vi); (Chicoutimi) 12030 (vi); (Clarke City) 12031 (vi); (East Templeton) 12031 (vi); (Escoumains) 12031 (vi); (Father Point) 12031 (vi); (Grand Mechins) 12031 (vi); (Grande Riviere) 12031 (vi); (Lake Aylmer) 12032 (vi); (Lake Megantic) 12032 (vi); (Lake St. Francis) 12033 (vi); (Lake St. John) 12033 (vi); (Lavaltrie) 12033 (vi); (Les Eboulements) 12033 (vi); (Lotbiniere) 12033 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 12034 (vi); (Malbay) 12034 (vi); (Matane) 12034 (vi); (Montmagny) 12034 (vi); (Nicolet) 12034 (vi); (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034 (vi); (Peribonka) 12035 (vi); (Petite Decharge) 12034 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi); (Pointe aux Trembles) 12035 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 12144 (vii); (Richelieu) 12037 (vi); (Rimouski) 12035 (vi); (Riviere du Lievre) 12037 (vi); (Riviere du Loup) 12036 (vi); (Riviere Maskinonge) 12037 (vi); (Riviere Ouelle) 12037 (vi); (St. Alphonse) 12041 (vi); (Ste. Anne des Monts) 12042 (vi); (St. Francis) 12041 (vi); (St. Francois) 12042 (vi); (St. Ignace de Loyola) 12042 (vi); (St. Jacques) 12041 (vi); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 12042 (vi); (St. Jean Orleans) 12042 (vi); (St. Laurent) 12042 (vi); (St. Louis) 12040 (vi); (St. Maurice River) 12041 (vi); (St. Omer) 12042 (vi); (St. Pierre les Becquets) 12042 (vi); (St. Simeon) 12042 (vi); (Saguenay) 12040 (vi); (Sorel) 12042 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Varennes) 12042 (vi); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska, lock) 12041 (vi); (Yamaska, river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Lesser Slave Lake) 5719 (iii); (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii); (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096 (vi); (cement testing) 11078 (vi); (clerical assistance) 11099 (vi); (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (engineering branch) 11093 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii); (International Commission *re* Red River) 11118 (vi); (monuments) 11118 (vi); (technical books) 11100 (vi); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi); (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731 (iii); (B. C. Cape Beale Lines) 5732 (iii); (cable service) 5731 (iii); (Chicoutimi) 13179 (vii); (Marconi) 12143 (vii); (operating) 13178 (vii); (Yukon) 13179 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii).

Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Tache, J. C., Emplymt. in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Lists of Papers *re* Advertisements (read) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).

Tiffin, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3229 (ii).

Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 682 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 9712 (v).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap), Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 354 (i).

—— Construction of Entrance (Ans.) 355 (i).

—— Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Date, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 518 (i), 4587 (iii), 10014 (v).

—— Entrance, Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works *re* (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv., 9343 (v).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Uniforms and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9571 (v).

Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Victoria Beach Pier, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Welchpool Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

Western Block Extension, Total Expenditure, Area, &c. (Ans.) 512 (i).

Westville Public Building, Total Cost (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure *re*, on M. (Mr. Blain) for Cor., 5476 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tenders, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

Yarmouth, Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Yukon Telegraphs, Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1934 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Emplymt. of Political Officers (remarks) in deb. on Technical Education, 3292 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4504 (iii).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8553 (v).

Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 188 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt., B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12853, 13052 (vii).

Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Catharine C., Incomplete Return (remarks) 5727 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11566 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5891 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

Cypress Hills, Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence River Dam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

——— Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13151 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1875 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12941 (vii).

Doukhobors, Religious Fanatics, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12161 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy. in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3798 (ii).

Gilmore, Edith May Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6269 (iv).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3292 (ii).

G.T.Ry., Connections at Prescott (remarks) 433 (i).

Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration *re* (remarks) 1739 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, Sale of (Ques.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

I.C.R., Delays to Maritime Express, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

——— Number of Tons of Steel Rails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock in Service on Sundays, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, Purchase of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Trains breaking down, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c. (M. for ret.) 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4469 (iii).
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9476 (v).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl., Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4004 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 7327 (iv).
——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7247 (iv).
Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ques.) 10791 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Collision with C.P.R. Steamer, Par. in 'Montreal Gazette' (remarks) 8086 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Contract *re* Cement, &c. (Ques.) 7199, 7499 (iv).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment of (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
——— Return Inquiry for, 5490 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6227 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 609 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to (Ques.) 6002 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
Petition, (M.) to introduce, 1682 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3894 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1739 (i), 2740 (ii).
Public Accounts Committee, Meetings, &c., Adjournments, &c. (remarks) 1439 (i).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4495 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4890 (iii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Troops, Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3929 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 90) 1° m., 2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3404 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Returns unopposed, *re* I. C. R. (remarks) 5914 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8516 (v).
St. Lawrence Power and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3009 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways.'
Salmon Licenses, Leases &c., in B.C. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8560, 8610 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5458 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12598 (vii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1929 (i).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed grain) 5500 (iii).
Canals—Galops (Upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5669 (iii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12197; (Port Colborne) 12216 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5681 (iii); (widening) 12211 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); Interior (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1909 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii); (customs dues) 12155; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (properties) 12148; (provisions) 12150;

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(R. M. College) 12153; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942, 2950; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13253 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953 (vi); (Neepawa) 8544; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7111 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7463; (Dom. renewals) 7479; (Glencoe) 7497 (iv); (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 1450; (deptl. buildings) 1505; (House of Com., additions) 1486; (mint) 1451, 1474; (museum) 1490; (observatory) 1485 (i); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7292; (Levis) 7294 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (St. Andrew's Rapids) 12145 (vii).

Public Works — Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby) 11226; (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12134; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Midland and Tiffin) 12125; (Petewawa) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Colborne) 12146; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Stanley Island wharf) 5720 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. Quebec harbour) 12144 (vii).

Public Works — Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11090; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11116; (engineering branch) 11094 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (Moncton car shops) 12250 (vii); (Pictou) 5561; (rolling stock) 5549 (iii); (St. John, increased accommodation) 12257 (vii); (train service) 10223; (Windsor Branch) 10146 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357; (Ry. Commission) 10361 (vi).

Tenders, Advertising, *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4702, neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

Timber Lands, Sale of to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 9774 (v).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., &c., on M. to adjn. House, 5905 (iii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3463 (ii).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4514 (iii).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Experimental Farm, Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade *re* Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

French Language, Par. in 'Le Soleil,' on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1212 (i).

Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13059 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6976, 6989 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7453 (iv).

Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7237 (iv).

Militia Dept., Quebec, Hours for Masons, &c. (Ques.) 10790 (vi).

Montmorency Falls Retaining Walls, Width, &c. (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3450 (ii).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures for the last fifty years (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Printing Supt., Apptmnt. of a Frenchman (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8850 (v).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 13061 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

——— Names of Jurymen, &c. (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13389 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures by Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.) 3853 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Deputy Minister of Public Works *re* French Canadians, 8465 (v).

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10606 (vi).
Excise (methylated spirits) 821 (i).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 909 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 267 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12453 (vii).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4285 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8691 (iv); on M. for 3°, 13257 (vii).
Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1719 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4486 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Accounts, Payments to Mr. Falconer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5847 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4046 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1068 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Porter's Lake) 11264 (vi).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Address, The, 485 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 5795 (iii).
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds' Rights, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Customs Collectors in Man., Additional Fees charged, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1183 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8012 (iv), 11762 (vi); in Com., 13005 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 759 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11168, 11422 (vi).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9953 (v).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Fish Exportations from Man., five years to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act, Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13211 (vii).
G.T.P., Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5802 (iii).
—— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions (Ques.) 1937 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration, Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
Indian Schools, Prosecutions *re* Riots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Internal Economy Board, H. of C., Minutes, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of (notice of motion) 3477 (ii).
See 'Seed Grain.'
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12803 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address, 495 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13222 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Polling Divisions, made by Judges (remarks) 13141 (vii).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty from 1905-8 (Ques.) 8441 (v).
Military Stores of Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
'Montague,' Dredge, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9488 (v).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Number, Total Receipts, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5258 (iii).

—— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads, Letter from Mr. Seaman (read) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Entry by Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

—— Timber Reserves, Squatters' Claims, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

—— Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

—— Title, Extinguish of, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Land Grants, Patents, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

Seed Grain in N. W., Distribution of, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leeh (remarks) 3040 (ii).

—— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Seed Grain for N.W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P. (remarks) 1442 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2909 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1373 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3815 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9769 (v).

Customs—Miscellaneous (guarantees) 9577; Inspectors (salaries) 9550 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10046; (forest rangers) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9860; (deportations) 9883 (v); (general expenses) 5754 (iii); (hospitals) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9952 (v).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5737 (iii); (rifle and artillery grants) 12152 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2775 (ii).

N.W. Ters. (school grants) 10118 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10889 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8519; (Neepawa) 8536; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10962 (vi); (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 8575 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582; (Saskatoon) 8603; (Yorkton) 8603 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ques.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Cutting by Saw-mill Owners, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).

Timber Permits to Saw-mill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).

Town Site, Section 32, Man., Erection of Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1125, 1348 (i).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

ROSS, Mr. A. C., *Cape Breton, N., and Victoria.*

Cement, Sydney, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11219; (Digby) 11226 (vi).

ROSS, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1283 (i).

Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) M. to adjn. debate, 4312 (iii).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 606 (i).

B.C. Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905 (M. for ret.) 3435 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 12089 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10747 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendments, Ques. of Order, 9282 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10138 (v).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Customs Outside Service, in Com. of Sup., Members remarks checked, 9451 (v).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N. W. M. Police Force (Ques.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1172 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1632, 1653 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8185 (iv); in Com., 11877, 11932 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13252 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11176 (vi).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 754 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry. Co., Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1512 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Ques. of Order, *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298 (i).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 630 (i).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Japanese Immigration Restriction, B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1744 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2066 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies, 855, 877 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 732 (i).

Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 754 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11244 (vi).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9916 (v).

——— Ques. of Order, 10023, 'Bourinot' quoted, 10030 (v).

Obstruction Tactics, &c., Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5337 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Order, Points of, 'Bourinot' *re* Discussions on, 4103 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4955 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13401 (vii).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4986 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, Ques. of Order, 10663 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Resignation as Member *re* Chinese Question (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).

Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 891 (i); in Com., 5409, 5519 (iii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3773 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 625 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9244; Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Legislation (voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4099 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7293 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing of, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2287 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. *re* Amts., 908 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4520 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8200 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11170, 11458, 11521; (amt.) 11943; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 11970; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 58) 11974 (vi).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* Closing (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipeg, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13210 (vii).

Homestead Entries granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian, &c. (Ques.) 9773 (v).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).

Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Immigration from U. S., Total Amount expended (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c. (Ques.) 3434 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 10, and 17, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2977 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13220 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1683 (i).

'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on order for Copy of Rep. (wthdn.) 850 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ques.) 1940 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4976 (iii).

——— (demurrage) B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3366 (ii).

Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 1689 (i).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1367 (i).

Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Squatters on Forest Reserves in Turtle Mountain (remarks) 4739 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10074; (surveys) 10007 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9866; (deportations) 9882 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8540; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10964 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11389 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Supplies, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13264 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13298 (vii).

G.T.P., Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12364 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com on Res., 13291 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12198; (Port Colborne) 12221 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (piping) 10195 (v).

Transportation Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12221 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2188 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford S.*

Budget, The, 5616, 5957 (iii).

Canada Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 753 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10835 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10560 (vi).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1550 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12439 (vii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission (remarks) 1435 (i).

Budget, The, 5338 (iii).

Imperial Pulp Co., Denial re Managing Directorship, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' Ques. of Priv., 3578 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, Govt. Aid (M.) to adjn., 1349 (i).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).
Budget, The, 6615 (iv).
Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red,' &c.
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12854 (vii).
Coasting Privileges, prop. Res. (Mr. Black) withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).
Debates of the House, Average Cost per Column (Ques.) 3479 (ii).
Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 508 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 31) 1°*, 562 (i); in Com., 5248 (iii).
Fisheries Com., Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of (prop. res.) 1691 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
Fishery Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
I.C.R., Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 5800 (iii).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3027 (ii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) 3680 (ii).
Northwest and Gold Dredging Co., Leases, assigned, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).
Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Presbyterian College, Halifax (B. 154) in Com., 7667 (iv).
Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority *re* (uQes.) 12775 (vii).
Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons Registered, &c. (Ques.) 2790 (ii).
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (contingencies) 10503 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4016, 4169 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10298 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2957; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761 (vii).

SLOAN, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*
British Columbia Bank incorp. (B. 59) 2° m., 1469 (i).

SLOAN, Mr. W.—*Con.*
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Schr., Seizure, &c.: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 350 (i).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 726 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox,' on M. for Sup., 3934 (ii).
——— (notice of motion) *re* Discussion, 3156 (ii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 2160 (ii); in Com., 4545; on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 10301 (vi).
Yukon Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1934 (i).

SMITH, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*
Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).
Budget, The, 5375, 5388 (iii).
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6203 (iii).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3523; in Com., 3595, 3645 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).
Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
Militia Food Supply, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4979 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (travelling expenses) 815 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5774 (iii).
Militia (stores, &c.) 5739 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1477; (museum) 1498 (i).

SMITH, Mr. G., *Oxford, N.*

Address, The, 407 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1555 (i).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2866 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrest *re* Picketing (remarks) 9027 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10548, 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11373 (vi).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9192 (v).
Coal Land Leases, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4685 (iii).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Dom. Interference (remarks) 1738 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 1293 (i).
Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* with Mr. Bastedo, Reports *re* (remarks) 6849 (iv).
G.T.P. Workmen Accidents, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6729, 7097 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11029 (vi).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ques.) 7196 (iv).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C. (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
—— Natal Act, Cor., &c., with Lt. Gov., B.C. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2081 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 874 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).
Mail Service in B.C., Better Arrangements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 12053 (vii).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2419 (ii).
Railway Act (working hours) Amt. (B. 157) 1° m., 6843 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 6919 (iv).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 9889 (v).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10066 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *Essex, N.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) Remarks, 530 (i).
Adjournment of the House, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4495 (iii).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) Irrelevancy of Debate, 4730 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) Members addressing Hse. from their Seats without rising (remarks) 10922 (vi).
Banking System, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) Members remarks checked, 2307 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111, on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).
Belleville City Floods, Investigation *re*, Members remarks checked, 3319 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., on Qes. of Order (Mr. German) 2809; (ruling) 2810 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex., 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 10656 (vi).
—— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).
Brantford Stove Works Strike (remarks) 9027 (v).
Cigarette Restraint B. (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11363, 11535, 11645 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Discussion *re*, Ques. of Order (ruling) 5627-8 (iii).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 680 (i).
Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9282 (v).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) (ruling) 8461 (v).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, Members remarks checked, 1195 (i), 2305 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster)—(ruling) 11717 (vi).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 13247 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3° (ruling) 11977 (vi), 12394 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.C., Rule *re* Producing, 6927 (iv).

——— Ref. to Matters before Committee (ruling) 6749 (iv).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 6843 (iv).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 7470 (iv).

Electoral Districts, Certificates of Election (notification) 890 (i).

Electoral District of Nicolet, Certificate of Election (notification) 1283 (i).

Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notifications) 2 (i).

Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).

Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).

Fire Extinguishers Ret., Members remarks checked, 4833 (iii).

——— Irrelevancy of debate, 7776 (iv).

French Language, Pet. *re*, Ques of Order, 8886 (v).

Govt. Grounds, Conditions *re*, Members remarks checked, 1741 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 89, Members remarks checked, 2254 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 8136 (iv).

G.T.P. Supplies via American Routes, Member's remarks checked, 9026 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25, in Com., on Ruling to ref. back to Com., 3262 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10491 (vi).

Huron, South Riding, Certificate of Election (notification) 2541 (ii).

——— Vacancy, &c. (notification) 890 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1299 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) Member's remarks checked, 13137 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Indian Lands in Algoma, *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram (remarks) 13532 (vii).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 8 (i).

Japanese Immigration, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt. (ruling) 1763 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted by Member (ruling) *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Officials, Member's remarks checked, 6633

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr .Fisher) on M. for 3°, Member's remarks checked, 7217 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227 (iv).

Members introduced, 3 (i).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 12503 (vii).

Moir, Private, Shooting, &c., Member's remarks checked, 7322 (iv).

Montmagny, Electoral District (Notification) Vacancy, 9263 (v).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher), Appeal to the Speaker, 4070; (ruling) 4071; Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on Amts. (ruling) 9503 (v).

Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8896 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9925 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 10624 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross)—(ruling) 10025, 10031 (v).

Opening of Parliament, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6741 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, re answering Questions by Govt. (ruling) 234 (i).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting in Ottawa, Com. from Senate (read) 13581 (vii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Discussion *re* (ruling) 9717 (v).

Petition, on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to introduce, 1682 (i).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., Member's remarks checked, 3164 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 12629 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of (remarks) 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Member's remarks checked, 4496 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. A. Lavergne) Member's remarks checked, 7993 (iv).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 13580 (vii).

——— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3085 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 9890 (v).

Public Works, Dep. Minister and French Canadians, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) Member's remarks checked, 4910 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 4958 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 13401 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 13402 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures (remarks) *re* Question, 3847 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators (remarks) 6061 (iii).

Ques. of Order, *re* Accepting Minister's Stmnt. (ruling) 9352 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Member's remarks checked, 2382 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) (ruling) 2383 (ii).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid)—(remarks) 9774 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) *re* Representation of Mar. Provs. (remarks) 9892 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden)—(ruling) 11618 (vi).

——— on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602 (vi).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) ref. to deb. in Senate (ruling) 577 (i).

Railway Commissioners' Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Ry. Connections at Brockville, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) Remarks checked, 9 (i).

Returns, Retention of by Members, on Ques. of Priv., Member's remarks checked, 4667 (iii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Member's remarks checked, 6635 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech, Discussion ruled out of Order, 3041 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Supplies purchased for Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5830, (ruling) 5831 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked, 5837 (iii).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (salaries) 10491, 10501 (vi); (salary, increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) Member's remarks checked, 1064 (i).

Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Timber Berths, on M. for Original Documents (remarks) 2984 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, *re* Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turrig)—(ruling) 11304 (vi).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolution *re* Moral Reform Associations, Member's remarks checked, 11302 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Barker) (ruling) 923 (i).

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ (notification) 569 (i).

York, Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 1018 (i).

SPEAKER, DEP. (Mr. C. Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11828 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, Member's remarks checked, 5025 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) ref. to Speaker, 8135 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3717 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Member's remarks checked, 11290 (vi).

Lord's Day Act, Violations *re* Horse Racing, Member's remarks checked, 3753 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., Discussion *re* M. to adjn., 3656 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Irrelevancy of debate, 2943 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 10993 (vi).

SPEAKER, DEP.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry. B. 202, Member's remarks checked, 12632 (vii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Talbot) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Member's remarks checked, 4222 (iii).

Restaurant Com., Joint, 1st Rep. (presented) 13510 (vii).

Royal Mint, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 1461 (i).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Prov. (remarks) 6854 (iv).

Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup. (ruling) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 9250 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey, E.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855, 3880 (ii).

Anglo-American Treaties, Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°. 5763 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13307 (vii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Banking Act Amts., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4272 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Banking Systems, Criticisms of Newspaper Report, Ques. of Privilege, 2308 (ii).

Battlefields of Quebec, Tercentenary at Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4388; in Com., 4415, 4511; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2810 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2994 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Bonusing System, on Notice of Motion (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Budget, The, 6595 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6171, 6173 (iii); in Com., 6408 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6872 (iv).

Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in the Senate, Ques. of Priv., 5047 (iii).
See 'Employees.'

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10749, 11021 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5114 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721; in Com., 11366, 11536, 11635 (vi), 12184 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5901 (iii).

——— Report (remarks) 5628, 5633 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).

Colonization Lands, Alienation of, Inquiry for Ret., 3752 (ii), 4317 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Statement of Members, Ruling *re*, 8462 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10487 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1147, 1194 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1782 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Copp) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 13244; (amt.) to M. for 3°. 13255 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11466 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10815, 10820 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5027 (iii).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7639 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6755 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266; in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5479 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13470 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7774 (iv).

Fisheries Treaty, Boundaries with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6739 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8294 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3618, 3636 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (remarks) 945 (i).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12556 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 6287 (iv).

——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence (remarks) 6917 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, Interference *re*, on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8552, 8744, 9461 (v).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8836 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Investigation *re* Charges of Major Hodgins, on 1st Rep. of Com., 8515 (v).

——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2241 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224; on M. for 3°, 4536 (iii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Neglect of Duty as Inspector at Halifax (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hindus in B. C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

Hogs saughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ques.) 6000 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 6302 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1299 (i).

Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. Walker and Mr. Smith (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475, 6482 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Employees, Circular from Genl. Manager *re* Municipal Politics (read) 2304 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Councils (remarks) 2309 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections, Circular *re* (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768, 953 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, B. C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1759 (i).
Lands set apart for Settlement since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 8481 (v).
Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6518 (iv).
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10953 (vi).
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 6985 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Book-keeping, &c., ref. to Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
—— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8454 (v).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020; in Com., 3035 (ii).
Meaford Harbour B. 158 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8510 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6895, 7238; on M. for 3°, 7218 (iv).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
—— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 12546 (vii).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3451 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9495 (v)
Niagara, St Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5067 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4631 (iii); in Com., 12054 (vii).
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Ministerial Speeches (remarks) 10126 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Order Paper, Differences in English and French Editions (remarks) 6740, 6850 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2837 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10552 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10412 (vi).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3979 (ii).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Inquiry for missing Papers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9722 (v).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (remarks) 10513 (vi).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3097 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7191 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 2394 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co., Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3376 (ii).
Railway Commission (asst. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3903 (ii); in Com., 8512 (v).
—— on M. to introduce, 3751 (ii).
—— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11630 (vi)
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13285 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies, Bridge Subsidies (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ques) 6000 (iii). 6232 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2988 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv), 8562, 9068 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

School Lands Exchange B 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470; in Com., 8478 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2781 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adn., 1361 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

——— (remarks) *re* Purchases, 3158 (ii).

Seed Wheat, Delegation *re* (remarks) 1740 (i).

Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Station, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Shipping Rings, Combination *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 5916 (iii).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5416 (iii).

Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom. Fruit Inspector Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

——— (M. for copies) 2398 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3761, 3832 (ii), 12595 (vii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5865 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (exhibitions) 10569, 10597 (vi); (seed branch) 5502 (iii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5664 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12217; (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9740 (v).

Excise (methylated spirits) 820; (travelling expenses) 815 (i).

Experimental Farms (salaries) 12549 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10503 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 13169 (vii).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13171 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5757 (iii).

Justice (Exchequer Court) 5505 (iii).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3986 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10290 (v); (pay and allowance) 12546 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 5765 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2948, 2949; (naval schools) 3222; (obstructions) 3214; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3184, 3195; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings — Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8535; (Neepawa) 8541; (Selkirk) 8550; (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax customs) 7168; (Shelburne) 7177; (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7692; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston, artillery park) 7702; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704; (Leamington) 7705; (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 11015; (rents, &c.) 10983; (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings — Que. (Cookshire) 7281; (dominion arsenal) 7435; (Farnham) 7288; (Montreal barracks) 7407; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station C) 7422; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (St. John's military) 7440; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Humboldt) 8586; (Maple Creek) 8601; (Medicine Hat) 8601; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601, 8602; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12114 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143 (vii).

Quarantine (Public health) 5505 (iii).

Railways—Generally (extra clerks) 10342 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10188; (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10358 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi).

Senate—(salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Supply, Conc., 5499 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2864 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Torrens Land Title Fund, (remarks) 10917 (vi).

Trent Canal, Newmarket (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) 6122 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for copies, 2177 (ii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10536 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9655 (v).

——— Clements, W. H. P., Apptmt. as Legal Adviser, O.Cs., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5659 (iii).

Yukon—Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for, 10623, 10689, 11016 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8483 (v).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

——— Successor to Dr. Brine, &c. (Ques.) 1735 (i).

Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

——— O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ques.) 8184 (iv).

Doyle, P., Immigration Agents, Superannuation of (Ques.) 6923 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Captains' Residences, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3241 (ii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).

I.C.R., Compensation *re* Horses Killed at Truro (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees, Increased Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

——— Ice Contract (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax to Sydney Division, &c. (Ques.) 12773 (vii).

——— Pictou Branch, Answer to Question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10789 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 10734 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ques.) 12052 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ques.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Ry. Station, Sanitary Condition, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Militia, Apptmts. of Generals, Names and Qualifications (Ques.) 5086 (iii).

Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 11298 (vi).

Pictou P. O. Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 10518 (vi).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ques.) 9271 (v).

Ry. Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10012 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174 (vii).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v).

Dom. Lands (Rocky Mountain Park) 9991 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7117; (Halifax, customs) 7161; (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Henri) 7439; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Pictou) 5559; (rolling stock) 5551 (iii); (salaries) 10180 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Tatamagouche, Dredging, Pets.. *re* (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 9711 (v).

Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, Payments *re* (Ques.) 7204 (iv).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Westville, N.S., Public Buildings, Total Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Address, The, 383 (i).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4297 (iii).

Brass, Quantity and Quality of Imports into Can. (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10104 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).

Cypress Hills Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8387 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11143; in Com., 11183, 11489, 11531 (vi).

Doukohobors Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9958 (v).

Fence Post Fees, Memorial from Union of Man. Municipalities, &c. (Ques.) 10258 (v).

Grain Commission, Emplymt. of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

——— Report (Ques.) 180 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Grain Commission Report, Inqiury for, 609 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13048, 13209 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Heath Point, Purchase of Cement from A. E. Walberg, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10495 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).

Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13050 (vii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12811 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Obstructions *re* Supply, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9932 (v).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

St. Laurent Harbour, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).

Seed Grain for Man. Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1357 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2930 (ii).

Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c (Ques.) 567, 891 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii)

Supply (seed grain) B. 96, in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi), 12890; (fumigating stations) 12881; (seeds) 12891 (vii); (seed branch) 5503 (iii).

Customs — Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577; (salaries) 9571 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10051 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9880; (agents in U. S.) 9964; (deportations) 9882; (hospitals, Winnipeg) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9950 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12729 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5760 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4212 (ii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2771 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8521; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8539; (Selkirk) 8547 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11011; (rents, &c.) 10983 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140; (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10199 (v).

Swamp Lands in Manitoba, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake, Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ques.) 693 (i).
——— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for, 1906-7 (Ques.) 892 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Turriff) 11307 (vi).
———on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ques.) 3843 (ii).
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 568 (i).

STEWART, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Alexander, Mrs. Mary, Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13572 (vii).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to, *re* Govt. Inspections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
British-Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).
Cannon, Mrs. Catherine Ann, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10728; on M. for 2°, 11350; in Com., 11354, 11567 (vi), 12189 (vii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Stewart) 6813 (iv).
General Chemical Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 9126 (v).

STEWART, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 891; 2° m., 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12070 (vii).
Paulding, Mrs. Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief (B. 176) 1°*, 9126 (v).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Alberta Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 891 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12481 (vii).
Campaign Literature (French) sent by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).
Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Ques. of Order, 7598 (iv).
Civil Service System, Ques. of Order, Member reading speech, 9175 (v).
Documents quoted by Ministers, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4575 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13255 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266 (vii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Approval, and Imp. Treaty (Ques.) 12655 (vii).
French Language Pet. *re*, Ques. of Order, 8887 (v).
German Development Co., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 1741 (i).
G.T.P. Construction, Accidents *re* (remarks) 6850 (iv).
Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4459 (iii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolishing of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Obstruction Tactics, Ques. of Order, 9223 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers, 4221 (iii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc. in Rep., 13366 (vii).
——— Rep., Ques. of Order, 13402 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10579 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4042 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1902 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1090 (i).
Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10899; Ont. (Kingston) 10912 (vi); Ottawa (museum) 1502 (i); Que. (Knowlton) 7293; (Levis) 7296; (Montreal, post office) 7413 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (ques. of priv.) 3578 (ii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 9250 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Accounts, Sums, &c., remaining unpaid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., History of Northern Cruise, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bate & Co. and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4390; in Com., 4519 (iii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Boiler Inspections, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act by Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Service, Connections, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— (remarks) 432 (i).
——— Charges against Ry. Commission, 1429 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'
Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).
Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10517 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vii).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 13203 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367, 11558 (vi), 12184 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5909 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5626 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Ry. Bridge (remarks) 11120 (vi).
Cowie, F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5649 (iii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' &c.
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1, 1908 (Ques.) 10791 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8900 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).
Doukhobors, Letter *re* Manner of Living at Yorkton (read) 5751 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6794 (iv).
——— Quebec Harbour (remarks) 7100, 7104 (iv).
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of accepting Apptmt. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication of Apptmt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 5086 (iii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Payments to *re* Bookkeeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3999 (iii).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13468 (vii).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1510 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
——— File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7782 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4832 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5659 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 899 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1860 (i).
Gananoque Lights and Buoys, Apptmt. of Keeper, &c. (Ques.) 8383 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6266 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
See 'Cowie.'

G. T. Ry., Connections at Brockville (Ques. of Privilege) 9 (i).
See 'Brockville.'

G.T.R. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2222 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimates *re* Cost (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ties purchased in U. S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

——— Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Branch, Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 935 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Retraction of Remarks by Fin. Min., 5784 (iii).

House of Commons, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi).

——— Rules for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 594 (i).
See 'Postal.'

'Hurona'-'Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 358 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).

Lacas, E., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979, 1039 (i).

Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Judgments undelivered, Action of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (remarks) 10791 (vi).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt. in Geodetic Survey (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8441 (v).
See 'Govt. Steamers.'

Montreal 'Gazette' Building, Amount paid for, &c. (Ques.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9499 (v).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9919 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10333 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal (remarks) 10123 (v).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, Appeal to the Chair *re* Chairman's Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, &c., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 6464, 7107 (iv).

Postal Service, H. of C., Delays, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) in Com. on Res., 12409 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3122 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3387 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii).

Ry. Connections: *See* 'Brockville,' &c.

Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 10301 (vi).

——— Emplymt. in Quebec Provincial Elections, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Su,., 10986 (vi).

Returns, Inqiury for, 2738 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf Dredging, &c. (remarks) 6462 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number in Use in Canada, Total &c. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Provisions *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3010 (ii)

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2780 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904, 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1366 (i).

Senate, Cost of, Outside of Indemnities (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Sorel Irregularities, Final Rep. (remarks) 10795 (vi).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition of Services (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3782 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* Wreck Investigations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture, &c. (dairying, &c.) 10397; (exhibitions) 10570; (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii).

Canals (statistical branch) 10320 (vi).

Canals—Trent (construction) 12225; (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).

Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1885 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 621 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 978; Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9223, 9253; Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540 (v).

Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5751 (iii).

Justice (Penitentiaries) 12265 (vii).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773, 5780 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4755 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1894 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); (observatories) 12262 (vii); (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Militia (pay and allowance) 12147; (properties) 12148; (Quebec cliffs) 12148; (salaries and wages) 12147; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 1049 (i), 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2968; (wrecks) 3150 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5530; (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891; (experimental farms, repairs, &c.) 10904 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7116; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax, customs) 7166; (Shelburne) 7174; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7465; (Dom. renewals) 7482; (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Renfrew) 7826 (iv); (R.M.C. Barracks) 10907 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi); (mint) 1451; (observatory) 1450 (i); (rents, &c.) 10986 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Farnham) 7288; (Knowlton) 7291; (Lachute) 7293; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11689 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Breton Cove) 11224; (Cape St. Mary) 11224; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Digby) 11227; (Glace Bay) 11228; (Hall's breakwater) 11228; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Port Hood) 11278; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Stanley Island wharf) 5720; (Tilbin) 5711 (iii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 11293 (vi).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 11118 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10391 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 12238 (vii); (private car of N.T.R.) 10186; (supplies) 10195 (v); (Truro) 12232 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10389 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 12262 (vii).

Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Marine Dept., Minister's, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

—— *re* Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

—— (M. for copies) 5800 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6135 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P., *Grey, N.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5102 (iii).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2459 (ii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1732 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Registrar of Grey County, 11302 (vi).

Returning Officers in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12109 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolutions from Moral Reform Associations (remarks) 11302 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Victoria City, B.C.*

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3868 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5473 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5787 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6213 (iii).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10750 (vi).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Cirkel, Franz., Remuneration *re* Report of Geological Survey *re* Graphites (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7202 (iv). *See* 'Graphite,' &c.

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ans.) 515 (i).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Cosgrove, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Dowling, Dr., Leave of Absence from Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

——— Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5206 (iii).

Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10792 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Geological Survey Dept., Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908 (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

——— Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Geological Survey Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11232 (vi).

Gooderham & Worts, Distiller, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5081 (iii).
See 'Cirkel,' &c.

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. by Excise Dept (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 6142 (iii); in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

———Seizures in Cornwall, Toronto, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

——— Violations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* (Ans.) 6639 (iv).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Accountants, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4109 (ii).

Medicine Patent Bill, *re* Apptmts. to Com. (remarks) 10689 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Criticism of, in Press (Ans.) 6056 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 146) Res. prop., 4963 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2° m., 10551; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 10553 (vi); in Com., 12622 (vii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl Legislation *re* (Ans.) 356, 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Peat Deposits in Canada, Development of (Ans.) 515 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Port Hope Inland Rev. Collectorship, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 895 (i).

Sugar Manufacture, Saccharine Standards, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Excise (inspectors' salaries) 813; Inland Revenue (salaries) 645, 646; Mines (salaries) 646 (i).

Excise (customs duty) 817; (distilleries) 814; (methylated spirits) 820; (provisional allowances) 818; (tobacco stamps) 816; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 814 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (oil borings) 13162; (specimens) 12261; (technical officers) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4109 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874; (Victoria, immigration) 10874 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3298 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act (Ans.) 179 (i).

—— Infractions of Inland Revenue Act, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9523 (v).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9240 (v).

Tobacco Manufactures, Total Amount of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 363 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 920 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10277 (v).

Windsor Ferry, Expiration of Franchise (Ans.) 1940 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4281 (iii).

Budget, The, 5405 (iii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 757 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Mint, Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3954 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3919 (ii).

Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada, Notice of Discussion, 3172 (ii).

Yukon—Finnie-Perron Case, Information *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

—— (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon, Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).

—— Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Mail Service, Nontransmissable, &c. (remarks) 5136 (iii).

—— Money Transmission, Rates *re* (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

THOMPSON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Yukon, Morality, Correspondence, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

TISDALE, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) in Com., 9962 (v).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4444 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1027 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12792 (vii).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4821 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Nicolet, Govt. Expenditure, for 1878-1896; 1896-1908 (Ques.) 12775 (vii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134) 1°*, 5649 (iii).

Blackhall, Mrs. Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1730 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater (remarks) 7110 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4920 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9795 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia, E.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11357 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11170, 11418, 11533, 11947 (vi).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6373 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13135 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals, 1927 (i).

Ry. Act (construction) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91 (i); Discussion *re*, 3404; 2° m., 3406 (ii).

—— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3359 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Timber Leases, Denial of Stmnt. of Mr. Ames, 8697 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4233 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3765, 3831 (ii); in Com., 12605 (vii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8595 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2290 (ii).

—— Opening of Tenders, Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster, 11303 (vi).

—— Papers used in Debate, on Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).

—— Par. in 'Toronto News,' Ques of Priv., 5077 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4562 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Immigration Agents in Italy, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).

Immigration Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

Montreal P. O. Building, Settlement of Strike (remarks) 8608 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., and Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 803 (i).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 97) 1° m., 3157 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2214 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3537 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschene, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Brockville Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Desaulniers, Mr. Gonsalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ques.) 1121, 1290 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

International Boundary Line, Representations *re* Buildings on (Ques.) 356 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4933 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13381 (vii).

St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

—— Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

—— Rep. of Engineer (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12898 (vii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dundee) 7286 (iv).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of (Ques.) 9270 (v).

WARD, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, &c., Cor., &c, (M. for copy) 3466 (ii).

WARD, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

Blunden, Frederick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12992 (vii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 5211 (iii).

Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 510 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 960 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1028 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission (remarks) 7387 (iv).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmt. of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8860 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3832 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (damages) 10308 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9704 (v).

Militia (customs dues) 12156; (pay and allowance) 12147; (provisions) 12151; (R. M. College) 12153 (vii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8529 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Hope) 12135 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10339 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2520, 2652 (ii).

WATSON, Mr. R. J., *Parry Sound.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1982 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, N.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report *re* (Ques.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

—— on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1970 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10314 (vi).

—— Rep. *re* Surveys (remarks) 11827 (vi).

G.T.P., Supplies, Contract *re* District No. 3, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

McInnes, W. B., Inquiry for Ret., 6061 (iii).

Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

—— Payment *re* Painting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Petawawa Dock, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10716 (vi).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4205 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5742 (iii); (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works — Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10901 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petawawa) 12134 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

——Tenders, Original Documents (M for ret.) 2983 (ii).

WILMOT, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

G.T.P., Nationality of Messrs. Foley, Welsh & Stewart, Discrimination against Canadians (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Immigration Agents in N. B., Apptmt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Live Stock, N. B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Office, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

N.B. Inland Waters, Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (iii).

Scotch Town, N.B., Wharf, Application (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Budget, The, 6610 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4500 (iii).

British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

Budget, The, 6082 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11353; in Com., 11365, 11661; (amt.) 11930 (vi).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5016 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13260; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3625 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

Governor General's Expenditure since 1892 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrant Detention Hospitals, Amount expended (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Agent M. C. Dunne, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agent Miller, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses (Ques.) 180 (i).

Immigrant Agents in G. B., Names, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

——— Reps. received from (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

——— Agents in Ont., &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

——— Special Agents in G. B., Salaries, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2398 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3300 (ii).

Immigration and Commercial Agents, Rets., Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re* (M. for copies*) 2171 (ii).

I.C.R., Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11240; in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 806 (i).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10709 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 984; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8880 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10878; (Victoria, immigration) 10878 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11007 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6186 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Cavalry Brigade Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Church of England Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society, incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Customs Duty on Militia Uniforms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2584 (ii).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* Building (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 1125 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, 5th Regiment, B.C., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ques.) 8442 9273 (v).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, Proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3167 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1290 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ques.) 7992 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

Rifles, Purchase of from other Cos. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

Ross Rifle Co., Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 6235, 8176 (iv), 8442 (v).

——— (M. for copy*) 5476 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Bonus Loans, Service of Govt. Employees, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

——— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

——— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).

——— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts, Inquiry for Rep., 5914 (iii).

——— Imp. Govt., Cor. with *re* Defects, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5210 (iii).

——— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Dept. of Militia, 8902; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 8953; Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).

——— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

——— Military Associations, &c., Rep. from, *re* Efficiency (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— Number reported unfit for Use (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

——— Payments for since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9333 (v).

——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).

——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ques.) 365 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Target Practice, Suspension by N.W.M. Police (Ques.) 3817 (ii).

——— Tests in England, Reps. *re* (remarks) 8170 (iv).

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Sutherland Rifle Sight, Contract *re* Additional Number (Ques.) 5257 (iii).

——— Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).

——— Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9567 (v); Marine (ice-breakers) 1897 (i).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. (Ques.) 356 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. A. A., *Renfrew, S.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5131 (iii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5228 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment (prop. Res.) 584 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4646 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii); Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10695 (vi).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Address, The, 396 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5108 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8271 (iv), 11716; in Com., 11869 (vi), 12935 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3613 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2018 (i).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11057 (vi).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation of Mrs. A. M. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10849 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753; N.B. (salaries) 12738; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4175 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10875; (Victoria, immigration) 10875 (vi); Ont. (Glencoe) 7491 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ZIMMERMAN, Mr. A., *Hamilton, W.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6179 (iii).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ques.) 6924 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3612 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4333 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

—— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12558 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3745 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7228; on M. for 3°, 7216 (iv).

Militia Uniforms, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9569 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 664 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9569 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1901 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii), 10294 (v).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10902 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v); Ont. (Owen Sound) 7818 (iv); Ottawa (mint) 1472 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS.

Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).

——— remaining unpaid by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Employmt. of Political Officials: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3292 (ii).

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5798 (iii).

Address The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Hall) 9; seconded (Mr. Lanctot) 17.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Foster) 66; (Mr. Fielding) 94; (Mr. Cockshutt) 123, (amt.) 147; Neg. (Y. 95; N. 56)274; (Mr. Miller) 148; (Mr. Clements) 194; (Mr. Fisher) 213; (Mr. Lewis) 242; (Mr. Clarke) 254; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 263; (Mr. W. Roche) 267; (Mr. Barr) 276; (Mr. Lalor) 292; (Mr. Elson) 304; (Mr. Crawford) 316; (Mr. Armstrong) 335, 366, (amt.) 380; (Neg. Y. 54; N. 103) 505; (Mr.. J. J. Hughes) 380; (Mr. Staples) 383; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 396; (Mr. Geo. Smith) 407; (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 412; (Mr. A. A. McLean) 420; (Mr. Kemp) 434; (Mr. W McIntyre) 445; (Mr. Perley) 449; (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 455; (Mr. Lake) 459; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 476; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 485; (Mr. Paquet) 505; (Mr. Barker) 519, (amt.) 530; (Neg. Y. 50; N. 96) 552; (Mr. Fielding) 531; (Mr. Monk) 535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 544; (Mr. Haggart) 548 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 554 (i).

Administrative Buildings, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Admiralty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4402 (iii).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amts. paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 936 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

See 'Tenders,' &c.

Agricultural Committee, 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Mackenzie) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Minister O'Halloran's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12878 (vii).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645, 671 (i), 10569 (vi), 12879 (vii).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).

——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Cable *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).

Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importation from U. S., from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).

Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).

Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
——— Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
——— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
——— in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c: (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
Hogs slaughtered, Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 1506 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
See 'Marine.'
Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192'
Alberta Development Co., Control of Coal Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3037 (ii).
Alberta Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Alberton Fire Damage Claims: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. Lefurgey) 1209 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry: prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3853 (ii).
Alexander, Mary, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
See 'I. C. R.'
Alien Act: *See* B. No. 130.'
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians: Pet. (Mr. Boyce) read in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
All-Red Line: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12414; Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 108; N. 48) 12499 (vii).
——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10253 (v).
——— Negotiations, Canadian Representative in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 353 (i).
——— Omission of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28 (i).
——— Route, Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 948 (i).
——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 947 (i).
All-Red Route, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 87 (i).
——— Remarks *re* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12162 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 366 (i).
——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6160 (iv).
——— Mr. White's Duties in England: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 694 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 608 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).

Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 8439 (v).
Anglo-American Treaty, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i), 6985 (iv).
——— Further Information: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7447, 7834 (iv).
——— Information *re* Presenting (Mr. R. L. 8516 (v).
——— Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9715 (v).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 10120 (v).
——— Treaty submitted to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6926 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Anglo-Canadian Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).
——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by Imperial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11705 (vi).
See 'Franco-Canadian.'
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.; M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 594 (i).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Anuities by Govt. for Old Age: *See* 'B. No. 120.' *See* 'Old Age,' &c.
Anse à la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Anse St. Jean Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Anthracite Coal, Qantity imported from U. S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salary of Judge: M. to withdraw Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 7992 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 353 (i).
Apples, &c., Marking of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Architects of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Architectural Institute of Canada: M. (Mr. Ethier) to Refund Fees, 11234, 11404 (vi).
Architects on Public Works Payments, &c.: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Architectural Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6057 (iii).
Archives Fittings, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 671 (i).
'Arctic, Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Army and Navy Veterans at the Tercentenary: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448 (iv).
See 'Que. Tercentenary.'
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Arthabaskaville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Artz, J. G., Apptmt. of. Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13578 (vii).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment: Notice of Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4221; M. 4314 (iii).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Immigration Act.'
Asiatic Labour in B.C., Rep. in Victoria 'Times': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Assaults on Women, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13573 (vii).
Assurance Fund of Saskn. and Alta.: *See* B. No. 168.'
Astronomical Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9737 (v).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1450, 1485 (i).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Atlantic Steamers, Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Aud. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Vol. i): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Auditor General's Salary: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
See 'Banks,' 'Finance,' &c.
Australia, G. B. and Canada Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
See 'Can. and Australia.'
Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2218
Australian Representative from Can. in 1901, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 2168 (ii).
Automobiles injuring Persons: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Autonomy Act, Validity of: Return, Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Co., N.B., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).
——— Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
See 'Cold Storage,' 'New Brunswick,' &c.
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
Balsam Lake and Gull River, Ret. Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
See 'Canals, Trent.
Bank Act, (additional circulation), Amt. *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banks, Govt. Assistance *re* Grain Blockade: *See* 'No. 159.'
Bank of Hamilton, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Banking System: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (iii).
See 'Can. Bank of Commerce.'
Bank of Vancouver: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Bank of Winnipeg: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure, Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223 (vi).
Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5205 (iii).
——— Survey *re* Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5473 (iii).
——— Payments *re* Survey of Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5787 (iii).
Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Amts. paid to *re* Supplies: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3234 (ii).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battlefields: *See* 'Can. Patriotic,' &c.
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 219.'
Battlefields: *See* 'Quebec.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bayfield, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
See 'Grand Bend,' &c.
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bear River Station Dwelling House, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2161 (ii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
——— Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Employment of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).

——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).

——— Water Power, New Lease, Copy of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).

Beaver Harbour Wharf: Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090, 13344 (vii).

Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).

——— Dredging, Commencement of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7212 (iv).

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).

——— Sir C. H. Tupper's Travelling Expenses: Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

Belgian Syndicate, Royal Commission, and Chap. 138, R.S.C., Judges as Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).

Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).

Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).

Belleville Floods, Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 3319 (ii), 4744 (iii).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6237 (iv).

——— Total Revenue, Expenditure for 1903-7: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2592 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 2983 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4408 (iii).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).

———M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 5211 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 7506 (iv).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co. Bill, on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 681 (i).

Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
See 'Brantford.'

Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, Use of by R. C. Clergy: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 12411 (vii).

Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).

——— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).

Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'

Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 13587 (vii).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier)
1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 90 (i); 2°m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 91; 2°, 570; in Com., 583; 3°*, 583 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 91 (i); 2°m., 3406 (ii).

Bill (No. 5) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 92; 2°m., (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii); 2°m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°, 93; 2°m., 938 (i), 3320, 3363 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To incorporate the North Empire Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 8) Respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting Surveys of Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such surveys (Mr. Oliver).
1° 231; 2° and in Com., 754, 948; 3°*, 953 (i), Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Bill (No. 10) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 231; 2°, 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); wthdn., 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, S. York).
1°, 231 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Maclean, Lunenburg).
1°, 313 (i); 2°, 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McColl).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*; 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., 1894; 3°, 1929 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McCarthy, N. Simcoe).
1°, 349 (i); 2°m., 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Kennedy).
1°, 350; 2°, 938 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Bole).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680 (i); in Com., 2787; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Porter).
1°*, 430; 2°m., 681, 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 9066 (iv).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1894 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 2788; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226; M. to ref. back to Com., 3228; in Com., 3362, 3621, 3692, 3793 (ii), 4224; 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)
1°, 430 (i); 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246; 3°*, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 508; 2°, 939; in Com., 940 (i); 3°*,3014 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 508 (i); 2°, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Ethier).
1°, 560 (i).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Sinclair).
1°*, 562 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 606; 2° m., 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4582 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779; in Com., 1894; 3°*, 1931 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).
1°*, 753; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5174 (iii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*,754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059; in Com., and 3°*, 1895 (i).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227; 3°*, 6231 (iv).

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6184 (iii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 827; 2°, 1741 (i).

Bill (No. 43) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 891; 2°, 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230; 3°*, 4230 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5109; 3° m., 5519 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 4231; 3°*, 4231; Sen. Amts., 5785 (iii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting a Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud.—(Mr. Gordon).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5762 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 1108; 2°, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 1207; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting a certain Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 941; in Com. on Res., 1213; 1° m., 1215, 1384 (i); 2°, 2221, 3493; in Com., 3577, 3581, 3636 (ii); 3° m., 4317, 4372 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Chartered Bank of British Columbia.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 61) Respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—(Mr. Osler).

1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Porter).

1°, 1283 (i); on order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1284 (i).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Borden).

1°, 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577; 3°*, 4579 (iii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3194 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'the Standard Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. Maclean, South York).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Power).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

Bill (No. 75) To incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Worthington).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2790 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—(Mr. C. Marcil).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1668 (i).

Bill (No. 79) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Assaults on Women and Children.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1670 (i).

Bill (No. 80) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Alcorn).

1°, 1671 (i); 2°, 5228 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4231; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Adamson).

1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4996, 5049; 3°*, 5077 (iii); Sen. Amts., 10511 (vi).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford).

1°*, 1732 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) To incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1859 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

Bill (No. 86) To incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. Caron).

1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).

1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2346 (ii); in Com., 4545; 3°*, 4545; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—(Mr. Walsh, Montreal, Ste. Anne).

1°*, 2214; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953; 3°*, 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) To authorize the Sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of a portion of Major's Hill Park, in the City of Ottawa, as a Hotel Site.—(Mr. Pugsley).

Res. prop., 1584 (i), 2221; in Com. on Res., 2258; 1°*, 2260 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 12061; 3°*, 12084 (vii).

Bill (No. 90) To amend the Passenger Ticket Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°,2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Act respecting the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2542 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to the Speedy Trial of Indictable Offences.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2543 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) To amend the Criminal Code and punish homicide while hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2590 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 2780; 1°, 2°, and in Com., 2782; 3°*, 2785 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to conspiracy in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2976 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the hours of labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).

1°, 3157 (ii).

Bill (No. 98, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Blain).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4671; 3°*, 4674 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).

1°*, 3316 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 3477 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223; 3°*, 6225 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 102) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 3477; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5492; 3°, 5495 (iii).

Bill (No. 105) To regulate the placing and maintaining of Booms in International Streams.—(Mr. Pugsley).

1°, 3654 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 3655 (ii).

Bill (No. 107 from the Senate) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 5386; 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 108 from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 3316; in Com. on Res., 3756, 3805; 1°* of B., 3834 (ii); Res. prop., 11938; in Com on Res., 12595; 2°, and in Com., 12595, 13047; 3°, 13207; Sen. Amts., 13524 (vii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidore Frank.—(Mr. Béland).

1°*, 3896 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4996 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Canadian Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 3579; in Com. on Res., 3901; 1°, 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4529 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Railway Act as respects the Constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1°*, 3933 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510; 3°*, 8514 (v).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4221 (iii); 2° m., 6517; in Com., 6518; 3°*, 6520 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°, 4312 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 115) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835, 7939, 7998; on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8076, 8089, 8138, 8185 (iv), 8296, 8332, 8387, 8619 (v), 11707; Amt. wthdrn., and in Com., 11796; in Com., 11827, 11885 (vi), 12919, 12984; 3° m., 13229; 3°*, 13258; Sen. Amts., 13579 (vii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4576 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8501; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4576; 2°, and in Com., 4994; 3°*, 4995 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4658 (iii); 2°, 10625; in Com., 10636, 10658; 3° m., 10777, 11124, 11590; ref. back to Com., 11633; 3°*, 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 119) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4314; in Com. on Res., 4675; 1°*, 4689 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6911 (iv); in Com., 10761; 3°*, 10771; Sen. Amts., 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 120) To authorize the Issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 4689; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 10848 (vi), 12053; 3°*, 12054; Sen. Amts., 13316 (vii).

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4826; 2°, and in Com., 5497; 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To make better Provision for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°*, 4867 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, and in Com., 5495; 3°*, 5497 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) For the relief of Andrew Walker.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 5336; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°*, 5256; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231; 3°*, 6231 (iv); Sen. Amts., 12773 (vii).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225; 3°*, 6227 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°*, 5256 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 11990 (vi); 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv); 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) To incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) To amend the Boards of Trade Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 5337 (iii); 2°, 11987; in Com., 11987 (vi), 12393; 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil).

1°*, 5649; 2°, 5763; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5657 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6429; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1908, and the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 5919, 5955; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9069; 3°*, 9070 (v).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 5913; 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141; 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°*, 5993 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6054; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 7724; 3°*, 7724 (iv).

Bill (No. 142) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6054 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6520; 3°*, 6523 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 5161; in Com. on Res., 6118; 1°*, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6523; 3°*, 6525 (iv).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 3493; in Com. on Res., 6161, 6191; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6408; 3°*, 6429 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 4963; in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2°, 10551 (vi); in Com., 12622; 3°*, 12628 (vii).

Bill (No. 147) To repeal the Canned Goods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6870; 3°*, 6890 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, 6900; in Com., 6900 (iv), 10553; 3°*, 10569 (vi).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6890; 3° m., 7215; ref. back to Com., 7227; 3°*, 7257 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518; 3°*, 10526 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Crawford).

1°*, 6287; 2°, 6561; in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 8741, 9066, 9377, 9461; 3°*, 9472 (v).

Bill (No. 152) Respecting Signal Dues at Halifax.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6457 (iv); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9166; 3° m., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7669 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 157) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 6843 (iv).

Bill (No. 158) Respecting Meaford Harbour.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 7195 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8510; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 159) Respecting a certain Issue of Dominion Notes.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10795; 3°*, 10848 (vi).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, 10919; in Com., 10933; 3°*, 10952 (vi).

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Beauparlant).

1°, 7307 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 7931 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10703; 3°*, 10716 (vi); Sen. Amts., 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 163) To authorize the exchange of certain School Lands for other Dominion Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478; 3°*, 8480 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1°, 8466 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10862; 3°*, 10863 (vi).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act in so far as the same affects the Province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 8604 (v); 2°, 10690; in Com., 10691; 3°*, 10693 (vi).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 8603; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 168) To authorize the payment to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480; 1°*, 8481 (v); 2°, 10525; in Com., 10526; 3°*, 10528 (vi).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8604 (v); 2°, 10528; in Com., 10529; 3°, 10545; Sen. Amts., 11634 (vi).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) Respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool).

1°*, 8694; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Government Guaranteed Bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 8835 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10771; 3°*, 10777 (vi).

Bill (No. 172) To incorporate the Dominion Power Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 9021; 2°*, 9168 (v).

Bill (No. 173) To restrain the Use of Tobacco by Young Persons.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 9021 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Alexander.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°* 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Relating to the Water-Carriage of Goods.—(Mr Johnston).

1°*, 9330 (v); M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 9330; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 11460 (vi).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

1°*, 9330; in Com., 9962; 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 181) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9333 (v); 2°, 11125; in Com., 11158, 11408, 11460, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi), 12394; 3°*, 12399; Sen. Amts., 13522 (vii).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Hattie Spratte.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 9889; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 10119 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12851, 13052; 3°*, 13223 (vii).

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10008 (v); 2°, 10545; in Com., 10546, 10743, 11020; 3°*, 11022 (vi).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 186) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 10510; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2° m., 13506; in Com., 13507; 3°*, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12559, 13207; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 189) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 11300; in Com. on Res., 11351; 1°, 10717; 2°, 11315; in Com., 11362, 11535, 11634 (vi), 12163; 3°*, 12189; Sen. Amts., 13520 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting Juvenile Delinquents.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399; 3°* 12406 (vii).

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 10952; in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°* of B., 10953; 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; 3°, 12054 (vii).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).

1°*, 11120; 2°*, 11460 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12594 (vii).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Timber Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 11120 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12408; 3°*, 12408 (vii).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson).

Res. prop., 11233; in Com. on Res., 11312; 1°* of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate) To incorporate the Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman).

1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur James Townsend.—(Mr. Copp).

1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Sale and Marking of Manufactures of Gold and Silver, and Gold and Silver Plated Ware.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12554; 3°*, 12559 (vii).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of William B. Smith.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 12393; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 199) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12406; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°, and in Com., 12644; 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 201) To assist in maintaining an Independent and Efficient service of Telegraphic news from Great Britain for Publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12408; 2°, 12644, 12837; in Com., 12848; 3°*, 12851 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To authorize the Construction of a Branch Line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris Branch to Elmira.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 1°* of B., 12409; 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631; 3°*, 12643 (vii).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 12594; 2°, and in Com., 13048, 13208; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 204) To amend chapter 38 of the Statutes of 1907, in amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 12549; 2°, and in Com., 13046; 3°*, 13047 (vii).

Bill (No. 205) To Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Opium for other than Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. Lemieux).

Res. prop., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 1°* of B., 12551; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12851; Sen. Amts., 13523 (vii).

Bill (No. 206) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1°* of B., 12554; 2°, and in Com., 13048; 3°*, 13051 (vii).

Bill (No. 207, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 12649; 2°, 12649; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 208) Respecting the office of the Auditor General.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12644; 1°* of B., 12645; 2°, and in Com., 12645; 3°*, 12645 (vii).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12645; 1°* of B., 12649; 2°, and in Com., 13053; 3°*, 13207 (vii).

Bill (No. 210) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 12650; 2°, and in Com., 13051; 3°*, 13052 (vii).

Bill (No. 211) To amend the Act of the present session intituled 'An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 2°*, 12773; in Com., and 3°*, 13224 (vii).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Criminal Code, and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 12919; 2°, and in Com., 13316; 3°*, 13320 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) Respecting Aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13066; M. for Com. on Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1°* of B., 13282; 2°, and in Com., 13419; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 214) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13069; in Com. on Res., 13282; 1°* of B., 13285; 2°, and in Com., 13420; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 215) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the Lines of Railway therein mentioned. —(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13071; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1°* of B., 13315; 2°, and in Com., 13478; 3°*, 13490 (vii).

Bill (No. 216) Respecting the Canadian Patriotic Funds Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

1°*, 2°, and in Com., 13320; 3°*, 13321 (vii).

Bill (No. 217) Respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; 1°* of B., 13417; 2°, and in Com., 13491; 3°*, 13493 (vii).

Bill (No. 218) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Ordnance Lands in the Cities of Toronto and Montreal.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 13226; in Com. on Res., 13417; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13418; 3°*, 13419 (vii).

Bill (No. 219) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°, 13495; 2°, and in Com., 13501; 3°*, 13506 (vii).

Bill (No. 220) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; in Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13579; 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Binder Twine Bounty, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

Binder Twine in Kingston Penitentiary, Sale and Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P. O. Addresses: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9715 (v).

——— Seizures, and Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blackhalls Estate, Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Blairmore Townsite: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Clements) 6465 (iv).

Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 241 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 432 (i).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902

——— Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

See 'Canals—Trent.'

Boiler Inspection Insurance Co., Payments to Mr. R. Stewart: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Boivin, Cote & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12650 (vii).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3230 (ii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Bonusing System *re* Immigration: Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 6288 (iv).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Booms in International Streams: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244, 5083 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 5476 (iii).

Borden, Sir Frederick, and Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'New Brunswick.'

Boundary Delimitations, Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 199.'

Bounties on Lead: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

See 'Lead,' &c.

Bounties, Total Amount paid by Govt since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 895 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1130 (i).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii)
Boyle Concessions, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 631 (i).
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
Brantford Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrests *re* Picketing: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 9027 (v).
——— Cor. with Justie Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 10016 (v).
Brantford Telephone Monument: on Conc., 13567 (vii).
See 'Bell.'
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Rvs.: Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com. on Res., 13310 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
B.C., Chartered Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
B.C., Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
B.C., Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Fishing Licenses issued to Packers' Association: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (v).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
C. P. Telegraphs, Claims of C. P. Ry. *re* Cape Beale Lines: in Com of Sup., 5732(iii).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
British Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204 (iii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3897 (ii).
———Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 3234 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections. Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. House, 186 (i).
——— Connection with C.P.R.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1689 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Brome County, Number of Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 6241 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 686 (i).
Buchanan Townsite, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10079, 10083 (v).
——— Homestead Entry by Mr. Ramsland: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10082 (v).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 5137 (iii).
Debate:—(Mr. Foster) 5260; (Mr. Paterson) 5296; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5314; (Mr. Sifton) 5338; (Mr. Bergeron) 5357; (Mr. Pardee) 5364; (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5375, 5388; (Mr. Thompson) 5405; (Mr. M. S. Schell) 5616, 5957; (Mr. W. Jackson) 5959; (Mr. Armstrong) 6046, 6062; (Mr. Guthrie) 6011; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6097; (Mr. U. Wilson) 6082 (iii); (Mr. Loggie) 6553; (Mr. Mackenzie) 6573; (Mr. Sinclair) 6615; (Mr. Sproule) 6595; (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 6610 (iv).
See 'Financial Review,' &c.

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
Budget Speech: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 519, 559 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 10011 (v).
Buffalo imported for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Park Reserves, Authority for Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Buffalo Herd, Location at Elk Park, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208 (iii).
—— Name of Purchaser: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5795 (iii).
—— Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (ii), 10102 (v).
Buildings B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Buildings, Cost of Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
——Construction of: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Buildings, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
Buildings, Man. and N. W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).
Buildings, Man. and N. W. T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
—— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Burlington Channel, Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
—— Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
—— Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Business of the House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).
—— Precedence *re* Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 430 (i).
—— Precedence on Tuesday: Remarks: (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2982 (ii).
—— Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2939 (ii).
Business of the House, Public Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butler, Mr. M. J., Dep. Min. of Rys., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12755 (vii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2162 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Cabinet Changes: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24; (Mr. Foster) 80; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44 (i).
Cabinet Ministers and Govt. Contracts, &c.: *See* 'Cold Storage,' &c.
Cable Service in St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Calgary P.O., and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).
Calgary Town Sites: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).
Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4769 (iii).
Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Public Works, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 65 (i).
Campaign Literature sent out by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Campbellton, Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v)
—— I.C.R. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
——Tenders *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
—— Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 941 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada and China, Japan, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12391
See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Germany Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13081 (vii).
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'Bill No. 187.'
Canada Temperance Act: M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13493 (vii).
Canada Weather Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subventions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5080 (iii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Can. Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111, 219.'
Canadian Battlefields: *See* 'Battlefields,' &c.
Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Canadian Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'
Canadians entering U. S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2738; Letter of Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries: Read, 2739 (ii).
Canadian Naturalization and British Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii).
Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 11121 (vi).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ry. Extension, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309, 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 45.'
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
——— Papineauville and Little Nation River Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
——— Plaster Rock Branch Line Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsldy: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vii).
Can. Patriotic Funds Association: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Canadians repatriated from U. S., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Canadian Timber used in Govt. Works: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Canada and U. S., Boundary Treaties: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7834 (iv).
——— Trade Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i).
See 'Anglo-American.'
CANALS—
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
——— Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Extra Remuneration: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).
——— Generally, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10325 (vi).
——— Remuneration *re* Sunday Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
——— list of officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
See main heading.
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613, 9476 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canal, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
——— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
——— Report of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Trent Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Bobcaygeon Dam, Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
——— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
——— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
——— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
———Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
———ret. incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
——— Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
——— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Newmarket Canal Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
———Newmarket Canal Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi), 12225 (vii).
——— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
——— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Contract Power Co., Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
———Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
———Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
———Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
——— Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (iii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Resignation of John R. Scott: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6058 (iii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3846 (ii).
———Cor. *re* Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 557 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Canned Goods Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Cannon, Catherine Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6646 (iv).
——— Successor to Dr. Brine: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 1735 (i).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3236 (ii).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
'Carlotta G. Fox,' Schr., Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10517 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6641 (iv).
Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).
'Catharine C.,' Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5727 (iii).
Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in Senate: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 5047 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).
———inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
———Cable, *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Armstrong) 13081 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S. during 1900-7, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1507 (i).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).
Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Cattle registered, Importation from U.S. from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).
Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Cement Testing Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 11078 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 11206, 11250 (vi).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Census Map, Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4406 (iii).

Census (complete) of the N. W. Provs., Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3422 (ii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 12651 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5652 (iii).
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 11495 (vi).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Charlotttown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
Charlottetown Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5655 (iii).
Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 517 (i).
—— Specifications, &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3241 (ii).
Chartered Bank of B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Charwomen, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Cheese Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
—— Public Works, Expenditures, &c: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 8894, 9266 (v), 10515 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 754 (i).
Church of England, Missionary Society, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5087; Amt. (Mr. Macpherson) to adjn. Debate, agreed to (Y. 61; N. 51) 5133 (iii).
—— on M. to resume adjn. debate: Remarks Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5246, 5251 (iii).
Cigarettes, Legislation *re*, Res. of W.C.T.U. of Brampton: Read (Mr. Blain) 7278 (iv).
Cigarettes: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 12390 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
—— Payment *re* Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Rep. of Geological Survey *re* 'Graphites': Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Civil Servants, General Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Civil Service Bill, Correction in 'Hansard' *re* Increases: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11494 (vi).
—— and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
—— Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11124 (vi).
—— Resolutions *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13168 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5723 (iii).
——— Govtl. Action, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr R. L. Borden) 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5491 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 938, 1740 (i), 2787 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Perley) 90 (i).
——— Issue of Commission of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6466 (iv).
——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassel's Powers: (amt.) to Com. of Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7506, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Cassels: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).
——— O.C. to Mr. Justice Cassels *re* Investigations: M. to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
See 'Cassels,' &c.
——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Number distributed: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6060 (iii).
——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5882 (iii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5620 (iii).
——— Translation into French: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 558 (i).
Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Civil Govt.: *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
Civil Service System, Reorganization of: Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9132; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 72) 9218 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) M. to drop, 6242 (iv).
Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
——— Squatters Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'
Clerical and Temporary Clerks, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Office: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Clerk of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Closure Rule: *See* 'Obstruction.'
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8380 (v).
Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in possession of Gov.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 843 (i).
Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5469 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5468 (iii).
——— held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 5476 (iii).
——— Names and Addresses of Agents *re* Applications: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5789 (iii).
Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).
Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9278 (v).
——— Royalty Fees, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11019 (vi).
Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3434 (ii).
Coal Land Leases, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2395 (ii).
Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3480 (ii).
——— Leased by Govt., Names of Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3232 (ii).
——— Leased, Sold or Assigned, since March, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Leases granted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 5087 (iii).
Coal Lands, O.Cs., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10512 (vi).
——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
——— Sale through J. W. Bettes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6242 (iv).

Coal Lands, sold by P. E. Lessard: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
——— Sale by McGivern & Hayden: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Coal Lands in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
——— Section 13, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3851 (ii).
Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12656 (vii).
Coal Mining Privileges in Section 11, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Coal Mine Royalties in Alberta, Sums received: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12391 (vii).
Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10257 (v).
Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5470 (iii).
See 'Shipping,' &c.
Coasting Privileges, Prop. Rys. withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4586 (iii).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6237 (iv).
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
——— Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colchester Election, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notifiation (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier,, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).
Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1685 (i).
——— Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 236 (i).
——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1937 (i).
See 'Butter,' 'Cheese,' 'Brockville,' &c.
Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B. Cold Storage,' &c.
Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6403 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Colonial Conference, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.
——— Travelling Expenses, ref. to in Com. of Sup. on Marine Estimates, 3985 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 998, 1040 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Colonization Lands: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 3752 (ii).
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Commercial Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Guthrie) 5794 (iii).
Commerical Treaty with Italy: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 1295 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).
Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2382 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 2383; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2383 (ii).
Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 507, 560 (i).
——— Sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
See 'Pub. Accts.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3482 (ii).
Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instructions *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
See 'Yukon.'

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Cookshire Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland County: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3841 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 11913 (vi).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2389 (ii).
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident to Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Cotton Strikers, Montreal, Commission Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Court of Appeal, B.C.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cowie, Mr. F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5649 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cowly, and Highwood, Railway Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Credit by False Pretences: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9281 (v).
Criminal Code (assault) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
——— (homicide while hunting) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
——— (injuries by motor vehicles) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
——— (libel) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
——— (offensive weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78.'
——— (speedy trials) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 92.'
——— (trade restraint) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
——— (trading stamps, credit) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Statistics: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Crown Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Crown Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crude Petroleum Bounty: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 7731 (iv)
Customs Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
CUSTOMS:
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Employmt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5203, 5466 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Cotton, Raw, Imports from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).

Customs Dept., Apptmts. and Civil Service Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

——— Criticism of Civil Service Commission: (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 10128 (vi).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

——— Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 10133 (v).

——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9536 (v).

——— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

——— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9226, 9430 (v).

——— Printing, Stationery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).

——— Salaries, Payments of, Speech of Hon. Mr. Paterson, *re* Obstruction: Remarks (Mr. Owen) to Com. of Sup., 9894 (v).

Customs and Excise Revenues from June 1st to 15, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10791 (vi).

Customs Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12655 (vii).

Customs Statistics, and Trade and Commerce Rets., Dupliate Printing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr Foster) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i).

——— Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

——— Ques (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).

——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).

——— Material imported for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4583 (iii).

Detroit River Tunnel and Customs Tariff on Material from U.S.: M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).

——— Explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii). *See* main heading.

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).

——— Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9442 (v).

French Books, Reductions of Customs *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Guarantee Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).

Halifax Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

——— ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).

Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i). *See* main heading.

Man. Customs Collectors, Brokerage Fees charged, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).

Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).

Montreal Customs Frauds, Penalties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Customs Officers, Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6980 (iv).

Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C., *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).

Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Prince Rupert Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Seizures for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cockshutt) 4588 (iii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7730 (iv).
Windsor Customs, Pepin, J. A., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
——Customs Officers, Ages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12655 (vii).
—— Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Cypress Hills Timber Reserve, Preservation of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3841 (ii).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Foster: Read (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8460; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8461 (v).
Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Dairy Products: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204, 5473 (iii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Debates, Official Reports of, Analytical Index: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).
—— Average Price per Column: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3479 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Apptmt. of French Supt. of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Distribution: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3486 (ii).
Debates Committee, Correction of Clerical Error in Res. of House (Mr. Gervais) 824 (i).
—— 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 2590 (ii).
—— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 6979 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep., Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 12504 (vii).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Amt. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to adopt, 13224 (vii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 8835 (v).
—— Conc. without Notice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Monk) *re* conc., 9709, 9889, 10119 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
—— Falling Due, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission, Proceedings *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11205 (vi).
—— St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 13142 (vii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11101 (vi).
Demurrage on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Deptl. Buildings, Mackenzie Avenue: in Com of Sup., 1505 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1121, 1290 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Detroit Tunnel, Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i), 4583 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).

——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).

——— explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii).

See 'International.'

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Grant: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8184 (iv).

Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 6001 (iii).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Diocese of the Synod of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2562 (ii).

Distilleries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).

Divorce of Mary Alexander: *See* 'B. No. 177.'

Divorce of Catherine Ann Cannon: *See* 'B. No. 175.'

Divorce of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell: *See* 'B. No. 139.'

Divorce of Edith May Gilmore: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Divorce of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Divorce of Hattie Spratte: *See* 'B. No. 182.'

Divorce of Arthur James Townsend: *See* 'B. No. 196.'

Divorce of Andrew Walker: *See* 'B. No. 124.'

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).

Dockyards, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).

Documents in Departments, Access to Originals by Members: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1132; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. Oliver) 1133; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1137; (Mr. Foster) 1135; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1140; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1143; (Mr. Sproule) 1147; (Mr. Brodeur) 1140; (Mr. Bennett) 1151; (Mr. Lennox) 1155; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1160; (Mr. Barker) 1162; (Mr. Galliher) 1170; (Mr. D. Ross) 1172; (Mr. Haggart) 1175; (Mr. Devlin) 1177; (Mr. Bergeron) 1180; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1183; (Mr. Northrup) 1190; (Mr. Sproule) 1194; (Mr. Ames) 1195 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of, &c., Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 1617, 1622; Agreed to, 1668 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623; (Mr. Foster) 1628; (Mr. D. Ross) 1632, 1653; (Mr. Oliver) 1636; (Mr. Barker) 1655; (Mr. Northrup) 1658; (Mr. Bristol) 1663; (Mr. Boyce) 1666 (i).

Documents, Original, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1766 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1775; (Mr. Haggart) 1778;; (Mr. Sproule) 1782; (Mr. Lennox) 1786; (Mr. Barker) 1793; (Mr. Bristol) 1797; (Mr. Osler) 1800; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1801; (Mr. Fielding) 1805; (Mr. Lancaster) 1814; (Mr. Perley) 1818; (Mr. Broder) 1825; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1827; (Mr. Northrup) 1830; (amt.) 1839; Neg. (Y. 50· N. 95) 1883; (Mr. Lake) 1839; (Mr. Alcorn) 1843; on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to adjn. debate (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1844; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1847; (Mr. Foster) 1851; (Mr. Crocket) 1861; (Mr. Blain) 1871; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1875; (Mr. Armstrong) 1878 (i).

Documents, Original, Custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7810 (iv).

——— Detention, &c., Par. in Press. Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Clements) 6010 (iii).

——— Examination of by Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3853 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2794 (ii).

——— Production of Originals, Announcement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1425 (i).

——— Production in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1427 (i).

——— Production of on Order from Hse. Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1617; Agreed to, 1667 (i).

——— Production of to Members: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1766 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1927 (i).

——— and Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2305, 2308 (ii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2305 (ii).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).

See 'Halifax.'

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Operation at: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii)

——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).

Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).

See 'Clarke's,' &c.

Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

Dokis Indians Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).

——— Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).

——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).

——— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).

——— Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).

——— Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv), 12154 (vii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3238 (ii).

Dom. Buildings, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).

——— Ont., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).

——— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).

——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Buildings.'

Dom. Coal Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (v). *See* 'Coal,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 2° m., 7835.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 7859; (Mr. Greenway) 7880; (Mr. Alcorn) 7890; (Mr. Bole) 7939; (Mr. Boyce) 7949; (Mr. Conmee) 7982, 7998; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8012; (amt.) 8076; (Mr. Crawford) 8076, 8089; (Mr. Monk) 8116, 8138; (Mr. Devlin) 8143; (Mr. Lake) 8150; (Mr. D. Ross) 8185; (Mr. Schaffner) 8200; (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8242; (Mr. W. Wright) 8271; (Mr. Dugas) 8282 (iv); (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8296 (v); (Mr. Foster) 8321; (Mr. Burrows) 8357; (Mr. Staples) 8387; (Mr. Carvell) 8401; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8423; (Mr. Galliher) 8619; (Mr. Armstrong) 8645; (Mr. Oliver) 8659; (Mr. Bergeron) 8681 (v); (Mr. Miller) 11707; (Mr. Conmee) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11727; (Mr. Boyce) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11739; (Mr. Alcorn) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11753; (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11755 (vi).

In Com., 11796 (vi).

Ballot Papers, Fraudulent Marking (sec. 20) 11890; Amt. (Mr. White) 11890; Amt. (Mr. Porter) 11892 (vi), 13013; Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 13022, 13027; Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 13025; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 13026; (Mr. Crocket) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 13036; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 13037 (vii).

Boards of Registration (sub.-sec. 4) 12995 (vii).

Canvassing by Aliens (sec. 25), Amt. (Mr. Lake) 11898 (vi).

Contributions for Political Purposes (sec. 28) Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11927; Amt. (Mr. Wilson) 11930; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 11931 (vi).

Contributions, Statement (sec. 18) 11884; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11884 (vi).

Conveyances of Voters (sec. 23) 11894; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11896; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11897 (vi).

Conveyances, paying for (sec. 10) 11829; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11835 (vi).

Corrupt Practices, Amt. (Mr. Fowler) 13044 (vii).

Enumerators, Posting of Notices (sec. 6) 11824 (vi).

Lists transmitted by Clerk of Crown in Chancery (sec. 1, sub.-sec. 8) 13004 (vii).

Manitoba Lists, Transmission (sec. 1, subsec. 10) 13009 (vii).

——— Polling Divisions (sec. 1, subsec. 2) 13005 (vii).

Nomination Papers, Address of Candidate (sec. 3) 11815; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11816; Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 11820; Amt. (Mr. Ames) 11820, 11827 (vi), 13010 (vii).

Ontario, Unorganized Territories (sec. 1) 11796 (vi), 12919 (vii).

Persons on General List, omitted from Special List (sec. 13) 11865 (vi), 13009 (vii); Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11881 (vi).

Polling Divisions (sec. 6) 13001 (vii).

Posters, Names and Addresses (sec. 26) 11922; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11922 (vi).

P.E.I., Oath (sec. 16) 11882 (vi).

Returning Officers, Instructions to (sec. 11) 11845 (vi); Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13032 (vii).

Voters' Lists Preparation (subsec. 5) 12998 (vii).

Yukon Enumerators (sec. 5) 11823, 11829 (vi). 13013 (vii).

3° m., 13229; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13230; Neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13251; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 13255; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 13257; 3° Agreed to, 13258 (vii).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 555 (i).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. Nos. 127 & 211.'

Dom. Govt. Employees, Interference at Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 & 181.'

Dom. Lands, Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10038 (v).
——— Area disposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
Dom. Lands and Exchange of School Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Sales of, during 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9987, 9996 (v).
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
See 'Finance.'
Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
Dom. Notes, Issue of : *See* 'B. Nos. 159 & 160.'
Dom. Notes, Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
Dom. Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
Dom. Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Power Co.'s Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. Cockshutt) 10919 (vi).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
Doukhobors, Condition of: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Foster) 2218 (ii).
——— Destitute Condition at Fort William (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).
——— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
——— Manner of living, Letter from Yorkton: Read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
——— Prisoners at Fort William, Release of by Justice Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 6847 (iv).
——— Religious Fanatics: Par. in 'Press' (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept.: Ques.: (Mr. Lake) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors, Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. of Bard of Trade: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7620; Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7621 (iv).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dowling, Dr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5206 (iii).
——— Emplymt. by German Development Co.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5564 (iii).
——— Leave of Absence from Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Templeman) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
——— and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 687 (i).
Dredges registered in Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11497 (vi).
Dredging Companies, Contracts, Investigations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
——— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
——— advertisements *re* tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Bennett) 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
——— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
——— Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
——— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
——— Tenders *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773 (v).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular Letter: Read in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 12043 (vi).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
Dredging in Ontario and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 2896 (ii).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Drop Letter, One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Drug Contracts with Bole Drug Co.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bole) 5562 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5513 (iii).
Drury, R. L., O.C. *re* Apptmt. to Japan: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4769 (iii).
Dry Docks, Construction of: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
——— O.Cs. &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Dundee Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act and Dom. Interference: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 1738 (i).
——— Tel. from Sec. of State: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1859 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1861 (i).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 694 (i).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464, 6843 (iv).
Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Eastern Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
Eclipse Manufaturing and Office Specialty Co., Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 68 & 213.'
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Eight Hour Day for Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to South Africa: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2792 (ii).
Election Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Election in N.B., Interference of Dom. Govt. *re* Patronage: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 3043 (ii).
See 'N. B.' &c.
Election of New Members, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Elections, Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Election Writs, Issue of: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Electrical Power exported from Niagara Falls, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 360 (i).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Empire and Ascension Day Adjnmt.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8894 (v).
Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Salaries, Religions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5206 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).

——Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).

——Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'

Essex County, Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).

Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Estimates, Basis of Appropriations *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).

—— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5661 (iii).

—— Discussions on Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

—— Insufficient Votes *re* Public Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5923 (iii).

Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).

—— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).

Exchange of Schools' Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'

Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'

Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).

—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).

Excise Collectors, Payments for Customs Collections: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Excise, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 813 (i).

—— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).

—— Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii). *See* 'Anglo-French.'

Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).

Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).

——Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10904 (vi).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).

—— Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).

Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).

—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).

Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).

—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).

—— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).

—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).

Express Charges in Mar. Provs., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 518 (i).

Expropriation of Lands by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'

Facilities and Increased Accommodations, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 7200 (iv).

Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Payments: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10516 (vi).

—— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5078 (iii).

—— Payments to *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8890 (v).

—— Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

Falconer, Mr. K.: *See* 'Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping.'

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Custom Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Alterations: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

—— Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).

Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 846 (i).

Fence Posts Fees, Memorial from Union of Manitoba Municipalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 10258 (v).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
FINANCE:
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amendments: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4248 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt., for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Debt. of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Loans.'
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
——— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
FINANCE—*Con.*
Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i), 12914 (vii).
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
Financial Stringency, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 35 (i).
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607 (i).
See 'Wheat.'
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11501 (vi).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233, 314 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
——— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
——— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
——— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
——— Dates of last Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237, 564 (i).
——— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
See main heading.
Receiver General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 2173 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
See 'Grain.'
Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1510 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 1690 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4832 (iii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7663 (iv).
——— File, Cor., quoted by Minister, custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Original Papers (Mr. Foster) 8901, 9281 (v).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3433 (ii).
Fisheries Act (jurisdiction of officers) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'

FISHERIES:
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
——— Expenses of Sir Charles H. Tupper: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Licenses issued to Packers' Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (iv).
——— Grants to Japanese: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 7445 (iv).
——— Negotiations, Instructions to Mr. Bastedo: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
——— Reports *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 6849 (iv).
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).
Fisheries Committee, Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1691 (i).
Fisheries Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
——— Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provinces, Conference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3235 (ii).
——— Instructions to Agent: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3429 (ii).
——— Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2395 (ii).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
——— Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4247 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fisheries Negotiations, &c., Between U.S and Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).
——— Boundary between Can. and U.S.: Information *re* (Mr. Sproule) 6632, 6739 (iv).
——— Regulations, Violation of: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Noble.'
Lake Winnipeg Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
——— Fisheries, Legislation *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2389 (ii).
Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1683 (i).
Leases, Sessional Papers No. 207: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Licenses granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
——— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6398 (iv).
Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 559, 697 (i).
——— Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2896 (ii).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10256 (v).
——— Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
——— Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
——— Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
——— Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
——— Overseers in Lunenburg, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lobster Fishing, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6644 (iv).
——— P.E.I. Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Man., Fish Exportations from, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4240 (iii).
Mar. Provs., Fisheries, Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7446 (iv).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan) 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
River John Licenses, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10511 (vi).
Salmon Licenses, Leases, &c., in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
——— Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
——— Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8294 (v).
Floods at Chatham, Damages, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4742 (iii).
Fog Signal Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11497 (vi).
Forbes, Mr Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*,899 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860 (i).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No.62.'
Foresters, Order of, Charges in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bennett) 6005 (iii).
Forest Rangers *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Forest Reserves, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8613 (v).
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Franco-Canadian SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 941 (i).
——— Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (Mr. Foster) 943 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., Stmnt., 1213 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3754 (ii).
——— *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying Benefits of Minimum Tariff, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 851 (i).
——— Consideration of Proposed Convention: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 923 (i).
——— Correction *re* Travelling Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (Mr. Ames) 1424 (i).
——— Delay in Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 12655 (vii).
——— Delay due to Canadian Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13534 (vii).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
——— Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 605 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12351
——— Favoured Nation Clause, Foreign Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Favoured Nation Clause: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 514 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
——— and German Surtax, Effect of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Information in Detail asked for (Mr. Foster) 1585 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 570 (i).
——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 178 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— Papers to be Distributed (Mr. Fielding) 848 (i).
——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 93 (i).
——— Ratification by French Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13083 (vii).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28; (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 43 (i).
——— Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8 (i).
——— U.S. Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
See 'Customs Defalcations,' &c.

Fredericton Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Free Transportation of Members by SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Books, Reduction of Customs Duties *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Language, Legislation *re*, Par. in 'La Presse': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8291 (v).
—— Par. in 'Le Soleil': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1209 (i).
French Language, Pet. *re*: Read (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8886; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 8886 (v).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
French Translation of Govt. Statutes and Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
See 'Debates.'
French Treaty, Taking Effect: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8614 (v).
French Treaty: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7202 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Frozen Wheat, Shipments from Man., Inspection under Seed Act: M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn. House, 825 (i).
Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2166 (ii).
Fruit Inspection in Closed Packages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 2981 (ii).
Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2754 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apple Packing: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 516 (i).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Fushimi, Prince, Expenditure *re* Visit: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
Gaetz Brothers, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments for Buffalo imported from Montana: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
See 'Lake Aylmer.'
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1120 (i).
—— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 515 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 654, 668 (i).
General Chemical Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Geological Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6402 (iv).
—— Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13574 (vii).
—— Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11231 (vi).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCool) 1941, 1992 (i), 5228 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
—— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 12053 (vii).
—— inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, Final Report of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
—— Final Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. White) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 1739 (i).
—— Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145 (vii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
German Development Co.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10579 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Gilmore, Edith May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Girard, Eugene Francois, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11634 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Glucose, Quantity imported from G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6980 (iv).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
——— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c,: Ques. (Mr Bristol) 9712 (v)
——— Remarks (Mr. Maclaren) 9779 (v).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 123 & 197.'
Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
'Golspie, Str., Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Goodwin Car Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Govt. Business: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7834 (iv), 12049, 12163 (vii).
——— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10258 (v), 10303, 10403, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).
——— M. for Precedence on Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6287 (iv).
——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6917 (iv).
——— Ry. Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12504 (vii).
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 13207 (vii).
——— Suppl. Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 11016 (vi).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Northrup) 558 (i).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 1741 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2890 (ii).
Govt. Officials as Political Partizans in Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
Govt. Ownership, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 75; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
——— Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
——— Maintenance and Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
——— Number purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
——— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
——— Purchase of Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3288 (ii).
Governor General's Expenditure since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3581 (ii).
Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Grain Blockade in the West: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Grain Commission, Names of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3486 (ii).
Grain Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr .Staples) 180 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Staples) 180, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607
See 'Wheat,' &c.
Grain Standards Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Grand Bend, &c., Pier, Delays in Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4408 (iii).
——— Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (ii).
See 'Public Works—Wharfs,' &c.
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Guaranteed Bonds: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Accidents to Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6655, 7447 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr Talbot) 6850 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 10624 (vi).
Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. D. Ross) 1512 (i).
Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 895 (i).
Bond Issue, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8440 (v).
Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 12051 (vii).
See 'Hodgins.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Commissioners' Rep., Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13226 (vii).
Commission issued to Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9716 (v).
Construction, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10393 (vi).
——— Inclusive of Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9265 (v).
——— Inquiry for Figures (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10916, 11939 (vi).
——— M. to Lay Statement on Table (Mr. Graham) 12049 (vii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii), 9265 (v), 11407 (vi).
——— Statement (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii)
——— Reply to Mr. Borden's Statement (Mr. Graham) 12662 (vii).
Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. T. Schell) 600 (i).
Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6458, 6636 (iv).
Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6234 (iv).
Contracts, Safeguard Clauses in Govt. Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. Morin) 2398 (ii).
Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5563 (iii).
——— Recent Estimate of Cost: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5259 (iii).
Eastern Limit, Mountain Section, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 9265 (v)
Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5802 (iii).
Engineering Staff, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 509, 681 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 853 (i).
——— Resignation of Mr. Hodgins: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 516 (i)
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 558 (i).
See 'Hodgins.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9266 (v).
G.T.P., and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: Ques (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hodgins, Major, Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
——— Retirement of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 366 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* Classification, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6844, 6925 (iv).
——Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7213, 7320 (iv).
—— Statement from Hon. Mr. Parent: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6985; Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7097 (iv).
—— Investigation *re*, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Geoffrion) 8515 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12265; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Minority Rep., 12291 (vii).
—— Counsel Fees, Payment: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 13578 (vii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (vi).
La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8607 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 8894 (v).
Liquor, Prohibition Zone, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2024
Location, Conference in Montreal *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7809 (iv).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
Madawaska Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 12661 (vii).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1937 (i).
—— Deductions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9473 (v).
Medical Officer Parent, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8618 (v).
Miles under construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 165 (i).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Montreal Branch Line Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Nationality of Contractors: Discrimination against Canadians: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7936 (iv).
Payments to Mr. A. Brunet: in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi).
Policy *re* Police Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7997 (iv).
Port Arthur Branch Line Subsidy: in Com on Res., 13303 (vii).
Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 516 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Protests *re* Land Acquisitions: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 6640 (iv).
Rails purchased, Name of Manufacturers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 12775 (vii).
—— corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 13065
Rails for Eastern Division, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9263 (v).
Return: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6288 (iv).
Route, Financial Reasons for Change of Route: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 8089 (iv).
Sections B. and F., Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 5211 (iii).
Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 356 (i).
Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 9025 (v), 10375 (vi).
Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2171 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1932 (i).
—— Contractor for District No. 3: Ques. (Mr. White) 1120 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
Ties purchased from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1443 (i).
Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2386 (ii).
——Number of Miles completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6643 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 935 (i).
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
G. T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
——Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.R. Hotel Site at Ottawa: *See* 'B No. 89.'
G.T.Ry. Hotel: *See* 'Major's Hill.'
'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5081 (iii).
See 'Fritz Cirkel,' &c.
Gratuities to Marine *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13062 (vii).
Grazing Lands Reservations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3850 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Wood, Fleck and Finnie: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3479 (ii).
Grazing Lease of H. Rivière, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13060 (vii).
Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Townships 12 to 19: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7210 (iv).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
G. B. and U. S. Treaties: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
See 'Anglo-American.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1508 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup.,7289 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. Maclaren) 184 (i).
Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 431 (i).
Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3844 (ii).
Hackett Dock, Purhase of at Amherstburg: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7211 (iv).
Halifax Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (iv).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
—— Disbandment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
—— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
—— Retraction of Remarks of Minister of Finance: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5784 (iii).
See 'Esquimault.'
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Halifax Immigration Frauds. Dismissal of Mr. Barnstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Platform *re* Conservative Speeches, ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 47; (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Halifax Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island: in Com. of Sup., 7171 (iv).
Halifax, Signal Dues at: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Halifax Southwestern Ry. (Tusket Wedge) Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 13296 (vii).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6236 (iv).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton Bank, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Hamilton, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Hamilton Radial Electric B. 25: in Com., *re* Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).
Haney, M. J., Claims *re* P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12762 (vii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbottle, N. F., Employmt. in Excise Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7730 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N. B., Members' Remarks checked: (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 11290 (vi).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— P. E. I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connection: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymt. as Returning Officer: Remarks (Mr. Avery) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3430 (ii)

——Political Interference, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5791 (iii).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4765 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).

—— Purchase of Cement from A. E. Wallberg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).

Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase in Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 10737 (vi).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration, &c.: Remarks (Mr J. D. Reid) 1739 (i).

—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &s.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2170 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).

Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii)

—— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Foster) 5489 (iii).

—— Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr Foster) 4407 (iii).

See 'Immigration.'

Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6238 (iv).

See 'Homesteads,' &c.

Hodgins, Major: *See* 'G.T.P.'

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).

—— Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2081 (ii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &e.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of Additional Living Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii)

Homestead Application of Mr. John Haddock: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v)

Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by Mr. R. Cruickshanks: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 698 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).

Homestead Entries granted for Quarter 10-17-17, W. of 4th Meridian: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9773 (v).

Homesteaders for Sections 15, 16 and 27, &c., Issue of Patents: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7503 (iv).

Homestead Entry for s.e. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2167 (ii).

Homesteading on Section 18, Extensions *re* Time Allowance: Quese. (Mr. Ames) 8381 (v).

Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).

—— n.e. ¼ Sec. 28, Permission *re* Grants: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1941 (i).

—— N.W. Quarter Section 35, History of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4762 (iii).

—— Records of Payments of Sale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Porter) 1294 (i).

See 'Hintz.'

Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Homestead Entries: *See* 'Land Patents.'

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

—— Sale of in Township 13, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7206 (iv).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U.S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c., *re* Coal Mining Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 698 (i)

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364, 568 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 3319 (ii).
House of Commons Act (election writ) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Estimates: in Com of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Colchester Electoral District, Ceretificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Committees sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
—— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, Nationalities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members in New Wing: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
—— Civil Service Bill, and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
—— Clerks, Changes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Owen) 4247 (iii).
—— Employees, Recommendations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3899 (ii).
—— Increase of Salaries: in Com. of Sup 13562 (vii).
—— Delays in Mails: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 11939 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
—— Delay, &c.: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 12044 (vi).
—— Salary Increases to Sessional Clerks: in Sup., Conc., 13578 (vii).
—— Ventilation and Cooling: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10978, 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
House of Commons and Senate, Cost, &c., Outside of Indemnities: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4760 (iii).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
Legislation, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
—— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
—— Montreal Directory: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
Members, New, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, Bourinot quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii)
—— Appeal to Speaker from Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i), 4495 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
—— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. A. Wright) 584 (i).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
Speaker's Expenses, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
——— Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
——— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
Stanstead By-Election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Spaker) 569 (i).
Voters' Lists, Manitoba: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
——— Manitoba Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Provincial: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks (Mr. Burrows) 13066 (vii).
Watson, Mr., K.C., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
York Electoral District: Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Register of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4403 (iii).
Hudson Bay Patrol System: in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction: M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (vii).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
See 'Railways.'
Hudson, Que., Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Hunting, Killing of Persons, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 358 (i).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1128 (i).
——— River St. Lawrence and Gulf: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 166 (i).
Ice-breakers for Govt. Service: in Com. of Sup., 2941, 2949 (ii).
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1734 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Immigration: *See* 'Chinese,' &c.
Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Immigration Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
IMMIGRATION:
Agents in G. B. and France: in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).
——— Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2169 (ii).
——— Reps. received from, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 557 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Agents, Special, Salaries, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2398 (ii).
Agents in East Elgin, Number employed: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 692 (i).
—— Italy. Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4584 (iii)
—— Kent County, Ont., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Clements) 3172 (ii).
—— payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3041 (ii).
Agents, Names, Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 180 (i).
—— Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3844 (ii).
Agents in N.B., Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 843 (i).
Agents, Special Prizes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3484 (ii).
Agents in U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Japanese.'
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Bonuses, Abolition of: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6663, 6945, 6989 (iv).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 4769 (iii), 6288 (iv).
Bonuses, Abolition of: on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i), 3300 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1299 (i).
—— Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1287 (i).
—— Increase to Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3429 (ii).
Bonuses. Par. in 'Canadian Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 7453 (iv).
B.C., Immigration, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 9890 (v).
British Subjects, Regulations *re*, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N.S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Detention Hospitals, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5081 (iii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).
See 'Halifax.'
Doukhobours bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. *re* (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321 (iv).
—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in Press (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Dunne, M. C., Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Expenditure from March, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 5080 (iii).
Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5084 (iii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Gimli Galicians, Relief to (Mr. Oliver) Rep. of Mr. Walker read: in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Halifax Immigration Frauds, Par in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4834 (iii).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
—— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5567 (iii).
—— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6465 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Robertson: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).
—— Restitution *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 4963 (iii).
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr Foster) 5488 (iii).
—— Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Hindus, Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5476 (iii).
—— Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto: Tel. read (Mr. Macdonell) 185 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Deportation of Five Families: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6922 (iv).
—— Names and Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5080 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 177 (i).
Immigrants Destitute, Stranded in Toronto: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Macdonell) 242 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 429 (i).
Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates of Farmers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1513 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
Immigrants landed in Canada June, 1907, Number deported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3339 (ii).
Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid on, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5256 (iii).
—— Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
—— Reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6921 (iv).
—— Stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 567 (i).
—— Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re*: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 7500 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8171, 8607, 8696 (v).
Immigration Act, B.C., Natal Act, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 567 (i).
Immigration, Circular issued to Immigrants *re* Fraudulent Powers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 606 (i).
—— Co-operation with N.B. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
—— Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 9882 (v).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. O. Smith, &c.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Sproule) 5491 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3847 (ii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
Immigration, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6402 (iv).
Immigration and Commercial Agencies Rets.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 1108 (i).
Immigration Literature: in Com. of Sup., 9918 (v).
—— Contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2171 (ii).
—— Regulations, O.C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Immigration from U.S., Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Japanese Immigration: *See* main heading.
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr Monk) 4244 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
London Immigration, Central Board, Moneys paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2545 (ii).
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Alcorn) 4773 (iii).
Miller, Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
—— Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Relief to Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 9983 (v).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
—— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
U. S. Labourers: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
U.S., Total Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii)
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Waugh, James S., Distribution of Immigrants, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gordon) 1690 (i).
—— Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
Waugh and Perrin, Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 511 (i).
—— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Imperial Pulp Co., Denial *re* Managing Directorship: Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sifton) 3578 (ii).
Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1939 (i)
Imports and Exports ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
—— Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Independence of Parlt. Act, Violation of *re* R. Stewart, M.P. for Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
INDIANS:
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Halfbreeds' Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
Destitute Indians, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Dokis Indian Reserve, Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
—— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dokis Indians, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
—— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
—— Extravagant Management of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 11022 (vi).
—— Generally, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
—— Tel. from Mr. Sifton read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13416 (vii).
—— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram, 13528 (vii).
Lands in Algoma, Withdrawal from Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2396 (ii).
Lands in B.C., Provincial Rights: Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5078 (iii).
Lands at New Westminster, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3037, 3839 (ii).
Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
Lands, Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Land Sales: in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
Man. and Sask. Indians, Investigation of Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 6919 (iv)
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Muskoday Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
N. B., Agents Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12736 (vii).
—— School Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Title, Extinguishment of, Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
—— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
Schools. Dr. Bryce's Report: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
—— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Swan Lake Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Yeomans, Agent. Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
Ingonish Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (excise duties, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
INLAND REVENUE:
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Excise, Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4964 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 6 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Seizures, 1906-7, in Cornwall, Toronto, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 3846 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 3851 (ii).
—— Seizures in Cornwall, &c., Names of Officers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 4247 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco. Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Revenue Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Seizures, at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
—— (dairy products, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
—— (grain) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
—— (oat standards) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Inspection of Staples: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
Inspection of Steamboats: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Inspectors of Food Products, Number, Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Institute of Architects of Can.: See 'B. No. 88.'
See 'Architects.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Personal Explanation *re* Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Mr. Foster) 1860 (i).
—— Introduction of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9272 (v).
—— Discussion *re* (Mr. Foster) 1107 (i).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals asked for (Mr. Macdonell) 7988 (iv).
—— Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6059 (iii).
—— and Political Campaign Literature: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 10792 (vi).
—— Rep.: Ques. of Priv. *re* Stmnt. of Sir Frederick Borden, 9337; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 9352, 9461 (v).
—— Total Expenditure, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt. of: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).

Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13225 (vii).
—— Expenses of Ministers: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents, Letter *re*:Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 6985 (iv).
Advertising for Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Amqui Station, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10012 (v).
—— Vote *re* Construction, Amount Expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12774 (vii).
Answer to Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 13415 (vii).
Antigonish Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Audit System: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 10214 (v).
Book-Keeping System, Correction of Par. in St. John 'Daily Telegraph': (Mr. Graham) 5260 (iii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Cars sent to U.S., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).
Cars in Service on Sundays: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Circular *re* Delay in Payment of Salaries: Read (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
—— Par. in St. John Press: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Fowler) 10016 (v).
Claims Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3480 (ii).
Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9472 (v).
Claims for Damages to Property or Personal Injury, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 6002 (iii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).
Claims Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10176 (v).
Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1688 (i).
Collection of Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 5693 (iii).
Compensation *re* Horses killed at Truro: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
Concrete Pipes, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
Dartmouth Branch Line Ry., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Delays to 'Maritime Express': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8614 (v).
Deterioration of Service: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 12236, 12250 (vii).
Earnings and Expenses: Ques.-(Mr. Fowler) 13510 (vii).
Employees, Apptmts. in N.B. during Jan. and Feb., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii).
—— Circular from Genl. Mgr. *re* Municipal Politics: Read (Mr. Sproule) 2304 (ii).
—— Circular *re* Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2884; on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).
—— Employees and Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2309 (ii).
—— Increased Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2981 (ii).
—— Provident Fund Act, Names on List: ues. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4582 (iii).
—— and Quebec Provincial Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9777 (v).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
Extension to Great Lakes, Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2435 (ii).
Extension Policy, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 73 (i).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Crocket) 2558 (ii).
Gross Earnings for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Civic Elections in Halifax, Interference of Employees: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
Halifax to Sydney Division, Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12773 (vii).
Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re*: M. for Paper* (Mr. Sinclair) 5800 (iii).
Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3233 (ii).
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'Que. Central.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ice Supply Contract: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5259 (iii), 7446 (iv).
Increased Accommodations: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., Change of Name, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6243 (iv).
Lac Saumon Station, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
Legal Costs to Mr. MacIlreith: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
Legal Services: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10190 (v).
Locomotives: in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Moncton, Additional Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1509 (i).
——— Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
——— Tenders *re* Leasing: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5800 (iii).
Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
N.B. Elections and I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
Newcastle Station, Inspector of Works: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13511 (vii).
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
North Sydney Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Notices printed in French and English: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7936 (iv).
Number of Men employed in N.B., for Jan., Feb., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 6241 (iv).
'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and Ending of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 6051 (iii).
Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c., for Travelling Expenses, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2982 (ii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Oxford and Pictou Branch, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vii).
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2387 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Pictou Branch, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 12661 (vii).
Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
——— Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10789 (vi).
Piping: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10195 (v).
Private Car for Mr. Schreiber, Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 189 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Rails, &c., Number of Tons of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 9269 (v).
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5995 (iii).
Receipts and Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 10514 (vi).
Revenue from Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5471 (iii).
Ricard, Mr., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
——— Station Master, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 7445 (iv).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
——— Purchase, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Statement *re* Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5697 (iii).
Running of Official Cars on Limited Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5474 (iii).
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5466 (iii).
Stationery Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10181 (v).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10734 (vi).
Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9712 (v).
——— Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Sunday Cars, Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 10734 (vi).
Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 10188 (v).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
——— Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i).
Ties delivered, Changes *re* Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12052 (vii).
Trains breaking down, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Explanations *re* Delays, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6242 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10159 (v).
Transportation Question, Statement, on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).
Trois Pistoles Station, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Truro, Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6233 (iv).
——— Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1936 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
——— Sewerage Frontage: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5800 (iii).
——— Station, Unsanitary Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7211 (iv).
William, Thos., Emplymt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Clearwater Lake, Squatters' Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
——— Deptl, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
Squatters' Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' &c.
Internal Economy Board of H. of C., Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line: Representations *re* Buildings on: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 519 (i).
International Commission, Red River of the North: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material: Ques. (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
See 'Detroit.'
Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Interprovl. Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4244 (iii).

Irrigation Act: *See* 'B. No. 10, 99.'
Irrigation in West, Investigation *re* Measurements: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Japanese Colony in the West, Application from C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 7196 (iv).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 4243 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C.: Ques. Mr. R. Smith) 6642 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
Japanese Immigration and Natal Act, Cor. with Lt.-Gov. of B.C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 2170 (ii).
See 'Dunsmuir.'
Japanese Immigration, Cor. *re* Limitations, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4737 (iii).
—— from U.S., Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3900 (ii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 947 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 692 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 854 (i).
—— Restriction of: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 699; (Mr. Macpherson) 719; (Mr. Sloan) 726; (Mr. D. Ross) 732; (Mr. Kennedy) 748 (i).
—— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 854 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2025; Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2043; Neg. (Y. 45: N. 100) 2158 (ii).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets: (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration, Recent Eentries into B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3751 (ii).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32; (Mr. Foster) 77; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
—— Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table (Mr. Lemieux) 1550 (i).
—— Restriction, B.C. Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. D. Ross) 1744 (i).
—— Result of Mission: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 1585 (i).
—— Riots, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
—— Statement of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208, 1424 (i).
—— Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1928 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,'
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5201 (iii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt.-Gov. of B.C., Cor., &c., sent to by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Judges' Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
JUSTICE:
Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).
Ancoin vs. The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salaries, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 8185 (iv).
Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Drysdale, Hon. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Exchequer Court, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
—— Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*, 899 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
—— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2981 (ii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
See 'Quebec.'
Judges Salaries, Applications *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Bureau) 185 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4768 (iii).
—— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of, O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 12265 (vii).
—— B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Generally, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
—— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. by Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
—— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Supreme Court Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents: *See* B. No. 190.'
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3036 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3850 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Keewatin, Synod of the Diocese of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13587 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
Kingston, Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
—— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
—— withdrawal of vote: in Com. of Sup., 7814 (iv).
—— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Koenig, Capt., Duties, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept.: Res. of Town Council Sydney: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9580, 9710 (v).
Labour, Deptl. Rep: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 841 (i).
——— (Japanese Investigation) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 1583 (i).
———Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 605 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
'Labour Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Labour Organization *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Labour, Unemployed, Protection to: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10735 (vi).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 979 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5082 (iii).
Lacoste, Sir Alexandre, Amount of Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1934 (i).
Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7936 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
——— Crew during Winter: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snag in St. John River: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privilege *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Lake Aylmer Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake François Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin, under Irrigation Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7209 (iv).
Lands, Dom.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3235 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N.W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
——— Selection and Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5083 (iii).
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of Quarter Section 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3432 (ii).
Land Patent for E. ½ S. E. ¼ Section 2, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2169 (ii).
——— S. E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2171 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3430 (ii).
——— Sections 10 and 17, Applicants *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9475 (v).
——— Sections 36, &c., Issue of: Ques (Mr. Lake) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii)
Land Sales in N.W., Purchasers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3835 (ii)
Lands set Apart for Settlement since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule), 2796 (ii).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Lands, Surveys of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 113 and 168.'
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Monk), 4244 (iii).
—— Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
Lavaltrie, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lead Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Lead Production by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11407, 11705 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of: Notice of Motion (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3477 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes), 10014 (v).
—— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provinces, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sandfield) 4768 (iii).
—— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
Legislation, House of Commons, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf, Contract *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
'Le Soleil,' Par. *re* Voting of French Members: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 7992 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7993 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup, 13336 (vii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
—— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Levis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Herron) 8867 (v).
Liability of Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Libel Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
—— Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Life-Saving Stations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2972 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Lighthouses, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9476 (v).
See 'Canals—Rideau.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262, 13323 (vii).
Lighthouse-Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
—— Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11299 (vi).
Light-Keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7729 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vii).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1286 (i).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1506 (i).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13359 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin), 2397 (ii).
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 12894 (vii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot), 1506 (i)
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 9475 (v).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster), 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. .Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster), 13582 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafs: *See* 'Dom. Loans,' 'Finance.'
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c.: M. for Ret.* Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
——— Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 314 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 314 (i).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey), 10256 (v).
Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin), 4404 (iii).
Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Overseers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean), 6644 (iv).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii)
Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11935 (vi).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Moncton: in Com. fo Com of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
London Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10094 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing: Remarks (Mr. Elson) 3753 (ii).
'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7198 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3428 (ii).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 230 (i).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9504 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10259 (v).
See 'Pulp.'
Lumber manufactured in N. W. Provs., Royalty Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3835 (ii).
Lunenburg Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G. T. P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
——— Storage of Refuse of Montreal Harbour Property: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11936 (vi).

MacIlraith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 12220 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6985 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr Herron) in Com of Sup, 9110 (v)
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road, P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 688 (i).
McGee, Hon. T. D'Arcy, Monument *re*: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6288 (iv).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McGuire, Hon. Thos., Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5794 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. White) 6061 (iii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6981 (iv).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii)
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry: Ques (Mr. Lake) 6401 (iv).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
——— lost in C. P. R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
——— Mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii).
Mail Service beteen Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N. B. and N. S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidy to France: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel Site: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys belonging to Mr. Walter Dick: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Man., Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Man. Boundaries, Bill *re* Extension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
——— Consent of Legislature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 936 (i)
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6222, 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 852 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. J. Roche), 495 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1288 (i).

Man. Lands, Section 32, Town Site, Applications *re* Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1348 (i).

Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).

——— Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).

Manitoba Voters' Lists: *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'

Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

——— Reps. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 893 (i).

Manning & Macdonald's Claims *re* Soulanges Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).

Maple Creek Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6639 (iv).

Maps, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruptions *re* Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).

——— Regulation of Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 174 (i).

See 'Wireless.'

Marcoun, Mr., Commission *re* Settlement of Claims: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).

Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

MARINE:

Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).

——— Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904 to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).

——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v). *See* 'Marine Signals.'

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Marine Dept.: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

——— Absence of Mr. Watson: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10918 (vi).

——— Apptmnt. of Ass't Judge in Exchequer Court: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11311 (vi).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron as Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6926 (iv).

——— Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8837 (v).

——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8445 (v).

——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9725 (v).

——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10789 (vi).

——— Evidence *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).

——— remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).

——— Evidence presented day by day to House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8203 (v).

——— Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11301 (vi).

——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).

——— Letter of Instructions to Mr. Watson laid on the Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 7621 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10741 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6846 (iv).

——— Mr. Perron's Duties: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 10743 (vi).

——— Postponment of by Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).

——— Proceedings in Public, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7321 (iv).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10915 (vi).

See 'Mar. and Fish.,' &c.

'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
——— and Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
——— Maintenance and Supplies (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
——— Number of purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
——— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Gratuities *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Life-boats in B.C., Purchase of from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses, Classification, &c., Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 12262, 13323 (vii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755 (iii).
Lighthouse-keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Light-keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lighthouses, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N. S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).
——— O.Cs., Cor. *re* Change of System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 852 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 510 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4223 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4747 (iii).
——— Acting Deputy Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11939 (vi).
——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10741 (vi).
——— Dep. Min., Ass't.: in Com. of Sup., 12915 (vii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7938, 7995, 8088: Letter of Dep. Min. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 8088 (iv).
——— Deptl. Investigation by Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
——— remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6636 (iv).
——— Deptl., Misconduct of Official: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 6633 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officers under Suspension, Dates of Aptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6982 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officials, Suspension of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8889 (v).
——— Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 6241 (iv).
——— Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2883 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
——— contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
——— Steamers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13062 (vii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
See 'Briar.'
Masters' and Mates' Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collission with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation re: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171, 9715 (iv), 10121 (v).
——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons Registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Life-Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
'Viligant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Mar. Provs., Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Masters' and Mates' Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on order for 2°: Remarks 583 (i). *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7179 (iv).
Meaford Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Meat and Canned Foods Act Enforcement: in Com. of Sup., 12893 (vii).
—— Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
—— Inspectors, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 172 (i).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1505 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1690 (i).
Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 4589 (iii).
Meat Inspection Regulations, Speech of Mr. Fisher at Chatham: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Clements) 196 (i).
Meat Inspection Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3042 (ii).
Medicine Hat Buildings, Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 46 (i).
Members introduced 3, 680 (i), 2542 (ii).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emoulment, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (a).
Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. in Geodetic Survey, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1349 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
Mess. from His Ex., Franco-Canadian Treaty: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
—— (Suppl. Estimates, 1908): Read (Mr. Speaker) 12503 (vii).
See 'Estimates,' &c.
Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5650 (iii).
Metal Shingle and Siding Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Methyated Spirits, Supplies to Manufacturers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 820 (i).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen: (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin, Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3235 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Milford, Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).
MILITIA :
Allowances, Arrears of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662, 5732 (iii); 10286 (v).
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tel., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv); 12154 (vii).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
——— Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).
——— Return *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5914 (iii), 6465 (iv).
Boot Contract, Attack *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 10739 (vi)
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3842 (ii).
Camps, Holding of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9779, 9835 (v).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Customs Dues: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i)
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 *See* 'Naval.'
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fredericton Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Generals, Apptmts. of Names and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5086 (iii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 9712 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. MacLaren) 9779 (v).
Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
——— Disbandment of, &c: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
——— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
——— Retraction of Remarks of Min. of Fin.: Remarks (Mr Taylor) 5784 (iii).
Halifax, Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Militia Supplies, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6405 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
——— Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10014 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
——— Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
London, Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 8871 (v), 12147 (vii).
——— Supplies, Provisions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
Militia, Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2165 (ii).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioner's Report; Stmnt. (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).
——— Quebec, Hours for Work of Masons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 10790 (vi).
——— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 4494 (iii).
——— Threats *re* Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Militia,—Memorandum of General Lake: M. to lay on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 12770 (vii).
——— Pay, Arrears, &c., Reasons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8442 (v).
Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv)
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools, *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Stations in Canada, Arrangements with G. B., *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
——— List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
Niagara Camp., Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
———Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
Niagara Falls, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Land Sale, 13540 (vii).
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1292 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Properties: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
——— Provisions and Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 12150 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Rearks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
——— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c.: Remarks, 8386 (v).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Rations, Cost per Day, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown,, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances to Co. *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
——— Arsenal. Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
——— Bayonets purchased for, &c., Contracts, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Bayonets, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O. C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— Bayonets, Provisions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Bonus, Loans, Services of the Govt., Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, &c., Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4401 (iii).
——— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
——— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 8902-8953; Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090
——— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's Denial of Stmnt., 9126, 9330 (v).
——— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
——— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Reports from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Rifles delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).
——— Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
——— Ross Rifle Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Target Practice, Suspensions by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
——— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplie: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi), 12152, 13177 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C.; on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
——— 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants, to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
Stoney Creek Battlefield Monument: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stores and Arms for Rural Battalions, Care of: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lalor) 5736 (iii).
Stores, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8181 (iv)
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
——— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
——— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
——— Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv)
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Uniforms and Customs Refunds: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Warlike and other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Winnipeg, Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10369 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Milk Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 64..
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Perley) 3851 (ii).
——— Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3238 (ii).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Travelling,' &c.
Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 938 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).
Mint: *See* 'Public Buildings, Ottawa.'
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3848 (ii).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv).
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
Moncton Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Payments to E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
Moncton-Truro, Additional Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
Money-Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1738 (i).
'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
Montague Moore, &c., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collision with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10121 (v).
'Montcalm,' Str., Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Increase of Salary: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. on B. 206, 12552 (vii).
Montreal Directory, in Library of House: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
——— Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3319 (ii).
Montreal Excise Officers, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3900 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Amount of Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 8888 (v).
——— Cement Contract, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7199, 7499 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gervais) 4064; Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4066; Appeal from Dep. Speaker to Speaker, 4071; Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
——— Settlement of Strike: Remarks (Mr. Verville) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).
——— Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last Fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Montreal 'Star,' Advertisements in, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108: N. 53) 3464 (ii)
—— Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
—— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
—— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
—— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
—— Rep. of Aud. Gen. J. Fraser: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2983 (ii).
See 'Toll Gates.'
Monuments to Sir L. H. Lafontaine and Robt. Baldwin: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Monuments to McGee and Brown: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).
Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch, C.P.R., Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 7654 (iv).
Moose Jaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9494 (v).
Mortgages as Securities by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Motions, Unopposed: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8839 (v).
—— Business of the Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Improved Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6239 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 10123 (v).
Museum: *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Muskoday Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 & 219.'
See 'Battlefields.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Naturalization Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
See 'Can. Naturalization.'
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Schools, Establishment of, List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
—— Arrangements with G.B. *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).
'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on Order for Reps.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 850 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
—— Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Connections *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9283; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9415 (v).
See 'Cold Storage.'
N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Porter) 9272 (v).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
N.B. Elections and Govt. Employees: Telegram read (Mr. Foster) 3229 (ii).
—— I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3579 (ii).
—— Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).
N.B. Inland Waters Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
N.B. Post Office Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Foster) to Adjn., 3657 (ii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
N.B. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).
New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Newmarket Canal, Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
—— Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
See 'Canals—Trent.'

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 1690 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
Newspapers, Payments to from 1904 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
——— Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
See 'Public Works—Advertising,' 'Tenders,' &c.
New York Central Ry., Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost, Criticism, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6054 (iii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Niagara Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
——— Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283 (i).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
——— Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
——— Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).
Nipigon Ry. (Branch Lines) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Land Patents to: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 8182 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
——— Financial Relations with Govt.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 770 (i).
——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2392 (ii).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
North Empire Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Northern Crown Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
North Sydney Improvements, I.C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Leases assigned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 11702 (vi).
N.W.M. Police, Compensations *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Salaries and Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8862 (v).
Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
N.W.T. Act (jurisdiction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
N.W.T. Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10116 (v).
N.W.T. School Grants: in Com. of Sup., 11117 (v).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
N.S. Prisons, &c., Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Oaths of Office: See 'B. No. 1.'
Oats, Standards of: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Observatory: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Obstructions in Navigable Streams, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 3156, 3211 (ii).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10016 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10023; (Mr. Speaker) 10024 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Ques. of Order, (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10024: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 10031 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9220 (v).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i), 2941, 2949, 3147, 3195 (ii), 5763 (iii).
Ocean SS. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Official Cars, Number and Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied to Govt.: Ques. (Br. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 3242 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
Oil Borings, Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 13162 (vii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Old Age Pensions: M. for Sel. Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) to wthdrw., 3654 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7722 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Olympic Games Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Ont., Judges of: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Ontario North, Division of Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 8294 (v).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 10123 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
Order Paper, Differences between English and French Editions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6740, 6850 (iv).
——— Printing in French: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5407 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, 'Bourinot' quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
——— Appeal to Speaker from Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Original Documents and Returns: *See* 'Documents.'
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass on I.C.R. Express: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5471, 5656 (iii).
——— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5566 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
——— Archives Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Sussex Street: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa Grounds, Circular of C. S. Ass'cn: Read (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11499 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 516 (i).
——— O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Owen Sound to Meaford Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3038 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Pacific Coast Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii). *See* 'Blunden.'
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
——— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11259 (vi).
Parrsborough Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry Service, Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1120 (i).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Passages of Immigrants to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Passenger Ticket Act: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Passes on Steamers to Members, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Patent Medicines, Committee of Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3899 (ii).
Patent Medicines, Govt. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 356 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Apptmt. to Special Com., 10689 (vi).
Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Patents of General Chemical Co.: *See* 'B No. 174.'
Patents of Goodwin Car Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.
Patents of Metal Shingle and Siding Co.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Patents of Montague Moore, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Patent of Wm. B. Smith: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 672 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6002 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6241 (iv).
Patronage *re* Civil Service: M. (Mr. Foster, to Drop, 6243 (iv). *See* 'Civil Service System.'
Paulding, Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grants: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10403 (vi).
——— Survey of Lands: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c., Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Peat for Fuel Deposits, Development of in Canada: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Peat Industry, Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1122 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan), 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii), 12265 (vii).
Penitentiaries B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
Pension Fund of I.C.R. & P.E.I. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Perdue, Mr. M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 173 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals (Mr. Turriff) 1927 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Peterborough Steamboat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petition: M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Present, 1682 (i).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464, 7107 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
Petit Rocher Spur Line I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7937 (iv).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 7937 (iv).
Petroleum Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payment to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6920 (iv).
Pianos rented for Speaker's Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, I.C.R., Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
Pictou Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk. Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Pilotage and Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 5046 (iii), 13324 (vii).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Plains of Abraham, Battle of: *See* 'Nos. 111 & 219.'
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
See 'Militia—Ross Rifle.'
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv). 13330 (vii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Tenders, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup.. 5713 (iii).
Point Pelee Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Point St. Charles, Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv). 13330 (vii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
See 'Dredging.'
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).

Port Burwell Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146, 12211 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (ii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hillford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Port Hope, Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Port Hope Pier Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
Port Maitland Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Port Mulgrave, N.S., Preventing Boats landing Cargoes: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Rates on N.S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5701 (iii).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— Deficiency, &c., Complaints *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Delays, &c., Complaints *re* Ret.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Armstrong) 7257 (iv).
Postal Service, H. of C., Delay in delivering: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Postal Service, Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).
Postal Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6461 (iv).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
POST OFFICE:
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Mail Service,' &c.
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).
Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Calgary, P. O. and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).
Drop Letter One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) 184 (i).
Hamilton Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska.' Postal Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I. Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
——— Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C.P.R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service in B.C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii)
Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7199 (iv).
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
——— Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
——— Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
Newspaper Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
——— Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
See 'Weekly Newspapers.'
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Point St. Charles Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postal Arrangements between Can. and U.S.: Re-arrangement of: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4761 (iii).
Post Office Dept., Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii), 8872 (v).
——— Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v), 13152 (vii).
——— Returns, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6405 (iv).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 6288 (iv).
Post Office Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
——— Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
——— Delays in Distributing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
Quebec Terentenary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
——— Designs for, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
——— New Series, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6397 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
——— Postage Stamps, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (v).
Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Rural Postmasters, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 183 (i).
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St, Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank Opening, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Irene des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. John's Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Mary Finlay, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 691 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Scotch Hill East, Establishment of Post Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
See 'Quebec,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 609 (i).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Rates in N.S., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Regulation *re*, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5201 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
——— Interference in Eelctions: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing, Acting Minister of Marine: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7732 (iv).
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Presbyterian College of Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Presbyterian Ministers' Widows and Orphans Fund: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques (Mr. Foster) 360 (i).
Prince Albert Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 359 (i).
P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1295 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
P.E.I. Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I. Ice-breaker, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8444 (v).
——— Date of Signing of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10254 (v).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 365 (i).
P.E.I. Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
——— Lighthouses, Supplies, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 358 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishing of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2171 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8696, 9893 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6642 (iv).
——— Bear River Station-master's Dwelling, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1737
P.E.I. Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 3242 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifications, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
——— Harmony-Elmira Branch, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 12052 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for Sup., 2740 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 7100 (iv).
——— Mail Service, Delays in Distributing &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com of Sup., 9092 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Montague Branch. Claims of James Maher, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3834 (ii).
——— Montague Branch Extension: M. to dsch. Bill (Mr. Graham) 11405 (vi).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 848 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. A. McLean) 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3236 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Deductions *re* Hillsborough Bridge: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5079 (iii).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
——— Tenders *re* News Agency: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 568 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with G.B.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).
P.E.I., Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5801 (iii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8515 (v).
P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 4589 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 562 (i).
P.E.I., Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2546 (ii).
——— Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 936 (i).
——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 895 (i).
——— Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1109 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Steamer from Georgetown, Discussion: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1207 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1513 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-Breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4583 (iii).
——— Mail Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 1203 (i).

P.E.I., Progress *re* Construction of Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 5796 (iii).
—— Winter Communication: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4496 (iii).
P.E.I Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 172 (i).
—— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 843 (i).
Prince Rupert, Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Electric Motor Machines: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
Printing and Lithographing done outside of Canada, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732, 1931 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
See 'Lithographing.'
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 5th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Parmelee) 10915 (vi).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Printing and Stationary Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5661 (iii).
Printing, Supt., Apptmt. of a Frenchman: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act *re* N.S.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Prisoner, Released: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers: (Mr. Talbot 4221 (iii).
—— Ques. of *re* Registrar of Grey County (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Privy Council, Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
—— Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Prohibition Vote in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
—— Mess. from Senate: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13587 (vii).
—— Speech from Throne, 13590 (vii).
Protection Tariff, ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 74 (i).
Provincial Elections and Federal Ministers' Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 8850 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amount paid before and after Adjustment: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8616 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Provincial Voters' Lists: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Public Accounts Com., Evidence *re* Investigation, Freedom of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Bain) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3085 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4495 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 311 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2159 (ii); M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc., 9890 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).
Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13493 (vii).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3405 (ii).
See 'Business of the House.'
Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
—— Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bovce) 2170 (ii).
Public Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Public Lands of Dom., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers., Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 97.'

PUBLIC WORKS:
Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).
Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 59; N. 95) (iii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse a l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com, of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Architects on Public Works, Payments, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Arthabaskaville Public Buildin: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223, 12029 (vi).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4744 (iii).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Brantford Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
—— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi). 13338 (vii).
Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
Buildings Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
—— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
—— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
—— Man. and N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, N.B.: in Com. of Sup. 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
———Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (vi), 13331 (vii).
Buildings, Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Buildings and Public Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2170 (ii).
Buildings, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
——— Tender *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Cape St. Mary Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Que. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 12030 (vi).
——— Public Works, Expenditures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clerks of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
——— Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii)
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr Monk) 9277 (v).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
——— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City, Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Docks, Piers, &c., Constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773, 10259 (v).
——— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
——— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts, Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
See 'Midland,' &c.
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging at Midland, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii)
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (iv).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Glace Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (iii).
See 'Wharfs.'
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 13338 (vii).
Halifax, Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (v).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton, Public Works Employees at, Delay in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10015, 10119 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 133350 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
——— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
——— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
——— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., purchased by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake Francois Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter Piers: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: in Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lesser Slave Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2397 (ii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lunenburg Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McPherson's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River, Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Maple Creek, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Mar. Provs. Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markham Public Building : in Com of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
——Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Michipicoton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
—— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*:Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
Milford Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
'Montague" Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
N.B. Inland Water Wharf, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).
New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).
New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).
North Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6409 (iv).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Archives Fitting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
——— Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Mackenzie Avenue: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
——— Mint, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
——— Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— list read (Mr. Pugsley) 10998 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Sussex Street Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii)
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
——— progress *re* construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on conc., 13568 (vii).
——— Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Owen Sound Public Building, Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Building Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 11259 (vi).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Petite Descharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7107 (iv).
——— Stmnt. as to Missing Letters: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 9716 (v).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
——— Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvement: in Com of Sup., 12135 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146 (vii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi)
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hope Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
——— Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
——— Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. François Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
——— Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Prince Albert, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
——— Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
Public Works Dept., Architectural Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
——— Clerical and Temporary Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
——— Ass't Dep. Minister, Apptmt. of: in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 12917 (vii).
——— Engineering Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5661 (iii).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5730 (iii).
——— Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
——— New Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13061 (vii).
——— Ret.: on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 6223 (iv).
——— Technical Books of Reference: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
——— Telegraph Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
——— Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 11119 (vi).
Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures: Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4868, 4886; Neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Quebec County, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (ii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John : in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivière a la Graisse Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Roberval, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi) .
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Paymaster's List: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John, Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
——— Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Laurent Wharf: Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).

St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).

St. Maurice, Dam at Grande Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).

St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Thérèse Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).

——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).

Sarnia Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).

Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).

Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).

Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).

Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).

Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).

Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).

Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

——— Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).

Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567 (i).

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

——— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).

Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).

Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).

Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).

Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).

Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).

Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).

Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).

Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).

Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).

Tancook Island Breakwater in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).

Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
——— Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
——— Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Leurgey) 682 (i).
——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (iii)
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &.: Ques. (Mr. Madonell) 354 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354, 518, (i), 4587 (iii).
——— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Uxbridge Public Building: Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8803 (v).
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Winnipegosis Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winnipeg River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Pulp Wood Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Pulp Wood Export Duty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4774 (iii).
See 'Wood.'
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
——— Last Deficit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6459 (iv).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3481 (ii).
Quarantine Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8176 (iv).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos 111 and 219.'
Que. Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Quebec Bridge Accident, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8173 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Bank Claims, &c.: Corrected Information (Mr. Fielding) 6059 (iii)
——— Change of Plans *re* Height: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5202 (iii).
——— Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5793 (iii).
——— Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 605 (i).
——— Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
——— G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse and Vehicle Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
——— Material, Customs Duties collected &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5200 (iii).
——— Material on Hand, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1290 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5566 (iii).
——— Names of Jurymen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Commission : in Com of Sup., 12769 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 30; (Mr. Monk) 535 (i).
——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5914 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10302 (vi).
——— Evidence, &c.: M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. to Special Com., 10401 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3043, 4494 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 6223 (iv).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
Quebec Bridge, Commission's Report, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8608 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Barker) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. Chisholm) to conc., 13353, Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13363, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (viii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Cliff Walls, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Conty, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi), 12190 (vii).
——— Additional Apptmts.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
——— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Que. and N. B. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128'
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (viii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Branch Lines Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure since Confederation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, Signed 'P.M. G.': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 11501 (vi).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Quebec Reviews, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup. 13176 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter Read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 129.'
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
——— Legal Holidays: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4669 (iii).
——— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
——— Rural Corps, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8386 (v).
Quebec Tercentary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (v).
——— Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5209 (iii).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Questions, Answering of, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 234; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 234 (i).
——— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 350 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader' (Mr. Bergeron) 8604 (v).
——— *re* Doukhobors: (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321
——— Hunter, Mr., and French Canadians (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).
——— Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
——— *re* Stmnts of Mr. Conmee (Mr. Boyce) 7995 (iv).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 85 and 100.'
Ry. Act, B. 3: Ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 577 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i).
——— B. No. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Johnston) 5211 (iii).
Ry. Act (construction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
——— (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
——— (8-hour day) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
——— (employees' liability) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
——— (expropriation) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
——— (fire damages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
——— (level crossings) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
——— (mileage books) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
——— (ry. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 112.'
——— (ry. commission) Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Graham) rsmg. adjn. debate on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3° (Mr. Aylesworth) 11590; Amt., Neg. (Y. 36, N. 77) 11600; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602; Amt. (Mr. (Mr. Monk) 11603; Neg. (Y. 36, N. 89) 11608 (vi); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11614, 11619; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 11631; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11632 (vi).
——— (securities) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
——— (telegraphers, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
——— (trains on time) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
——— (wires, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
——— (working hours) Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. R. Smith): Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10120 (v)
Railway Commission, Applications *re* Crossing of Tracks, by Water Mains, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 1294 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Increase of. *See* 'B. No 112.'
——— Jurisdiction of: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
——— Legal Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 10362 (vi).
——— Salaries and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 10385 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10256 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Railway Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Applications to Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1109 (i).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
RAILWAYS :
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
—— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
See 'G.T.R..' &c.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Missions: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
—— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
—— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsidy: in Com of Sup., 13305 (vii).
—— Taxation Cases: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R., &c.'
G.T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
—— Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
See 'Brockville,' &c.
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.P. and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Knowles) 6291 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (ii).
—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W .J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
—— Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1689 (i).
—— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii), 9271 (v).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896; Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-06: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
National Transcontinental: *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
New York Central, Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
Railway Arbitrations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10329 (vi).
Railway Bridge Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9271 (v).
Railway Connections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) 434 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 10342

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Railway Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v)
——— Vote for: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 10007 (v).
Railways Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10341 (vi).
Railways, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 10357 (vi).
Railways and Municipalities, Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6987 (iv).
Railways Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Railway Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1346 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Applications for, Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12771 (viii).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
White Pass Ry. Co., (Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Rainy River. Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5209 (iii).
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5258 (iii).
Ranchvale Sub-land Agency, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4829 (iii).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchase of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12392 (vii).
Receiver-General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (viii).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rehm, Frederick C., *et al*, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10361 (vi).
Reinhardt, Mr., Interference in Quebec Provl. Elections: Cor., &c., read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).
See 'Caron.'
Renfrew Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Representation from Mar. Provs.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9891 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 9892 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9892 (v).
Representation in H. of C. for the Mar. Provinces: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Daniel) 9780 (v).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate : M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).
Restraint of Trade, Conspiracy in: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
Returns delayed: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13082 (vii).
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Detention of by Members: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5048 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2024 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 13081 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2384 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1018 (i), 3318, 2309 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Macdonell) 569 (i), 2885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8516 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 2738 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 2024 (ii).
Returns ordered, Lost, &c., Placed in Record Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to Complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
———Retention by Members: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4660 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Returns unopposed: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5914 (iii).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John's: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613 (v).
See 'Canals.'
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
——— Timber Reserve, Preservation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).
——— Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654 (iii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
See 'Ross Rifle.'
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7727 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivard, Mr. S., Employmt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraservile) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
——— Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
River St. John, Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4763 (iii).
——— M. for Papers (Mr. Ames) 5210 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Rolla L. Crain, Amounts paid to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges, Par. in 'Ottawa Citizen' *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Date of Contract, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— provisions *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus, Loans, Services of Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (ii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Consignment to N.W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Com., Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).
——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4404 (iii).
——— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
Ross Rifle. Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M.for Sup., 8902-8953 (v); Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
——— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v).
Ross Rifle, Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques, (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
——— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number, delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
——— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
——— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Report from Public Accounts, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of : Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
——— Target Practice, Suspension by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
——— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11289 (vi).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).
Royal Commission Return: Inquiry for (Mr Porter) 6288, 7447 (iv).
See 'Commissions'.
Royal Military College Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 12152, 13177 (vii).
——— Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Investigation into Conduct of Cadet Lancaster: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1451
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Rules of the House, Amendments to : Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Russian Govt. Payments *re* Compensation to B.C. Sealers: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
——— Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2391 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Appt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1690 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7731 (iv).
Ste. Barbe Floods, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— Damages *re* Floods: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 6987 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246, 5999 (iii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. Francis River Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
St. Francis River, Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c., Apptmt. of Dr. Savard, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office, Savings Bank, Recommendation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi)
St. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John and Cumberland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12263 (vii).
St. John, N.B., Cold Storage Co., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3580 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 3690 (ii).
—— Names of Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1938 (i).
See 'N.B.'
St. John, N.B., Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John Harbour, Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
St. John Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
—— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
—— Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
—— Quarantine, Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
—— Steam Sterilizer: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
—— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
—— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. John's, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Rapids Dam, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Gervais) 2996 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.
St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5035 (iii).
St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).
—— Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
—— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
—— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grand Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
——— Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7438 (iv).
St. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
——— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Saccharine Standards, &c., *re* Sugar Manufacture: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 183 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King, Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Salaries of Judges: *See* 'Judges.'
Salmon Licenses granted in B.C., Exclusive Privileges, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
——— in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted, in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr .A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr .Lake) 557 (i).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alta., Assurance Fund: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
Saskatchewan Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6400 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4761 (iii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9280 (v).
——— Land Grants, Patents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5801 (iii).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Stmnt. Read (Mr. Oliver) 10402 (vi).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
'Sault Express,' Amounts paid to for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 696 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853, 1129 (i).
Sault Ste Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 13470 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9278 (v).
Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 557 (i).
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6644 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6647 (iv).
—— M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c., Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3430 (ii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Sec. of State, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
Section 14, Southeast Quarter, Applications for: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Herron) 5476 (iii).
Section 32, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 8383 (v).
Securities of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Seed Control Act, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5500 (iii).
Seed Grain in N.W., Distribution to Settlers, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3040 (ii).
Seed Grain, Distribution, Duties of Mr. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3158 (ii).
Seed Grain, Buying and Distribution. Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420 vii).
—— Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 1438 (i).
—— Delegation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1840 (i).
Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5408 (iii).
—— Distribution to Settlers in N.W.: in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
See 'B. No. 96.'
Seed Grain to N.W. Settlers: M. to Adjn. (Mr. Sifton) 1349 (i).
—— O.C. *re* Advances: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6634 (iv).
—— O.C. amending Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6981 (iv).
—— Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 692 (i).
—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10121 (v).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3690 (ii).
—— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3752 (ii).
—— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 3157 (ii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12391 (vii).
—— Incomplete Answer (Mr. Blain) 12551 (vii).
—— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12661 (vii).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 13066 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, 'Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1684 (i).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9714 (v).

Semaphores on Railways, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 239 (i).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Senate Reform: Prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1513 (i).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Senate Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 10489 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26th: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Sessional Papers and Returns, Number ordered, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 2796 (ii).
——— Number presented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 2592 (ii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
See 'Clarke City.'
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com .of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1295 (i)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
——— Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shipbuilding in Canada: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2947 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7732 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6919 (iv).
Shipping Master at Quebec, Apptmnt. of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5915; Cor. read (Mr. Sproule) 5916 (iii).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii) .
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5445; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5460.
Signal Dues at Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Six Nations Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Skinner's Cove Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Sleeping Car Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Smith, O., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4765 (iii).
Smith, Wm. B., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom .Fruit Inspector, Salary ,&c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Salary: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2398 (ii).
——— Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5085 (iii).
Snag Boats on Red River, Construction and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567, 891 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 8295 (v).
——— Investigation by Mr. Gaudet *re* Irregularities, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6988, 7099 (iv).
——— Irregularities, Final Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10794 (vi).
Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5408 (iii)

Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 5477 (iii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet *re* Padding: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7938 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet: laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 8170 (iv).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Sorel Public Works, Investigations *re* Pay Rolls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
—— Charges against Overseer, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
—— Comnr. Boyer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
—— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
—— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
Soulanges Canal, Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2386 (ii).
—— Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
S.A. Volunteers' Lands Grants Bill: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3316 (ii), 11938 (vi).
—— Land Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
—— Land Grants: Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
—— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— School Teachers, Recognition of Services by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2791 (ii).
South African Volunteers, Bounty to: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Southampton Breakwater: in Com of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7729 (iv).
South Huron By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Spain, Commander, Expenditure re Wrecks Investigations: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4405 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 4670
—— Papers *re* Travelling Expenses: Laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4825 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
—— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).
Speakers' Expenses, House of Commons, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
—— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 565 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Springhill Increased Accommodation: in Com of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Squatters Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 4739 (iii).
Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Standard Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Standard Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).
'Stanley,' Passenger Accommodation *re* Staterooms: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 687 (i).
Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv)
—— Disappearance of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).

Statistical Branch, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
—— List of Officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection Act: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
—— Rep. presented (Mr. Brodeur) 3896 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for Five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 853 (i).
Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3850 (ii).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. White) 3233 (ii).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor I.C.R., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Stoney Creek Battleford Monument: in Com of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stoney Lake Damage Claims: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5565 (iii).
Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Students of Technology: *See* 'Govt. Works.'
Subsidiary High Court of A. O. F.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
—— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
See 'Sutherland Rifle Sight,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Sugar Manufacture, Regulations *re* Saccharine Standards: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley': Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7989 (iv).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Blain) 5847, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 90) 5877 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 94, 136, 186.'
Supply—Changes in Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1884 (i).
—— Conc.: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5499, 5915 (iii).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Obstruction *re*, Charges by Govt: on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
See 'Obstruction.'
SUPPLY:
Committee:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 671 (i).
Census and Statistics, 673 (i), 12879 (vii)
Exhibitions, 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Experimental Farms, 12549 (vii).
Fruit and Dairying Industry, 10397 (vi).
Fumigation Stations, 12879 (vii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibits, 10623
Live Stock Industry, 12894 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 12893 (vii).
Patent Record, 672 (i).
Seed Control, &c., 5500 (iii), 12891 (vii).
Year Book, 677 (i).
Charges of Management:
Dom .Notes, 5562 (iii).
Offices of Assistant Receivers General, 12160 (vii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 645 (i), 12878 (vii).
Auditor General's Office, 635 (i).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 12917 (vii).
Customs, 637 (i).
Finance, 637 (i), 5562 (iii), 12914 (vii).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 610 (i).
Inland Revenue, 645 (i).
Interior, 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Justice, 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Labour, 12156 (vii).
Marine, 976 (i), 12915 (vii).
Militia and Defence, 611 (i), 8871 (v).
Mines, 646 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police, 8862 (v).
Post Office, 8872 (v).
Printing Bureau, 612 (i).
Privy Council, 610 (i), 12902 (vii).
Public Works, 638, 645 (i), 5698 (iii), 12916 (vii).
Railways and Canals, 10325 (vi), 12755 (vii).
Secretary of State, 611 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 648 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Customs:
Printing, &c., 9577 (v).
Revenue Cruisers, &c., 9578 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9223, 9439 (v).
Salaries, Inspectors of Ports, &c., 9536 (v).
Departments Generally:
Charwomen, 10508 (vi).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 10038 (v).
Surveys, &c., 9987 (v).
Dominion Police, 5509 (iii).
Excise:
Methylated Spirits, 820 (i).
Distillery Duty, 814 (i).
Duty collected, Expenses *re*, 817 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 817 (i).
Salaries, &c., 813 (i).
Stamps for Tobacco, 816 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 814 (i).
Fisheries:
Dog Fish, Reduction Works, 13325 (vii).
Protection Service, 13326 (vii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5777 (iii), 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey:
Boring for Oil, &c., 13162 (vii).
Maps, &c., 12260 (vii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 12261 (vii).
Govt. of the Northwest Territories:
General Vote, 10116 (v).
Govt. of the Yukon:
General Vote, 10107 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 9769, 9840 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 9948, 9964 (v).
Deporting Immigrants, 9952 (v).
General Expenses, 5751 (iii), 13169 (vii)
Winnipeg Hospital, &c., 9982 (v).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Salaries, 12752 (vii).
Generally:
Destitute Indians, Relief, 5762 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, 5762 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Salaries, 12736, 13170 (vii).
Sioux, 5762 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 12729 (vii).
Inspection of Staples:
Salaries, 12264 (vii).
Justice:
Exchequer Court, 5505 (iii).
Printing and Binding, 5508 (iii)
Supreme Court:
Contingencies, 12917 (vii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 10502 (vi).
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 10508 (vi).
General Vote, 10490 (vi).
Printing and Binding, 10507 (vi).
Salaries, 10501 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 10503 (vi)
Voters' Lists, 10500 (vi).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library of Parliament:
General Vote, 10503 (vi).
Senate:
General Vote, 10489 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5039 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262 (vii)
Dockyards, Maintenance, 5039 (iii).
Lightship at Point Pelee, 13325 (vii).
Limekiln Crossing, 13323 (vii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5039 (iii).
Pilotage, Str. 'Eureka,' 5046 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 13324 (vii).
Repairs to Lightships, 5039 (iii)
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Signal Service, 5045 (iii).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking, 5041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, 5045 (iii).
Mail Subsidies:
Can. and Australia, 13152 (vii).
Can. and G. B., 12728 (vii).
Can., Japan and China, 13152 (vii).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Marine Hospitals:
Further Amount, 5782 (iii).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5662, 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13176, 13540 (vii).
Battlefields, Monuments, 13177 (vii).
Customs Dues, 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Dominion Arsenal, 12154 (vii).
Gratuity to Caretaker J. Donovan, 13177 (vii).
Gratuity to Mrs. C. D. Murray, 13177 (vii).
Military Properties, Construction, &c., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Cliff Repairs, 12148 (vii).
Ordnance, &c., 12505 (vii).
Pay and Allowances, 12147 (vii).
Provisions, 5662 (iii), 12150 (vii).
Rifle Associations, Grants, 12152 (vii).
Royal Military College, 12152, 13177 (vii).
Salaries and Wages, 12147 (vii).
Warlike Stores, 12149 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Bank of Commerce, Yukon Services, 13167 (vii).
Chinese Riots, Vancouver, 13155 (vii).
Royal Commission, 13156 (vii).
Civil Service Commission, 13168 (vii).
Cotton Industry, Quebec, Commission, 13156 (vii).
Grant to National Gymnastic Society, 13167 (vii).
Jamaica Earthquake, 5784 iii).
Japanese Riots, B.C., 5783 (iii).
Labour Dept., 12261 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries, Investigation, 13169 (vii).
Mounted Police, Compensation, 8870 (v).
Olympic Games, Can. Representatives, 13167 (vii).
Oriental Labour Question, 13156 (vii).
Park Reservations, 5755 (iii).
Prince Fushimi's Visit, 5783 (iii).
Seed Grain Relief, 2770 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8863 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Strait, 1885, 1895 (i), 2941 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, Ice-breakers, &c., 1033, 1060 (i), 5763 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 12918 (vii).
General Vote, 5509, 5522 (iii), 12265 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 12918 (vii).
Pensions:
Rebellion of 1885, *re*, 8870 (v).
Post Office:
Durston, Robt., Apptmt., 5561 (iii).
Mail Service, 5561 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 5562 (iii).
North Bay Office, 13152 (vii).
Salaries and Allowances, 9092 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Archives, 5700 (iii).
Astronomical Observatory, 1450, 1485 (i).
Eastern Building, 1504 (i).
New Buildings, 1504 (i), 5701 (iii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1486 (i).
Royal Mint, 1451, 1470 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 5701 (iii).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Quebec:
Lake St. Peter Piers, 4752 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Sorel Property, 4751 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5035 (iii).
Dredging Plant, 4754 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 12145, 13326 (vii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 12146 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 12145 (vii).
Marine Dept.:
Gratuity to mother of late J. Carbonneau, 13321 (vii).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue:
Graving Docks, Maintenance, 5731 (iii).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 5721 (iii).
Telegraph Lines:
Ashcroft-Dawson, 5731 (iii).
Cape Beale Lines, 5731 (iii).
Operating Expenses, 13178 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Chilliwack, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Cranbrook, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Cumberland, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Fernie, Public Building, 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
Grand Forks, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Greenwood, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Quesnel, Public Building, 10867 (vi).
Revelstoke, Public Building, 13339 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse, 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building, 10868 (vi).
Vernon, Public Building, 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Victoria, Immigration Building, 10874 (vi).
——— Post Office, 10883 (vi).
Williams Head, Quarantine Station, 10883 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 10886 (vi).
Experimental Farms, 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii).
General Vote, 10886 (vi).
Manitoba:
Brandon, Drill Hall, 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building, 8519 (v).
Elmwood, Public Building, 13335 (vii).
Emerson, Public Building, 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Neepawa, Public Building, 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Selkirk, Public Building, 8547 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 8566 (v).
Souris, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Examining Warehouse, 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building, 8573 (v).
Winnipeg, Military Buildings, Hospital, 10955 (vi).
——— Fort Osborne Barracks, 10969 (vi), 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Post Office, Land and Building, 8575 (v).
Winnipeg, Postal Station 'B,' 8576 (v).
New Brunswick:
Fairville, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, 13328 (vii).
Grand Falls, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Hillsborough, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Moncton, Armoury, 13328 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
St. John, 5703 (iii), 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7187 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 7110 (iv).
Bridgewater, Public Building, 7135 (iv).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 7139 (iv).
Halifax, Dom. Buildings, Repairs, 7140 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7142 (iv).
——— Immigrant Detention Building, 7143 (iv).
——— Military Quarters, 7143 (iv).
——— New Building, 7144 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station, 7171 (iv).
Inverness, Public Building, 7172 (iv).
Lunenburg, Public Building, 13326 (vii).
Parrsborough, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 7173 (iv).
Westville, Public Building, 7179 (iv).
Wolfville, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Yarmouth, Public Building, 7180 (iv).
Ontario:
Arnprior, Public Building, 7454 (iv).
Belleville Armoury, 7454, 7678 (iv).
Brantford, Public Buildings, 7455 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7467 (iv).
Glencoe, Public Building, 7473 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph Armoury, 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 7692 (iv).
——— Post Office, 7696 (iv).
Harriston, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Kincardine, Public Building, 7698 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 10907 (vi).
——— New Gun Shed, 7700, 7814 (iv).
——— New Guard-house, 7701, 7814 (iv).
——— New Hospital, 7702, 7814 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, 7702 7819 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, Stables, 10907 (vi).
——— New Magazine, 10907 (vi).
Leamington, Public Building, 7701, 7815 (v), 13331 (vii).
Listowel, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
London, Military Buildings, 7705 (iv).
Markham, Public Building, 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Mount Forest, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Mitchell, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
North Bay, Public Building, 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Ottawa, Departmental Buildings, Sky-lights, 7816 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa Post Office, 5705 (iii).
——— Printing Bureau, 7817 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 7817 (iv).
Parkhill, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 7826 (iv).
Sarnia, 7829 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Seaforth, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sudbury, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Tilsonburg, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Uxbridge, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Waterloo, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Walkerville, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Welland, Public Building, 7830 (iv).
Whitby, Public Building, 7833 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Georgetown, 7182 (iv).
Quebec:
Arthabaskaville, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Chicoutimi, Post Office, 7279 (iv).
Cookshire, Post Office, 7281 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7286 (iv).
Dundee, Custom House, 7286 (iv).
Farnham, Post Office, 7287 (iv).
Grand Mere, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Grosse Isle, Improvements, 7289 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus, 7290 (iv).
Joliette, Armoury, 13329 (vii).
Knowlton, Public Building, 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building, 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lake Megantic, Public Building, 7294 (iv).
Lévis, Public Building, 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Longueuil, Public Buiding, 7304 (iv).
Magog, Public Building, 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Marieville, Public Building, 7306 (iv).
Megantic, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Montreal, Barracks, 7407 (iv).
——— General Post Office, 7410 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, 'B,' 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, Point St. Charles, 5703 (iii), 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
——— Eastern Postal Station, 7419 (iv).
——— New Examining Warehouse, 7423 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 7428 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Plessisville, Public Building, 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Quebec Citadel, Drill Shed, 7430 (iv).
——— Governor General's Quarters, 7431 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital, 7433 (iv).
——— Military Building, 7434 (iv).
Quebec East, Public Building, 7438 (iv).
Roberval, Public Building, 13330 (vii). (vii).
St, Henri, Post Office, 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe, Public Building, 7440 (iv).
St. Johns, Military Buildings, 7440 (iv).
——— Public Buildings, 7444 (iv).
St. Therese, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Shawenegan, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Three Rivers, New Building, 13330 (vii).
Westmount, Public Buildings, 13330 (vii).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 10981 (vi).
Electric Light, &c., 11011 (vi).
Elevator Attendants, 11011 (vi).
Furniture, 11007 (vi).
Grounds, 11012 (vi).
Heating, &c., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
Immigration Buildings, 11008 (vi).
Major's Hill Park, 11015 (vi).
Post Office, 11007 (vi).
Quarantine Stations, 11008 (vi).
Rideau Hall, 11005 (vi).
Telephones, 5706 (iii), 11012 (vi).
Ventilation, Lighting, &c., 5707 (iii), 10981 (vi).
Yukon Buildings, 11005 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Barracks for Permanent Corps (Strathcona Horse), 10975 (vi).
Battleford, Public Building, 8576 (v).
Calgary, Public Building, 8578 (v).
Edmonton, Public Building, 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan, Land Office, 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Humboldt, Public Building, 8582 (v).
Lethbridge, Armoury, 13336 (vii).
Maple Creek, Public Building, 8600 (v), 13337 (vii) .
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 8601 (v).
Moose Jaw, Armoury, 13337 (vii)
——— Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Prince Albert, 8601 (v), 13337 (vii).
Regina, Post Office, 8602 (v).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Saskatchewan and Alberta—*Con.*
Strathcona, Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Wetaskiwin, Public Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Yorkton, Public Building, 8603 (v).
Yukon Territory:
Commissioner's Residence, 10883 (vi).
P. O. Building, 13339 (vii).
Dredging:
Mar. Provs., New Plant, 12142 (vii).
Ont. and Quebec, 13351 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Spillumcheen River, 13351 (vii).
Thompson River, 13351 (vii).
Manitoba:
Grand Marais Harbour, 12140 (vii).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake, 12141 (vii).
Mar. Provs.:
General Vote, Creosoted Timber, 12028 (vi).
New Brunswick:
Beaver Harbour, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Buctouche, Channel, 11679 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Caraquet, Wharf, &c., 11685 (vi).
Dorchester Wharf, Addition, 13344 (vii).
Dover, Wharf, 11692 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11693 (vi).
Harvey Bank, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Leonardsville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lorneville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lower Newcastle, Wharf, 11695 (vii).
Madawaska River, Extension of Dyke, 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Miscou, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Moncton, Wharf, 11696 (vi).
New Mills, Wharf, 13345 (vii).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers, &c., 11698 (vi).
River St. John, including tributaries, 11698 (vi).
River St. John, Wharfs in Tide Water, 12000 (vi), 13345 (vii).
St. Andrews, Harbour Improvements, 12011 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements, 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
Shippegan, Harbour, 12027 (vi).
Tracadie, Protection Works, 13349 (vii)
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis Harbour Improvements, 11207 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf, 11219 (vi).
Barachois, Training Pier, 11223 (vi).
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour, 12224 (vi).
Big Lorraine Harbour, 11224 (vi).
Breton Cove, 11224 (vi).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater, 11224
Cariboo Island, Causeway, 11224 (vi).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 11225 (vi).
Church Point, 11225 (vi).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) 11225 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Digby, Harbour, 11226 (vi).
Fort Lawrence Wharf—Extension of head block, additional trestle approach, &c., General Vote, 13341 (vii).
Glace Bay, 11223 (vi).
Hall's Harbour, 11228 (vi).
Lake Ainslie, Boat Channel, 11228 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11229 (vi).
Margaree River, Shear Dams, &c., 11229 (vi).
Middle River (Lower) 11229 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Wharf, 11257 (vi).
Oyster Pond, 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 11258 (vi).
Parrsboro', Harbour Improvements, 11259 (vi).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 11260 (vi).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, 11268 (vi).
Port Joli West, Herring Rocks. Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Port Royal, Madame Island, Wharf 11278 (vi).
Portuguese Cove, Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Pugwash, Wharf, 11279 (vi).
Round Hill, Wharf, 11282 (vi).
Scotch Cove Breakwater, 11290 (vi).
Skinner's Cove, Dredging Channel, &c., 11290 (vi).
Sydney Harbour, Wharf, 11230 (vi).
Tancook Island, 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay, Wharf, 11290 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 11291 (vi).
Ontario :
Beaverton, Harbour Improvements, 12090 (vii).
Belle River, Dredging, 12090 (vii).
Blanche River, Improvement, 12090 vii).
Blind River, Dredging, &c., 12091 (vii).
Bronte Dredging, 5703 (iii).
Bronte Harbour, Repairs, 12091 (vii).
Burlington Channel Piers, 12092 (vi).
Chûte à Blondeau, Wharf, 12092 (vii).
Cobourg, Dredging, &c., 12095 (vii).
Colborne, Wharf, 12095 (vi).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements, 12096 (vii).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 12101, 13350 (vii).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 12101 (vii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12101 (vii).
Juniper Island, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Lakefield, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Little Current, 13350 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, 12103 (vii).
Magnetawan River, 13350 (vii).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 12103 (vii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Michipicoten, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Midland and Tiffin Harbours, 5709 (iii), 12103 (vii).
Montreal River, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Petawawa, 12133 (vii).
Peterborough, Steamboat Landing, 12133 (vii).
Point Edward, Dredging, 5713 (iii).
Port Burwell, Improvement to Harbour, 12135 (vii).
Port Hope, Repairs, 12135 (vii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 12136 (vii).
Rainy River, Improvements at Long Sault Rapid, 12136 (vii).
Roach's Point, Wharf, 12136 (vii).
Rondeau, Harbour Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Rossport, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Severn River, 12137 (vii).
Southampton, Repairs to Chantry Island Breakwaters, 12137 (vii).
Stanley Island, Wharf, 5720 (iii).
Tobermory, Harbour, 13351 (vii).
Toronto Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Winnipeg River, Improvements, 12133 (vii).
Prince Edward Island :
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11292 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11292 (vi).
New London, 11292 (vi).
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater, 11293 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point, Strengthening Breakwater, &c., 13341 (vii).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13343 (vii).
Quebec:
Anse à la Barbe, Breakwater, 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 12029 (vi).
Baie St. Paul, 12029 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 12029 (vi).
Batiscan, Dredging, 12029 (vi).
Berthier, Wharf, 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Harbour, Improvements, 12030 (vi).
Clarke City, Wharf Improvements, 12031 (vi).
East Templeton, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Escoumains, Pier, 12031 (vi).
Father Point, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Grand Méchin, Breakwater, 12031 (vi).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé), Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12031 (vi).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 12032 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lake Megantic, Piers, 12032 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers, Repairs, &c., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Lavaltrie, Wharf, 12033 (vi).
Les Eboulements, Repairs, 12033 (vi).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Government Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, &c., 12033 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter, 12034 (vi).
Matane Breakwater, &c., 12034 (vi).
Montmagny, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Harbour, 12034 (vi).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, 12034 (vi).
Piché Point (Lake Temiskaming) Pile Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Point aux Trembles, Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Wharf Improvements, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Dredging Approach, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Ashouapmouchouan, Training Dykes, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Batiscan, Dredging Channel, 12036 (vi).
River Bonaventure, Training Pier, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (en haut) Dredging, &c., 12036 (vi).
River du Lièvre, Lock and Dam, 12037 (vi).
River Maskinonge, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Ouelle, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Ice Piers, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Improvements, 12038 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Lawrence, Ice Piers at River St. Jacques, 12041 (vi).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 12040 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Channel between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, 12041 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dam at Grandes Piles. 12041 (vi).
River Yamaska, Lock, &c., 12041 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Addition to Wharf, 12041 (vi).
St. Anne des Monts, 12041 (vi).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Ignace de Loyola, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Omer, Landing Pier, 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets, Pile Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Siméon, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Wharf, 13349 (vii).
Varennes, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Lesser Slave River, 5719 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Old Man's River, 12142 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Architectural Branch, Salaries, 11096 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 11078 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, 11101 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. Thos. O'Leary, 5730 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Salaries, 11093 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 11119 (vi).
International Commission, Red River of the North, 11118 (vi).
Monuments to late Sir L. H. Lafontaine, R. Baldwin, 11118 (vi).
Monuments at Brantford *re* Telephone Invention, 11118 (vi).
Surveys, &c., 11071 (vi).
Technical Books, 11100 (vi).
Telegraph Service, Salaries, 11097 (vi).
Temporary Assistance, &c., 11099 (vi).
Roads and Bridges:
Shellmouth Bridge, 12143 (vii).
Telegraph Lines:
General Operating Expenses—Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 12143 (vii).
Maritime Provs.:
Generally, 5730 (iii).
Quarantine:
Salaries, Public Health, &c., 5504 (iii).
Railways and Canals—
Canals—
Carillon:
Dam. 12768 (vii).
Chambly:
Macadamizing Towpath, 12226 (vii).
Cornwall:
Gate Lifter, 12226 (vii).
Repairs to Bank, 12768 (vii).
Galops:
Generally, 5671 (iii).
Generally, 5696 (iii).
Sunday Work, 13174 (vii).
Lachine:
J. Richard, Loss of Horse, 13174 (vii).
Leak at Lock No. 1, 5672 (iii).
Slope Walls, 5663 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Lachine—*Con.*
Staff, 5696 (iii).
Walls, 12226 (vii).
Murray:
Houses, 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Roller, 12225 (vii).
Rideau:
Generally, 5689 (iii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
Sault St. Marie:
Construction, 12223 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office, 12225 (vii).
Soulanges:
Improvements, 12225 (vii).
Manning and Macdonald's Claim, 5668 (iii).
Trent:
Construction, 12225 (vii).
Dam at Buckhorn, 12227 (vii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
New Lock, &c., Lindsay, 12227 (vii).
Properties, Damages *re* Flooding, 12768 (vii).
Welland:
Dredge Slide in Deep Cut, 5673 (iii).
Electric Lighting, 12195 (vii).
Port Colborne, Improvements, 12211 (vii).
Port Maitland, Entrance, 5673 (iii).
Queenston, St. Bridge, &c., 12207 (vii).
Surveys, 12207 (vii).
To Purchase Boat, 5691 (iii).
Widen Canal, 12210 (vii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, 12704 (vii).
Intercolonial Railway:
Additional Line, Moncton to Truro, Survey, 12760 (vii).
Amherst Improvements, 12233 (vii).
Antigonish, Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Chatham, Improvements, 12757 (vii).
Double Tracking, 12236 (vii).
Fredericton, Improvements, 12758 (vii).
General Vote, 5693 (iii), 10126 (v).
Halifax Accommodation, 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 12259 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Machinery for Shops, 12257 (vii).
Moncton Shops, &c., 12250 (vii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
New Glasgow, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
North Sydney, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
Petit Rocher, Spur Track, 12759 (vii).
Pictou, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Rolling Stock, 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
St. Cyrille and Drummondville, 12756 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
St. John, Accommodation, 12257 (vii).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville, Improvements, 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Accommodation, 12233 (vii).
Stellarton, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Strengthening Bridges, 12259 (vii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, 12229, 12759 (vii).
Truro, Accommodation, 12231 (vii).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys and Construction, 12238, 12728 (vii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Hillsborough Bridge, 12762 (vii).
Surveys of Branch Lines, 12764 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 10329 (vi).
Compensation to C.P.R. *re* Right of Way, 5561 (iii).
Extra Clerks, &c., 10342 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry., Inspections, 10390 (vi).
International Congress, Subscription, 10377 (vii).
Legal Expenses, 10357 (vi).
Miscellaneous Works, 10328 (vi).
Ry. Commission, 10361, 10385 (vi).
Ry. Statistics, 10328 (vi).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 10378 (vi).
Staff and Repairs, 10304 (vi).
Statistical Offices, 10317 (vi).
Surveys, &c., Canals, 10338 (vi).
To provide for Quebec Bridge Plans, 12769 (vii).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 9737 (v).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 13169 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Supt. of Insurance:
General Vote, 12160 (vii).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 12264 (vii).
Concurrence:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 13573 (vii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c., 13574 (vii).
J. G. Artz, Salary, 13578 (vii).
Mines Branch, Investigation of Ore Deposits, &c., 13569 (vii).
Sessional Clerks, 13577 (vii).
South Lake, N.S., Opening Channel, 13568 (vii).
Telephone Invention, Monument *re*, 13567 (vii).
Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Supreme Court of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Supreme Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Registrar's Official Uniform: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Owen) 5507 (iii).

Surveys of Dom. Lands: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle, Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Sutherland Rifle Sight Co. Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
—— Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Sydney Cement, Quality, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Ross) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
—— Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines, Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Technical Books of Reference, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry: Prop. Res. (Mr. Gutherie) 2856 (ii).
—— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12660 (vii).
Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 12657 (vii).
Telegraph Branch, P. W. Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
Telegraph Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telegraph Lines, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
—— Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
—— Operating and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Telegraphs and Telephones, and Man. Boundaries, Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3042 (ii).
Telegraph, Yukon, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup,. 13178 (vii).
——ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Telephone Invention, Monument at Brantford: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Telephone Rates: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 690 (i).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Tenders, List of Papers *re* Advertisements: Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
Tenders, Opening of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Haggart) 2738 (ii).
Tenders for Public Works, &c.: *See* 'Advertisements.'
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadian Commission: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4770 (iii).
Tercentenary at Quebec: *See* 'Battlefields,' 'Quebec,' &c.
Territories Real Property Act, Payments *re* Land to Alberta and Saskatchewan: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7094 (iv).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number Cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).
Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 13085 (vii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
'Thin Red Line': *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 3215 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 682 (i).
—— Breakwater Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tiffin Harbour Dredging: in Com of Sup., 5709 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v). *See* 'Midland,' &c.
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Timber Berths awarded between June, 1904, and July 15th, 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crawford) 3851 (ii).
Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Petition by Original Grantees: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2546 (ii).
Timber Berths: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4833 (iii).
Timber Berth, East Sask., Conditions of Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3839 (ii).
Timber Berths in Man. and N.W. Ters. under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 852
Timber Berths Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. McCraney) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCraney) 4589 (iii).
—— Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. White) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1046, &c., Original Applications: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 852 (i).
—— No. 1100, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364 (i).
—— No. 1168, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 363 (i).
—— Nos. 1220-1272: on Order for Ret., Amt. (Mr. Lake) 849 (i).
—— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster (Mr. Turriff) 11303; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 11304; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11304 (vi).
Timber Berths, Original Documents: M. for Papers (Mr. Lake) 2855 (ii).
—— Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2856 (ii). *See* 'Documents.'
—— Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2983 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3318 (ii).
Timber Berths, Par. in Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 5077 (iii).
—— Tenders, &c., Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. White) 2983 (ii).
Timber Berths, &c.: *See* 'Documents, Original.'
Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2168 (ii).
Timber Lands, Sale to Messrs. Rutherford, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1293 (i).
—— Sale or Lease, subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 8697 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3212 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3038 (ii).
Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 359 (i).
—— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 236 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1739 (i).
Timber Licenses in Manitoba and N. W. Ters., Renewal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 691 (i).
—— during 1896-7: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2396 (ii).
—— Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1127 (i).
—— Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
—— Denial *re* Application (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3578 (ii).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., Com. of Investigation *re*: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2269, 2310, 2466, 2595; Amt. neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).
Timber Limits, Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2386 (ii).
Timber Limits: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3580 (ii).
Timber Marking Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Timber Permits to Settlers, *re* Cutting in Twp. 39, Range 11: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11495

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 179 (i).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (Amt.) 8778; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).
Timber Sales, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Burrows) *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).
Tobacco Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 566 (i).
Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4402 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 178 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers, in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Tobacco Prohibition, Res. from Moral Reform Associations: Remarks (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Rev. Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Resolutions: in Com. on Ways and Means, 6118 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Tobacco Stamps for Imports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 816 (i).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tobique Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
See 'Montreal Turnpike,' &c.
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354 (i).
—— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
—— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354,518 (i).
—— Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4587 (iii).
—— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10916 .(vi).
Townsend, Arthur James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'
Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works, &c., *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1125 (i).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Trade and Commerce, Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
—— Chinese Act: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i), (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5199 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Returns: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Trans.-Canada Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (vii).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
See 'G.T.P.,' &c.
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
—— Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145, 13326 (vii).
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Travellers Life Assurance Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Travelling Expenses, Minister of Marine at Colonial Conference: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 985; (Mr. Foster) 998 (i).
—— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial Conference.'
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Thompson) 3172 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of: Remarks (Mr .Owen) 609 (i).
Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
—— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
—— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
—— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com .of Sup., 10310 (vi).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
—— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
—— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
—— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
—— Holland River Dredging Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
—— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
—— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
—— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Trueman, Mr., and N.B. Cold Storage Co.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9343 (v).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Truro Inreased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to the Senate: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).
Two-Cent-a-Mile Rate: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Under-Secretaries of State, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).
U.S., Treaties with: *See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7502 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5338 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5788 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 5800 (iii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i).
Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7996 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Vancouver Bank incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 779 (i).
Vancouver Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Vancouver, New Westminster and Yukon Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6406, 7730 (iv).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa".
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
—— Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8893 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
'Victor' Tug, Repairs to by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9774 (v).
'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks: (Mr. Bergeron) 13066 (vii).
Walker, Andrew, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt. in Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3230 (ii).
—— Contracts with Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3843 (ii).
—— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3842 (ii).
—— Payments to by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5085 (iii).
—— Purchase of Cement for Heath Point Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Warlike and Other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Water Carriage of Goods: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13416 (vii).
Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Water Mains across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Water Power Privileges in Alberta, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8378 (v).
Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
See 'Cassels.'
Waugh and Perrin, Immigration Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement, 5137 (iii).
—— For Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— in Com on Tobacco Resolutions, 6118 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78 & 93.'
Weather Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
—— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
—— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
—— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
—— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
West Indian Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1860 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v)

Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
Whaling Licenses, B.C., Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9276 (v).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
——— Harbours Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L .Borden) 1130 (i).
——— and Revenues Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution of in Thetford Mines: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9894 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11496 (vi).
White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Wheat Frozen in Shipping from Man., &c.: M. to adjn. House (Mr. Blain) 825 (i).
Wheat Shipments, Feed, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 893 (i).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) for copies of Memorials, &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Banks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Finance,' &c.
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Yukon.'
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (ii).
Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11498 (vi).
Wilson Cordage Co., Cor., Accounts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 95, 102, 144.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1131 (i).
——— Expiration of Franchise: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1940 (i).
Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'B .No. 19.'
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
——— Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winnipeg River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 9982 (v).
Winnipegosis Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216
See 'P.E.I.'
Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Wireless Stations, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
See 'Marconi.'
Wires Across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 568 (i).
Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7449 (iv).
See 'Pulp.'

Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com .of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster C. L. Smith, Interference in Elections: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
Woollen Industry, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13082 (vii).
——— Legislation *re* Relief: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12772 (vii).
——— Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7504 (iv).
——— Reply to Manufacturers' Ass'cn. by Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
——— Specific Duty: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 6988 (iv).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr .Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Writs of Elections: *See* 'B .No. 66.'
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 677 (i).
Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
York, Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'

YUKON:
Bank of Commerce Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Clements, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
——— O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 5801 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 10301 (v).
Charges against Administrators, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1690 (i), 2170 (ii).
Charges of Dr. Pringle *re* Immorality, &c.: (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instruction *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12050 (vii).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Ret., 1691 (i). *See* 'Wiley,' &c.
Corruption Charges in Public Officials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5785 (iii).
Elections Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
Expenditures, Total Amount: Remarks *re* Question (Mr .Foster) 1128 (i).
Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 1132 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 6464 (iv). *See* 'Revenue.'
Finnie, Mr. O. S., Investigation *re* Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 4316 (iii).
Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commissioners *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 894 (i).
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
Gold Commissioner's Office, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
Gold Cos., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7725 (iv).
Govt. Officials, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (v).
Judges' Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11123 (vi).
Liquor Permits, Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 5048 (iii).
Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. F. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5999 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*
Mail Service: Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Mail Service during Winter: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5136 (iii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Money Transmission, Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2979 (ii).
Morality Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, (vi).
—— Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689, 11016 (vi).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, 11122 (vi).
Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4245, 4588 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 4589 (iii).
Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 698 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*
Revenue and Expenditure from March 31st to June 30, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114, 1346 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N.W.M.P. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Gobt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Land, Names, &c.: M .for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2796 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon.'
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).